

January 8, 2007

To: George Carlo
From: B. Blake Levitt

Dear George,

I am in receipt of your email dated 11/14/06 and this is my response. There will not likely be another after this. Below, I have appended the three pertinent emails about to be discussed.

An employee of yours, Jill Ungar, sent me a query email on 11/13/06, saying she'd heard that I did not have a high opinion of you and wondered why not, since we are ostensibly on the same side of the EMF issue. She did not identify herself as working for you. When I answered her initial query honestly, as I do the numerous people who contact me on a daily basis, she obviously sent it along to you. In my first response to her, thinking she was another EMF activist or a possible BioPro rep, one of the things I said was that she should keep in mind that you are a lawyer. Your hair-trigger response couldn't have been more in character. You threatened me with legal action for slander for the way I further described you. Too bad I am not a fiction writer. It's tough to make this stuff up.

In your 11/14/06 email to me, you then tried to obscure the origin of Ungar's email by removing her name & return path when you included it. Ungar, it turns out, has co-written articles with you; she is the contact for anyone wanting to become "faculty" at your current Safe Wireless Initiative in Washington, DC; and she is also now contacting many people within the bioelectromagnetics community re: promoting you and BioPro products for which you are currently a spokesperson.

Threatening to sue must seem like a particularly inspired and subtle way to win hearts & minds since you do it quite often. Unfortunately it's to people one would imagine you'd want to hold in high regard. I have now joined the ranks of some of the best and brightest in EMF circles – Henry Lai and the University of Washington who you threatened with legal action twice; Louis Slesin and Microwave News; and Jeff Silva and RCR. You have also implied the same to activists and others who don't fall into line with you. Does this kind of approach actually work? Surely you can't imagine that people bully that easily.

In your email, you expressed surprise that my views of you are so "vicious and inappropriate" since, among other things, we have never met or spoken. You further said that all of the "nasty" things I said about you can be "easily refuted by information readily available in a number of public sources for anyone who would care to look." You also said that some of what I said in my email "...is just plain silly." And you claimed that the

attachment I'd sent to Ungar, originally posted on Australian journalist Stewart Fist's website, re: your corporate hired-gun history was "old and warn (sic) forment..." accusing me of "poor journalism and... outright intentional slander." The choices you gave me were to either call you (and make nice "...in the direction of mutual respect and understanding"), or get sued. But there are many more choices available to me than that.

As a 25-year veteran science journalist, there is no need for me to call you, nor has there been a reason in the past since I have yet to write about you journalistically. And even if I had written about you professionally, depending on how a piece is structured, a phone call is more courtesy than obligation. Journalists can and do cite first and reputable second-hand sources all of the time without contacting the subject being written about. Otherwise, far fewer articles/books would ever be written. And just so you know, my own work is constantly being misrepresented but I don't threaten to sue.

I have expressed personal opinions about you in emails and other venues, which is certainly my right. Next time someone asks, I will just send along verifying information. Every "opinion" I have formed about you is based on facts observed since long before you formed the WTR. Legally speaking, as you know, truth is always an absolute defense against slander or libel and as you also note, your record is readily available for all who look. I have a voluminous file here already with many primary documents of yours, and I have easy access to many more. My opinions about you are far from "vicious." That is too personal a description. Informed is more like it.

In my email to Ungar, I noted that you are a long-time industry hired gun. No amount of personal spin, or your recent attempts at metamorphosis, changes that. I became aware of you round 1979 re: your involvement with Love Canal when I first started writing on environmental issues and interviewed Lois Gibbs. Then later your name came up again with your attempts to spin environmental dioxin exposures for The Chlorine Institute when I was researching a piece on ethics and for-hire scientists intentionally contaminating the database to affect paralysis in public health policy under the guise of "risk analysis" – your specialty. And your name came up again with more spin for Dow Corning re: silicon breast implants when you formed the Breast Implant Public Health Project (BIPHP) that, according to Microwave News (November/December 1997), shared the same phone number with your Health and Environmental Sciences Group LTD (HES), as well and the Wireless Technology Research, LLC (WTR). Under HES, I believe you did work for the asbestos and tobacco industries too. The BIPHPD received \$1.3M from Dow Corning and your work focused mainly on implant ruptures and scar tissue formation but largely avoided systemic immune system reactions. This is just a sampling – all available in the public domain.

