In summary:

1 Dr David Black is an honorary senior lecturer with Auckland University School of Population Health - Dept of Audiology - but has not lectured for many years

The head of the Dept of Audiology has confirmed that "David Black doesn’t lecture in Audiology. He had an appointment in occupational medicine but no longer is based at the school of population health as far as i know."

I have not been able to ascertain Auckland University’s criteria for appointing honorary senior lectureships but would expect (based on criteria from other universities) that it involves a distinguished history of lecturing AND ongoing lecturing without payment

2 Dr Black has never done research - apart from co-authoring a couple of review papers in 2003.
He describes himself as a practitioner not a researcher.

When I queried this in the past I was told that he is part of the NZ mobi-kids study.
However Professor Woodward confirmed last night that:

"MOBIKIDS New Zealand is still seeking funds. We have been unsuccessful in our applications so far, unfortunately. But we are still hunting. This is a simple case control study, following the international protocol. It will take a couple of years to accumulate the study participants"

3 Dr Black was awarded a Doctor of Medicine by Auckland University in May 2010 based on a thesis he submitted in 2009. This is a top level degree that requires 3-4 years full time study. It is supposed to be the equivalent of a PhD for a medical doctor.

Dr Black's thesis for this was unsupervised and was awarded without an oral examination. It largely comprised of the work he co-authored in 2003 (which apparently was funded/sponsored by overseas Telco's) and for his role on the initially joint Australia/NZ working group that was attempting to prepare a new joint standard for RF EMR. The process failed leading to NZS2772:1 1999 and a separate ARPANSA standard for Australia.
Some of the inner workings and problems of that Joint working group are explained by Dr Don Maische in his PhD (available from [www.emfacts.com](http://www.emfacts.com)). Dr Maische has advised that during sessions on how precautionary to make the standard, Dr Black frequently left the room to take telephone instructions.

Dr Black initially advised that I cannot have a copy of his PhD as it is copyright. Mary's research has however located a public copy at Auckland University (Philson library). I am trying to access this.

At the time he did his 4 year full time equivalent degree, Dr Black was apparently a full time medical practitioner employed by companies he set up (Enviromedix Ltd and/or ITMedical Ltd) which appear to be major ACC advisors specialising in occupational health. Dr Black was also busy offering expert evidence to various government bodies and courts.

I have written to the Auckland University Board of Graduate Studies asking for information on any exemptions they have granted from the usual course requirements. If he did get an exemption I would be very interested to know what it is about his thesis that justified this.

**4 There are serious misleading claims in Dr Black’s bio for ICNIRP and for BEMS** (of which he is president elect) where he typically describes himself as a senior lecturer in environmental medicine at the school of population medicine and makes various other incorrect claims.

I wonder if he would have been appointed if he had limited his bio to the facts.

**Summary**

If you look back over Dr Black's true qualifications you have to wonder how he ever became recognised as an expert or got his Doctorate.

He has done almost no research and very limited lecturing (and then not for years).

At best he is a commentator/reviewer who is funded largely if not almost exclusively by the Telcos - for "advice they request from him because they know they are going to like it!"

As such he is conflicted and cannot justify his claims to academic independence.

His views have become increasingly at odds with those who have done research and who are true international experts.

The NZ government and courts have relied heavily on Dr Black's advice in the past eg when he was a member of the Interagency Advisory Committee on the Health Effects of Non-Ionising Radiation (he was included as an independent academic from Auckland...
university). More recently he has taken the international stage- as an ICNIRP advisor and President elect of BEMS - base don misleading claims about his qualifications.

Dr Black has regularly been on the NZ media making what I interpret as some very extreme claims (certainly they are NOT precautionary) which could put public health at risk.

Please can anyone add anything to this analysis as it is important it is accurate And suggest a forum to have these concerns addressed

Thanks

Sue Grey LLB(Hons), BSC, RSHDipPHI

From: Alistair Woodward <a.woodward@auckland.ac.nz>
Date: 26 June 2011 10:38:30 PM NZST
To: "sue.grey@ts.co.nz" <sue.grey@tasman.net>
Subject: Re: Interphone and Mobi-kids

Dear Sue

The NZ results have been published as part of the INTERPHONE reports. I will send you copies of the papers that have come out so far, separately.

