

**THE MAHA- (MAKE AMERICA HEALTHY AGAIN) REPORT OF MAY 22 –  
Why is Electro-Magnetic Radiation absent from "Contents" and placed between Fluoride and  
Phthalates in a section on "Chemicals"?<sup>1</sup>**

*"In your remarks and in the report, it's very clear that there are no sacred cows when it comes to our children's health. We are showing the courage to turn over every stone to figure out, to investigate what is behind the chronic childhood disease crisis, and that's what this report represents, Sir."  
(Director of the Domestic Policy Council, Vince Haley to the President, May 22.)*

**Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; May 28, 2025**

The MAHA-report – Make Our Children Healthy Again: Assessment<sup>2</sup> – "is a call to action... By examining the root causes of deteriorating child health, this assessment establishes a clear, evidence-based foundation for the policy interventions, institutional reforms, and societal shifts needed to reverse course." (Purpose; p.5)

The report has four sections – on Food, Chemicals, Childhood Behavior in the Digital Age, and Overmedicalization. Of which Chemicals includes EMRs, and 'Digital impact' does not include the impact of the technology's EMR – Electro-Magnetic Radiation.

The President's Executive Order 14212 of February 13, 2025<sup>3</sup> "established the President's Make America Healthy Again Commission". "The initial mission of the Commission shall be to advise and assist the President on how best to exercise his authority to address the childhood chronic disease crisis. Therefore, the Commission shall ... study the scope of the childhood chronic disease crisis and any potential contributing causes, including ... environmental factors, Government policies ... electromagnetic radiation, and corporate influence or cronyism". (Section 4)

After "initial mission" is completed, the Commission – concerning electromagnetic radiation (p.44) – informs the President as follows:

"Electromagnetic Radiation (EMR): an exposure due to the proliferation of cell phones(286), Wi Fi routers, cell towers, and wearables)(287)<sup>[4]</sup> Some studies have linked EMR exposure to reduced sperm counts and motility but not quality.(288) The NIH's National Toxicology Program identified "clear evidence" of DNA damage and increased cancer risk in rats.(289) However, a recent systematic review of over 50 studies found low to inadequate evidence on impact in children and called for more high-quality research.(290)"

So, how do we understand this? That motility is not part of sperm quality? Reduced counts and motility – we're heading for extinction – but don't worry, the quality of the remainder is still good?

---

<sup>1</sup> Is it in any way reasonable to handle Electro Magnetic Radiation as chemicals? An AI concludes: "Treating EMR as chemicals is not scientifically justified. They require distinct frameworks for understanding, measurement, and regulation due to their fundamentally different natures and interactions with biological systems and the environment."

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/WH-The-MAHA-Report-Assessment.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/02/19/2025-02871/establishing-the-presidents-make-america-healthy-again-commission>

<sup>4</sup> Frank, J. 2021, 'Electromagnetic fields, 5G and health: what about the precautionary principle?'; [https://www.pure.ed.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/207842854/Electromagnetic\\_Fields\\_5G\\_and\\_Health.pdf](https://www.pure.ed.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/207842854/Electromagnetic_Fields_5G_and_Health.pdf); see e.g. p.7; 4. Persistent Allegations of Unscientific Bases for Existing Health Protection Guidelines on RF-EMFs and Unmanaged Conflicts of Interest on Expert Advisory Panels.

What about the "However", the constantly "however", and the permanent call "for more high-quality research" – this old demand used to maintain the status quo and avoid regulatory changes?

The actual Bodewein, L. et al. 2022-study (MAHA-report's ref. 290<sup>5</sup>) writes: "Due to a lack of consistency regarding the outcomes as well as the lack of scientific rigor in most reviewed studies, the body of evidence for the effects of RF EMF of mobile communication devices on subjective symptoms, cognition, and behavior in children and adolescents was low to inadequate. Evidence from the studies investigating early childhood development, brain activity, cancer, and physiological parameters was considered inadequate for drawing conclusions about possible effects." (Results)

"Overall, the body of evidence allows no final conclusion on the question whether exposure to RF EMF from mobile communication devices poses a particular risk to children and adolescents." (Discussion)

'More high-quality research needed' ...

"We are, of course, seeing major lowering of sperm counts and sperm quality in many countries around the world; given the major impact of EMF exposures on sperm count and quality in human and in animal studies, the pattern of evidence is very worrying." Writes Martin L. Pall back in 2017.<sup>6</sup> ("Pall's work since his retirement has focused entirely on analyzing published literature to produce partially novel interpretations of biological effects including chronic disease mechanisms."<sup>7</sup>)

Still Pall, Prof. Em. of Biochemistry and Basic Medical Sciences Washington State University:<sup>8</sup> "Human sperm count has dropped to below 50% of what used to be considered normal throughout the technologically advanced countries of the world".<sup>9</sup> (This from a 53 pages document where Pall states that "their position [(International Commission on Non Ionising Radiation Protection – ICNIRP, Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks – SCENIHR)], and similar positions have been taken by the U.S. FCC, FDA and the National Cancer Institute, is that the evidence is inconsistent or conflicting and therefore, in their view, no conclusions can be drawn. Some of these organization[s] have also stated that there is no known mechanism by which effects can be produced. What is shown below is that there is a vast amount of evidence in the independent scientific literature that conflicts with both the conclusion about lack of demonstrated effects and the conclusion about lack of mechanism.")