Despite your "reports," Dow Corning filed for bankruptcy and the FDA subsequently banned silicon breast implants for 15 years. The FDA recently relaxed that ban and so society is back to a giant field experiment on those products again. Your early work for

Dow Corning undoubtedly contributed to that decision.

And then there's The Science and Public Policy Institute (SPPI), a 501 (c) (3) nonprofit registered under your name but which you stated to the Energy and Environment Subcommittee on Science at the U.S. House of Representatives in 1998 was at George Washington University. And The Carlo Institute at which you are Chairman. And your newest venture, the Safe Wireless Initiative (an oxymoron in my opinion). All of these are private consulting firms, started by you, looking for clients, whoever they may be. Some of your companies are for-profit ventures wrapped within nonprofit structures (like WTR under HES and SWI under the SPPI) to allow "nonprofits" to make quite a lot of profit. All are structured to limit liability. In fact, if one traces the dates when most of these were formed, it looks as if you create them in response to specific hot-button issues in anticipation of research monies becoming available – monies that could go to private consulting firms for "oversight" and mostly spin. You appear quite clever at all this. I would imagine a full review of these various entities, and the propriety of their tax exempt status, could prove revealing.

When you chaired the WTR from @1993-1999, you were in charge of a \$28M research project for the CTIA. There has never been a full public accounting for how those funds were actually spent, either by WTR or the CTIA, despite your statements that the CTIA's accounting firm, Deloitte & Touche, satisfied everyone internally with their audits. The WTR's Peer Review Board based at the Harvard Center for Risk Analysis, urged you at the time to reveal the WTR's financial details but you refused. (Ironically, the Harvard Center for Risk Analysis also refused to reveal how much they had been paid by WTR.) Even members within the CTIA were unhappy. As quoted in Microwave News, (November/December 1997), John Madrid, Toshiba's representative to the CTIA said, "The bottom line is, a lot of money was collected and not very much research got done." He further noted that in the future, "I wouldn't give the CTIA or the WTR a plugged nickel. I don't think either of those organizations has properly managed the money given to them for health research. I don't know what they've done with more than \$20 million." Madrid went further and said what many were thinking... "I think you'll find that several million dollars were spent on research... But what happened to the rest of it?"

And Ron Petersen, a usually taciturn gentleman, then of Lucent Technologies, is also quoted in Microwave News, (March/April, 1998) as saying, five years after the WTR was in operation, "We cannot really account for the money that WTR spent." He noted that the cancer research program "is really nonexistent. There's nothing there." By then well over half of the funds had been spent.

The WTR program has to stand as a world record for the most amount of dollars spent for the least amount of work published. (A collection of proceedings doesn't count as peer-reviewed and published.) It's right out of the satiric movie "Thank You For Smoking." But maybe that was the whole point – until you jumped ship after the CTIA refused to keep

WTR funded. From what I can tell, there were only two studies actually peer-reviewed and published that came out of that entire effort – Muscat and Tice, and Dr. Muscat does not even credit the WTR as a funding source in his paper (unless ‘Wireless Technology, Inc.’ is a typo). In addition, Dr. Muscat was upset at the time, as documented in Microwave News (May/June, 1999) when you released his test results prematurely, before he had finished his analysis, or been through the peer review process. (In a recent email to activists, you made it seem as if Dr. Muscat caved in to industry pressure and changed his results. You neglected to mention the preliminary nature of those results at the time you released them.) Drs. Lai and Singh never published their results at all because the entire program had been problematic. Yet you repeatedly claim 50-to-57 studies were done under WTR. Where are they? You also use the possessive “we” in recent statements that lays claim to the work of others as if it was done under WTR, when it was merely an initial analysis of work already published.

It seems you play fast & loose with re-spinning what WTR actually accomplished, but no one ever questions you very fully about it, least of all the trusting activists. In a recent article by you in Common Ground (January 2007), you claimed that the WTR was “funded by the industry and overseen by the US government.” But there was no official government oversight of that program. It was a private effort between the CTIA and their private consulting firm – WTR. Just because it was being watched by all parties concerned, and just because the FDA looked over WTR’s initial work plan (and I am informed that you didn’t take their advice anyway) does not mean there was actual government oversight. You need to be far more precise with your language because the way you describe things now is nothing short of misleading self-aggrandizement.