MOBIKIDS New Zealand is still seeking funds. We have been unsuccessful in our applications so far, unfortunately. But we are still hunting. This is a simple case control study, following the international protocol. It will take a couple of years to accumulate the study participants.

Regards

Alistair Woodward

On 26/06/11 3:30 PM, "sue.grey@ts.co.nz" <sue.grey@tasman.net> wrote:

Dear Professor Woodward

I am following RF EMR related issues with interest and am very interested in aspects of your work. In particular:

1 In relation to your work on the Interphone study I wondered how I can access the New Zealand results and analysis - which I understand was funded by the Health Research Council and others and where these have been published;
I have seen suggestions that you and Auckland University is involved in the international **Mobi-kids study**. Please could you advise:

a) who at Auckland university is involved in this study;
b) the stage this is at and the likely timeframe from here;
c) the source and amount of the funding for the New Zealand part of the Mobi-kids study; and
d) where on the Auckland University website I can find information about the Mobi-kids study.

thank you very much for your help.

Sue Grey LLB(Hons), BSc, RSHDipPHI

"Inside NZ"

Paul Stichbury <paulstichbury@gmail.com> 6/25/11
to David, bcc: herman.adams

Dear Dr Black,

On Wednesday's Inside NZ you made a statement which I find very disconcerting. You said words to the effect that

"the telecommunications and power companies sought my input because they like what I say"

Could you please elaborate on why these companies like what you say. From my perspective it looks very much like you are a paid shill for your clients and that the truth is inconsequential.

I look forward to your early reply.

Yours sincerely

David Black <David@evx.co.nz> 6/29/11
to me

Hello Paul

Yes, I can understand that could be interpreted a number of ways. Unfortunately the TV editors turned long interviews and complete answers into sound-bytes.
The context of that remark was that they like what I say because I rely on and advise them using established science and widely accepted Standards as recommended by the World Health Organization and the NZ Ministry of Health.

Thanks for your interest, best wishes

David Black

David Black M.D. FAFOEM
Honorary Senior Lecturer in Environmental Medicine
School of Population Health
University of Auckland
Tel (Univ) 82345
Tel (Mob) 021 482 345

>>> Paul Stichbury <paulstichbury@gmail.com> Saturday, 25 June 2011 1:26 p.m. >>>

WAIKATO TIMES

ONE MAN GOES HEAD TO HEAD OVER WIND FARM.

01/01/2009
Sean Cox is opposed to Wel Networks’ plan for a wind farm west of Hamilton and now the wind expert has succeeded in getting a hearing into the farm adjourned for two months. Bruce Holloway reports.

AUTHOR Jack London once observed it was a lot cheaper to buy a general than to fight him and his army.

How Wel Networks must wish it had taken a similar approach with Sean Cox, a former wind farm designer who just happens to live a few kilometres upwind of its projected Te Uku wind farm.

Cox may have thrust a major spoke in the turbines of Wel's $140 million plans with a wide-ranging and compelling submission in opposition to the project.

The sail design consultant, who lives at Aotea Harbour, has effectively forced a two-month adjournment of a Resource Management Act hearing into the project to allow Wel to prepare a time-consuming and costly response to his evidence.

Ironically Cox began his engaging two-hour submission at the hearing by observing Wel Networks "could have hired me as a consultant for nominal dollars and shut me up straight away".

But, he mused, the community-owned company preferred to ignore him, and his offer to
share 10 years of wind data he had collected on the district. Contact Energy, which is preparing its own application for a far bigger west coast wind farm to the north, is certainly not making the same mistake.

Cox told the hearing he has been hired by Contact to consult on its massive $2 billion project for the Te Akau-Waikareti district. Cox designed some of the world’s first wind farms back in the early 1970s, and at the hearing was quick to present himself as every RMA applicant’s nightmare an affected resident who is more technical than the technical experts. With the zeal of a mad scientist, Cox set about rubbishing almost everything to do with the wind farm, but, in particular Wel’s evidence related to noise and subsonics (sounds that cannot consciously be heard).

It was the sort of stuff that only someone who has designed turbine blades for 30 years could truly appreciate. Cox presented a string of complex calculations even more complicated than rugby’s tackled-ball rule or the blue lines in ice hockey to conclude that not only was the Wel case full of "fluff" but the bottom line was that there would be no public benefit from such a marginal proposition.