## 54 YEARS AGO ... –

In Martin L. Pall's words (2016<sup>10</sup>): In 1971, the U.S. Office of Naval Medical Research produced a document reporting over 100 different non-thermal effects [1]<sup>11</sup>, listing 40 apparent neuropsychiatric changes produced by non-thermal microwave frequency exposures, including 5 central/peripheral nervous system (NS) changes, 9 central NS effects, 4 autonomic system effects, 17 psychological

<sup>5</sup> <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0268641#abstract0>

<sup>6</sup> <https://sageliving.us/wp-content/uploads/1-WiFi-as-a-Very-Substantial-Threat-to-Human-Health.-Martin-L.-Pall-PhD-and-Cindy-Sage-April-2017..pdf>

<sup>7</sup> <https://sciprofiles.com/profile/51772>

<sup>8</sup> <https://integrativemedicine.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/5G-Risks-8-types-of-harm-Martin-Pall-2018.pdf>; p.2.

<sup>9</sup> Ref. <https://academic.oup.com/humupd/article/23/6/646/4035689> (2017); "This comprehensive meta-regression analysis reports a significant decline in sperm counts (as measured by SC and TSC) between 1973 and 2011, driven by a 50–60% decline among men unselected by fertility from North America, Europe, Australia and New Zealand. Because of the significant public health implications of these results, research on the causes of this continuing decline is urgently needed." (Wider implications)

<sup>10</sup> Page 28 here: <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Doctor-Letters-on-Health-Effects-of-Cell-Tower-Radiation-.pdf>

<sup>11</sup> "Naval Medical Research Institute Research Report, June 1971. Bibliography of Reported Biological Phenomena ('Effects') and Clinical Manifestations Attributed to Microwave and Radio-Frequency Radiation. Report No. 2 Revised." <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/AD0750271.pdf>

disorders, 4 behavioral changes and 2 misc. effects [1]. It also listed cardiac effects including ECG changes and cardiac necrosis as well as both hypotension and hypertension, and also 8 different endocrine effects. Changes affecting fertility included tubular degeneration in the testis, decreased spermatogenesis, altered sex ratio, altered menstrual activity, altered fetal development, programmed cell death (what is now known as apoptosis) and decreased lactation. Many other non-thermal changes were also listed for a total of over 100 non-thermal effects. They also provided [1] approximately 2000 citations documenting these various health effects. That was almost 45 years ago and is only the beginning of the evidence for the existence of non-thermal effects. My own recent paper [2] shows that widespread neuropsychiatric effects are caused by non-thermal exposures to many different microwave frequency electromagnetic fields (EMFs)."

With Richard A. Lear & Camilla R. G. Rees (Safety of Wireless Technologies: The Scientific View;<sup>12,13</sup> Feb. 2025): "In 1971... Lt. Colonel<sup>[14]</sup> Zorach Glaser,<sup>[15]</sup> PhD documented the global science in the meta-study... Glaser found 2,311 studies that link low-intensity microwave signals and other EMR with biological impacts. The paper cites 132 different biological effects, symptoms and diseases associated with wireless exposures. The majority of studies examined microwave signals in the 1 to 4 gigahertz (GHz) range at low intensities. These types of wireless exposures are virtually identical with those from modern devices and wireless sources such as cell phones, WiFi, Bluetooth, smart meters, GPS, wearables, and wireless infrastructure."

"Of the 36 chronic diseases and conditions that more than doubled (1990-2015), the U.S. Navy study warned us of the connection between wireless radiation and twenty-three of those chronic diseases, predicting what has indeed happened to the health of Americans."

So then – action? Beginning, e.g., with the termination of the Starlink-nightmare?

Or shall Big Tobacco's old trick (selling doubt), a trick employed by Big Tech, continue to rule the day – despite Presidential Executive Orders or whatever else comes their way?

---

<sup>12</sup> Preprint;

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388763046\\_Safety\\_of\\_Wireless\\_Technologies\\_The\\_Scientific\\_View](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388763046_Safety_of_Wireless_Technologies_The_Scientific_View) ;

"With no evidence for safety and mounting evidence of risk, how did we get here? The answer to this knotty question is found in the carefully crafted messages by federal agencies, industry groups, the media and clever spins on what the science actually says. But that story is for another day. Instead, let's first look at the evidence of what followed. What happened to our health since the wireless revolution, beginning in 1990?"

<sup>13</sup> See also Tom Butler; Wireless Technologies and the Risk of Adverse Health Effects in Society: A Retrospective Ethical Risk Analysis of Health and Safety Guidelines; <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Wireless-Technologies-Ethical-Risk-Analysis-Working-Paper-2021.pdf>

<sup>14</sup> His document states 'Zorach R. Glaser, Ph.D. LT, MSC, USNR'

<sup>15</sup> <https://zoryglaser.com/>