Having covered this subject for over 20 years now, I had early reservations about the WTR when Ron Nessen, former Vice President of CTIA, called me in 1995 to offer help with a book that he heard I was writing. (That was my Electromagnetic Fields, A Consumer’s Guide to the Issues and How to Protect Ourselves, Harvest/Harcourt Brace, 1995). We had a lengthy conversation about WTR, your background, and the Harvard Center for Risk Analysis, then headed by John Graham, chosen by you for peer review. Mr. Nessen subsequently sent me a list of those on the peer committee and I recognized some of the names as confirmed thermalists. I expressed my reservations to Mr. Nessen in later conversations, along the lines of the entire program having the appearance of independence but actually being tooled to industry’s favor right from the start. My reservations included the wisdom of subjecting a primary biological research program to risk analysis at all. From the outset, it seemed WTR was structured to do work that could then potentially be dismissed within its own intellectual framework – a kind of de facto pretzel program. Whether it was intentional or not, that program was a chaotic disaster on so many levels. That chaos was well-documented in the press.

Regarding the Harvard Center for Risk Analysis (HCRA)... that organization is not an official department within Harvard University any more than your Science and Public

Policy Institute was an actual part of George Washington University. These are very loose alliances formed by independent consulting firms and why august universities allow their names to be used like that is a mystery. The primary advantage is to the consulting firm.

Below is a list of clients who fund the “industrial wing” of HCRA.

3M, Aetna Life & Casualty Company, Alcoa Foundation, American Automobile Manufacturers Association, American Crop Protection Association, American Petroleum Institute, Amoco Corporation, ARCO Chemical Company, ASARCO Inc., Ashland Inc., Astra AB, Atlantic Richfield Corporation, BASF, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, BP America Inc., Chemical Manufacturers Association, Chevron Research & Technology Company, CIBA-GEIGY Corporation, The Coca-Cola Company, Cytec Industries, Dow Chemical Company, DowElanco, Eastman Chemical Company, Eastman Kodak Company, Edison Electric Institute, E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Company, Electric Power Research Institute, Exxon Corporation, Ford Motor Company, Frito-Lay, General Electric Fund, General Motors Corporation, Georgia-Pacific Corporation, The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company, Grocery Manufacturers of America, Hoechst Celanese Corporation, Hoechst Marion Roussel, ICI Americas Inc., Inland Steel Industries, International Paper, Janssen Pharmaceutica, Inc., Johnson & Johnson, Kraft General Foods, Mead, Merck & Company, Mobil Oil Corporation, Monsanto Company, New England Power Service, Olin Corporation, Oxygenated Fuels Association, PepsiCo Inc., Pfizer, Procter & Gamble Company, Rhone-Poulenc, Inc., Rohm and Haas Company, Shell Oil Company Foundation, Texaco Inc., Union Carbide Corporation, Unocal, USX Corporation, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, and WMX Technologies, Inc.

The question is obvious – Why did you chose this group for “peer review” when you could have chosen the Harvard School of Public Health, which really would have performed that task? Probably because the hallmark of HCRA – and John Graham in particular – is to make comparisons for corporate clients in order to nullify public concerns over particular products or activities, e.g. using a cell phone is less dangerous than driving a car. That appears to also be the reason that your various firms have been set up too. Your clients and HCRA’s are rarely disappointed. There is a reason that CTIA chose you, and there is a reason that you and the CTIA chose HCRA for the misnomered “peer review.” The whole approach was bogus from the start, and I said as much to Ron Nessen in 1994.

I believe you also shared some of the decision-making at WTR with Ian Monro as part of your Science Advisory Group. Ian Monro, head of a Canadian consulting firm called CanTox, also did work for The Chlorine Institute as reported in Science, July 9, 1993. CanTox created reports stating that concerns over the safety of chlorine are exaggerated, despite what is known about that chemical’s toxicity/carcinogenicity, and that chlorine compounds are significant endocrine disruptors capable of causing widespread damage throughout the environment, threatening numerous species.