"Wel refused to let me see their data and showed no interest in seeing mine," he said. "I was dumbfounded."

The Irish-born Cox made an immediate impact when he asked the presiding commissioners to declare their own technical backgrounds so he could pitch his presentation at a suitable level. When he found he was dealing with landscapers, town planners and barristers, he duly dumbed down his technical message. While some of his scientific equations looked like they could have served as props for the movie A Beautiful Mind, other parts of his submission were brutally blunt. He noted Wel Networks noise expert Nevil Hegley was an acoustics engineer, with a background in audible sound waves (those above 15hz) rather than subsonics, and argued his evidence should be set aside.

"Once the wavelength goes much over 20m the characteristics of air pressure waves change significantly," he said. "Much of the art in acoustics is to do with air-ear-brain interface as it is a subjective science. "Subsonics is to do with the study of the properties of the air, the wave, the mechanics of it and its interaction with environmental objects, including humans. "This is the proper province of the aerodynamicist, such as myself."

From this platform of presumed technical superiority Cox attacked Hegley’s submission that noise levels should be measured only at house sites. "Does he believe that people should hide in their houses from the noise made by their neighbours? I believe that people have a right to privacy and enjoyment of their property over every square metre of it."
Cox himself suffers from a severe metabolic disorder that requires him to live in a low-stress and clean environment at Aotea Harbour. He highlighted particular problems that could be expected with night noise at the eastern end of Pond Rd, parts of Waitetuna Valley and Aramiro, though he warned that since he had been modeling his predictions, the second Wind Turbine Noise Symposium has taken place in Europe, and more information might come to light after the World Health Organisation’s Night Noise Guidelines project issues its final report later this month.

But Cox said many noise issues were pretty basic. "Sound is an entirely subjective phenomena and it is easy to forget when quoting numbers that people do not hear absolute levels of sound," he said. "If a person is in a quiet environment then a certain sound will seem louder than if they are in a noisy environment... To suggest that the Wel wind turbines should be allowed to make noise as if they were standing in an Auckland industrial estate is absurd. "If Wel wish to build an industrial site in a quiet country area then they must adapt to it."

Cox also waded into a spat with Dr David Black, senior lecturer in the department of medicine at Auckland University, over health effects of the proposed wind turbines. In his initial submission, Cox argued subsonic sound pollution was the most recently discovered and "possibly the worst of all the bad environmental effects of giant wind turbines".

In reply Dr Black said his literature review found no significant health effects due to subsonic noise from wind turbines documented in medical literature. Cox snorted at this. "Saying ‘I looked and found nothing’ is meaningless. Absence of proof is not proof of absence."

Cox said it was clear Dr Black, who supported the wind farm and concluded it would have no more than minor effects on the living environment around it, "had no understanding or aerodynamics and the mechanics of wind turbines". "Everybody connected with the wind turbine industry knows that there is some kind of health problem with subsonics. "There is no doubt that high-level subsonics are lethal. That there are health problems with subsonics is as obvious now as it was 50 years ago that there were health problems with cigarettes."

Dr Black is overseas and not available for comment. Perhaps most controversially, Cox also raised the spectre of the wind farm interfering with the delicate balance of rainfall in summer easterlies on the Aotea Harbour. Cox, who was the first person to do research into the micro-cell structure of wind since 1928, described air approaching a wind turbine as being like a crowd of people in a tube station walkway. All are moving the same way at nominally the same speed, but some going at slightly different speeds and directions than others. Different chunks will have slightly different
speed direction and temperatures, but they all have one thing in common. They are all at the same average pressure."

However, when an air molecule is deflected by the blade it changes direction and speed, and this causes localised pressure changes.

"The net result of these pressure zones is a pressure on the face more toward the wind and a suction on the face more away from the wind."

Cox said in some areas the wind velocity would stay high and form local low pressure zones.

"The overall rotation will cause high level faster moving air to be pulled down to the surface and slow surface air to be pushed high.

"I have no idea what the net effect will be to local weather except to say that the energy flux involved with 28 3MW turbines in this small area is enough to have significant effects.

"I will give fair warning that if this proposal goes ahead and I find evidence of interference to rainfall or other weather patterns I will bring an action for negligence against Environment Waikato at least."