And then there was the work that your HES did on air pollution for an undisclosed private client that argued against the Environmental Protection Agency’s proposal for stricter air pollution standards... and on & on... The question is: Have you ever done work for anyone other than a corporate client with an agenda? Other than yourself, that is, as the “client” to promote now under SWI?

There is a journalistic thread here and one that I have been following for over two decades – that when scientists turn to private enterprise as for-hire consultants, society is the sure loser re: accurate data. And your name has been popping up all that time, in numerous credible publications and in your own reports, as a stark illustration of the premise. Your endeavors have been well-documented in Microwave News, RCR, (both of which you threatened to sue), The Boston Globe, The Baltimore Sun, The Washington Post, etc. etc. and on various websites. Contrary to your denigration of Stewart Fist’s biographical sketch of you, he may only have scratched the surface, and from what I can tell without doing a full fact check of all his points, what he published is easily in line with what I have in my own files.

Then most recently, there was your foray into teaching golf, and now your avid support of BioPro products – supposed EMF/RF “mitigation” devices with no credible science to support any of their claims.

I have been contacted numerous times over the last two years by BioPro representatives, as have many others who maintain a profile within the bioelectromagnetics community. BioPro reps have gotten very aggressive and almost cult-like when it comes to you and you seem to encourage that kind of adulation – like the ‘06 so-called “interview” with the

obsequious “Dr. Cathy.” However, I have yet to meet a single person affiliated with BioPro who actually knows anything about biophysics. They all look like sincere ‘prophets’ involved with a multi-level marketing/pyramid scheme. When I tried to get accurate information from one rep on how these products are supposed to work, I was told by her that top management said the information was “proprietary.” When I relayed to the rep that I had sent one of the cell phone chips that are supposed to “harmonize” the bad energy into less harmful waves thereby making cell phones “safe,” to a physics lab for independent testing, I was told again by the rep that top management said “nothing was measurable because the product is based on Quantum physics.” I was essentially told the same about the QLink medallions too. I have repeatedly explained to BioPro reps – laymen all – that the term “harmonization” is a strict physics term. The way it is being used by them, and in the company’s literature, is misleading and inaccurate.

Questionable products like this are often investigated by the Federal Trade Commission. Many people presume protections that may be nonexistent and therefore do not reduce their cell phone usage or try to cut down on other exposures. Example: I got a phone call from a woman in California with a cell tower proposed for her neighborhood. After a long conversation, I recommended she organize her neighbors into a coalition, etc. The next day she told me she had approached one of her neighbors – a BioPro rep – who said “We don’t have to fight the cell tower. We have BioPro now.” That’s the height of irresponsibility and they are using their affiliation with you and your endorsement of their products to justify that rationale.

There are mitigation products that may work and are based on sound science, though they do nothing to reduce ambient exposures. Ted Litovitz created some for EMX. Dave Stetzer and Madga Havas have teamed up in important endeavors. But BioPro doesn’t look to be offering anything like that. Even their airtube cell phone headsets may have quality control problems. Independent testing has found RF literally pouring out of the ear-piece just like other wired models. Plus, with hollow air tubes, you can hear but cannot talk into a phone without bringing the handset close to the face. Not much safety gain there. I have been told that you charged \$10,000 to write a single letter of endorsement for such a product.

Regarding some of the other things I said about you to Jill Ungar that you found “slanderous” but which are certainly factual: You did indeed partner with a ‘high-profile’ attorney named Peter Angelos re: cell phones in anticipation of profitable product liability suits in your favor. Peter Angelos’s firm won \$1 billion in personal injury claims against tobacco and asbestos manufacturers, among other personal injury suits for lead paint, etc, according to RCR Wireless News, January 1, 2001, and many other sources. Personal injury suits are his bailiwick and they’ve made him a very rich man. (Too bad he unnecessarily blew the Newman case over the Daubert standard. There was no reason for that.) You and Angelos teamed up initially to start your own research effort but couldn’t figure out a way around the conflict there. (RCR Wireless News, February 25, 2000.)

I also see in reviewing my files that you and Angelos planned to try to “coordinate” with U.S. Senator Patrick Leahy’s office re: his proposal to fund RF research after his efforts got some press. Just so you know, I wrote the first draft of that legislation for Senator Leahy and we specifically used the WTR (and some aspects of the EMF RAPID Program) as negative examples of what to avoid in future research projects. That was after I interviewed many scientists within the BEMS community to get an idea of what really would be an effective, independent program and how to direct the funds.

And regarding your cell phone/cell towers “Registry” under SWI... Maybe the next time someone asks me about you, I should add that your “Radiation Protection Project Registry” fails to tell people with perceived damage from either cell phones or infrastructure antenna arrays that there is a two-year statute of limitations in which to file a personal claim for health damages from the day they make their situation known. Deb Carney, an attorney in Golden, CO, notified you of that ethical obligation several years ago when the registry was first set up. Even though you answered Ms. Carney’s email to you at the time, saying you hadn’t “thought of that,” you have nevertheless continued to fail in posting such notice. This might be taken to mean that you do not care about preserving an individual’s rights under the law but only in gathering a list of names in the event you decide to carry forward a class action suit, which as anyone knows, bears fruit primarily for the attorneys.

Last but not least is the way you undercut, bullied and denigrated the BEMS research community during your WTR years – researchers who really ARE whistleblowers and who have devoted their lives to accuracy and integrity. But this pattern started with you even before WTR. It would be informative to see you rationalize in a court of law how you undercut Richard Albanese who was the first military MD to talk about dioxin, and who later came forward on phased array radiation from the PAVE PAWS installation on Cape Cod – at considerable risk to his own career. And it would be interesting to see how you’d spin clandestinely working for Motorola when you helped in “War Gaming” the Lai/Singh DNA work done under your own WTR. Talk about double-dealing. That war-gaming tells more about the heart of the WTR’s mission and the intent of its chairman than anything else. You tried your best to discredit two decent researchers and threatened the University of Washington into firing them – or get sued. Yet now you posit yourself as the friend of that work, having “discovered it” under the WTR. What’s wrong with this self-serving picture?

I quote directly from the letter you sent to Richard L. McCormick, President, University of Washington, dated May 14, 1999:

“Dear Dr. McCormick,

Attached is a letter published this week in Microwave News, a trade newsletter, by Drs. Henry Lai and N.P. Singh, both University of Washington employees, I consider this letter to be libelous and preceded by a pattern of slanderous conduct by these men over the

past several years. I am hereby requesting a personal meeting with you to discuss this very serious problem....”

Then you went into a four-page rant about how deficient Drs. Lai & Singh’s work was, stating categorically that their lab was not even up to normal “Good Laboratory Practice” procedures, etc. etc. You concluded your letter to Dr. McCormick by saying:

“The behaviors of Drs. Lai and Singh in this regard is inexplicable, and not without measurable consequences and damages to several institutions and individuals. Under normal circumstances, the failure to comply with the protocols, Good Laboratory Practice procedures and publication schedules prescribed in the contract between WTR and The University of Washington would be a basis for dismissal. Indeed, WTR staff recommended to me on several occasions that Drs. Lai and Singh, and The University of Washington, be fired. I chose not to take that step so that scientific reputations and personal dignity would not be impugned. Their behavior now shows that I erred in that judgement.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss this problem with you in person. I would like to resolve this outside of the courts.”

Sincerely yours,

George L. Carlo, Ph.D., M.S., J.D.
Chairman

You c/c’d it to:

Dr. Donald McRee (WTR)
Dr. Ray Tice (Integrated Laboratory Systems)
Thomas Wheeler (CTIA)
Dr. C.K. Chou (Motorola)
Dr. Arthur W. Guy (University of Washington)

All of this was in response to a letter that Drs. Lai & Singh published, entitled “Inside the WTR Research Program: A Very Strange Experience” ([Microwave News](#), March/April 1999), in which they described continuing confrontations and stonewalling with WTR and your attempts to micromanage the research as well as your insistence that key discussion be removed from final reports. They refused to change their data or conclusions to suit WTR’s political ends.

In response to that letter, you then proceeded to impugn Drs. Lai & Singh far and wide. If anyone should have sued for slander, it should have been them. WTR lawyers also threatened to sue them again when they refused to grant WTR a six-month extension on their contract, which, all things considered, they might have been anxious to terminate.

I also find your language in these kinds of letters – and I’ve seen several now – remarkably similar. Always the same carrot (call & make nice) and stick (or get sued). It is not a big leap to conclude that you like bullying people.

Perhaps I will avail myself of your invitation to call when I write my next book on EMF/RF. I intend to include a chapter on the politics of RF and for the sake of thoroughness, will briefly discuss the WTR. But it will only be a blip on the radar screen – a poster child for what can happen when industry controls the show with a so-called “independent” consultant at the helm. Far more interesting things happened at Bell Labs, Motorola, and Brooks that are of more consequence in the public sphere.

Regarding your “carrot” of wanting to extend respect and civility... Respect is something that is earned, not appropriated. I have enormous respect for many in the BEMS community, including those researchers with whose endpoints I typically disagree. It is often difficult for the more zealous in this community to keep in mind that the early thermalists were pioneers too, mapping unknown biophysical properties and defining the basic physiology of how the human anatomy dissipates heat. None of this was understood before the 1950’s when many began their careers. That some of these people later hardened their attitudes into professional turf battles, and perhaps abandoned basic curiosity when information didn’t support preconceived ideas, is a sad loss. As a writer, I believe I have earned the respect of those within the BEMS community whose respect I would like to have. I am not sure the same can be said of you. You have managed to alienate just about everyone – industry and independent researchers alike – and for good reason. People with an interest and/or stake in this subject in America were appalled at what you did with the WTR – and remember it, unlike people in Europe.

And regarding civility... As writer Robin Mogowan said: “Civility is not a flower you keep trampling.” Civility is afforded on a case-by-case basis these days. Threatening lawsuits inspires neither respect nor civility.

Don’t threaten to sue me again unless you are prepared to serve papers. I can easily defend myself re: what I say about you in both a court of law and in the court of public opinion. If you go this route, you will win in neither. And know this... should we meet in court, I will have some of the best legal advice and representation available. My two most immediate neighbors are Jim Goodale, longtime chief counsel for The New York Times Corp. and one of the country’s great authorities on slander and the rights of the press; and Peter Mullen, retired senior partner at Skaden Aarps. I also have an excellent working relationship with Whitney North Seymour, Jr., a former federal prosecutor as well as a constitutional scholar and First Amendment expert, who I first introduced to the subject of environmental EMF/RF exposures and inspired him to take several cases to the U.S. Supreme Court. In addition, I lack for no absence of pro bono expertise and expert witnesses. I come from an all-medical and legal family – several quite distinguished in their

respective fields. It would not be difficult to establish normal standards for “good/independent” research and position you on that continuum to your detriment. Plus, many within the BEMS community might welcome the opportunity to testify about their unhappy professional experiences with you.

In the very least, it would be interesting to get you under oath (the way was done with Sir Richard Doll to ferret out his industry connections) and find out just how \$28M was spent on so little research, with such an extraordinary opportunity permanently lost. At the time the WTR was in operation, ambient background levels were nowhere near what they are today. We will never again be able to tease apart one generating source from another to get clear epidemiological baselines. Society has you to partially thank for that lost opportunity. When I tell people that you are not who you currently appear to be, you should be praising me for linguistic restraint rather than threatening legal action. The next time you fire a shot across someone’s bow, you might want to have a clearer idea at whom you are aiming.

Very Sincerely,

B. Blake Levitt

Three Emails Appended:

Subj: Your EMF book
Date: 11/13/06 10:12:38 AM Eastern Standard Time
From: hhcoyote@verizon.net
To: Blakelevit@cs.com

Dear Ms. Levitt,

I discovered your book while researching adverse affects and EMF radiation and found it quite comprehensive. Since it was written in 1995, I'm wondering if you're planning on doing an updated edition. I think most everything you have referenced in your book is even more valid, just exponentially increased.

At any rate, thank you for writing it and in a way that is understandable to the general public. It ought to be a text book.

It has come to my attention that you are not a fan of Dr. George Carlo and I was wondering why this is the case. From everything I have read about him or heard from those who deal quite extensively with him, like Olle Johannson, L. Hardell, etc. he has the utmost integrity and is working very hard to deal with the soon-to-be epidemic levels of EMF-related diseases. It would seem that with the quite repugnant resources and tactics of the Industry,

all those who are in agreement regarding the potential risks ought to find every and any way possible to join forces and merge resources.

Thank you for your time and for giving me a great template for the complex biological connections involved with EMF radiation.

Jill Ungar
hhcoyote@verizon.net

Subj: Re: Your EMF book
Date: 11/13/06 3:31:40 PM Eastern Standard Time
From: Blakelevit
To: hhcoyote@verizon.net
File: GeorgeCarloHistory.doc (238592 bytes) DL Time (49333 bps): <1 minute

Dear Jill,

Thanks for contacting me. I am planning to update my first book on EMFs. Or write a whole new one perhaps within the year. That's yet to be decided.

Re: George Carlo. I am curious who told you I am not a fan of his, and who said that Olle Johansson & Lennardt Hardell think he is of "utmost integrity." Few people in America who witnessed what he did both before and after he headed the WTR research project feel that way. Those who know him, don't trust him at all, despite his current "good guy" posture. It doesn't matter that people are on the same side of an issue if some of those individuals are primarily out for themselves, as Carlo's long track record indicates. I have attached his biographical information. Judge for yourself. He's essentially a life-long hired gun for various industries. This time he is his own client.

Keep in mind that he is also a lawyer. It is to his advantage to be seen as a whistleblower now -- which he really isn't -- so as not to end up down the line on the wrong side of lawsuits re: cell phones the way the tobacco researchers did. He is also currently endorsing mitigation products that are suspect at best and scams at worst. I don't see any substantive change in his self-serving behaviors since he tried to get Henry Lai fired, cooked the data in the WTR studies to suit the industry, made other researchers sign confidentiality clauses before awarding WTR \$\$\$ to their labs, squandered millions on first class travel & limousines and then when the money ran out, partnered with another high-profile attorney in an attempt to rake in millions more in product liability suits against cell phone manufacturers.

He has a lot of European activists fooled at the moment and a handful in America & Canada too, probably because he says what they want to hear and because he has gone out of his way to solicit activist support, which most scientists do not do. But most who know his history here stay away from him. I cannot think of a single American researcher who would have anything to do with him. And as if that's not enough, he also doesn't do very

good science according to the precise standards developed over decades within the bioelectromagnetics research community. He is very good at personal public relations though. That's where his real talent is.

Best Regards,
Blake Levitt

Subj: Fwd: Your EMF book]
Date: 11/14/06 5:10:10 PM Eastern Standard Time
From: Glac44@aol.com
To: Blakelevit

Dear Blake:

I don't believe we have ever met. The note below has been forwarded to me and has been attributed to you directly as evidenced by your return e-mail address. This is actually the fourth instance of your perpetrating such information that has come to my attention in the past month. You appear to be busy.

On the surface, it seems odd that someone whom I have never met, and never spoken to if memory serves, would carry such a vicious and inappropriate view of me. And, to say the least, there is almost nothing in what you have written that is true. Virtually all of the nasty claims you perpetrate here can be easily refuted by information readily available in a number of public sources for anyone who would care to look. Some of it is just plain silly. And to use the old and worn foment from Stewart Fist as a source -- well at best, that is poor journalism and at worst it is outright intentional slander. Of course, I keep close track of where this type of information comes from, so it is not a surprise in terms of the misinformation. But, the amount of uninformed personal vitriol is surprising in view of our never having had personal contact.

Now, with that said, there are two purposes to this mail.

The first is to suggest that we have a phone conference to discuss the questions you might have that seem to be embedded in the information you are circulating. Whether or not you are persuaded by our talk, it is at least a step in the direction of mutual respect and understanding. No matter what our differences of opinion, it does make sense to be both truthful and civil.

The second is to put you on notice that I will not allow this type of slanderous misinformation to be intentionally circulated without using the full range of self-help and other steps legally available to me to stop it.

I would be happy to hear back from you.

George Carlo

Dr. George L. Carlo
Science and Public Policy Institute
1101 Pennsylvania Ave. NW -- 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20004
www.sppionline.org
202-756-7744