From: Atkinson Rapley Group [mailto:arg@paradise.net.nz]
Sent: Saturday, 25 June 2011 11:25 a.m.
To: John & Rosemary Adams
Subject: Fwd: URGENT- EMR- a serious Mary-Jane Thompson type problem with Dr Black that is about to blow internationally

Begin forwarded message:

From: "sue.grey@ts.co.nz" <sue.grey@tasman.net>
Date: 25 June 2011 10:50:03 AM NZST
To: Atkinson Rapley Group <arg@paradise.net.nz>
Subject: Fwd: URGENT- EMR- a serious Mary-Jane Thompson type problem with Dr Black that is about to blow internationally

Begin forwarded message:
Dear Prime Minister, and Honourable Ministers of the Crown Nick and Tony

I write to draw your urgent attention to a serious problem which may adversely affect New Zealand’s international credibility.

It relates to the dubious qualifications and CV claims of Dr David Black who was until recently recognised as an "independent academic advisor" on the New Zealand Government's "Interagency Advisory Committee on the Health Effects of Non-Ionising Radiation" based on his claimed lectureship at Auckland University and expertise in EMR (electromagnetic radiation). Dr Black also sits on various international advisory agencies including ICNIRP and BEMS reliant on the same claims of expertise and independence.

Following Dr Black's appearance on the TV3 Inside New Zealand documentary last Wednesday evening "Is Your Cellphone Killing You" (where he admitted that the Telco's employ him because they like what he is going to say) I have had a series of email exchanges with Dr Black and others. My purpose was to try to understand how Dr Black can give such extreme advice in the face of best international practice, why anyone listens to that advice and to explore his various claims about his expertise, qualifications and independence.

I have already copied the Ministers for Health and the Environment into my exchanges with Dr Black (but am happy to provide further copies if that would assist).

I have also already copied my of the correspondence to various other New Zealand experts and some of my international colleagues who share my frustration. They in turn have forwarded it to their contacts, including Dr Don Maisch who is a true international leader on this issue, having completed a very in depth PhD "The Procrustean Approach - Setting Exposure Standards for Telecommunications Frequency Electromagnetic Radiation - an examination of the manipulation of telecommunication standards by political, military and industrial vested interests at the expense of public health protection"

Some of Dr Maisch's comments are in his email below.

The key issues from my perspective are: a) how the NZ government came to rely on advice from Dr Black without properly investigating his qualifications, expertise and
independence thereby falling into exactly the type of trap explained by Dr Maisch in his PhD;
b) what urgent steps the NZ Government will now take to review the safety and adequacy of the NZS2772:1 and to address the competence and independence of advice it has been relying on.

Urgent review of NZS2772:1 by competent and independent experts is surely essential bearing in mind:
1) NZS2772:1 1999 protects only against acute effects of EM such as death, shocks and burns;
2) the WHO /IARC advice of 31 May 2011 which recognises the likely biological effects of EMR resulting in it being listed as a schedule 2B carcinogen; and
3) the multitude of NZ and international research identifying a series of biological effects including damage to DNA, changes to the endocrine system; see for example the Bioinitiatives Report.

My correspondence with Dr Black and Dr Maisch also raises serious questions about the criteria applied by Auckland University and how Dr Black came to be awarded a very senior degree (Doctor of Medicine) without any supervision, apparently based on the limited work he co-authored in 2003 work and his own role on advisory committees.

This issue has international implications. Just last month a member of the WHO advisory committee was publicly stood down due to his conflict of interest.

As a result of my role in the Saxmere/Justice Wilson Supreme Court proceedings and the resulting investigation, the belated 180 degree turn by the Crown and the serious resulting consequences I believe it is fair for me to claim expertise in the area of identifying and addressing conflicts of interest. With Justice Wilson, the Crown tried to close me down (going to the extent of firing me from the public service because my client filed proceedings in the Supreme Court) instead of listening to my concerns and addressing them.

I believe you have another serious problem with EMR management in New Zealand.

As with the Justice Wilson issue my concerns regarding the management of radio frequency EMR in New Zealand and the role of Dr Black are very well documented.

I would very much welcome the opportunity to meet urgently with you to fully brief you on this issue and to suggest potential solutions.

Thank you for your consideration and attention.

Sue Grey LLB(Hons), BSc (Microbiology and Biochemistry), RSHDipPHI and concerned mother of three

ph 03 5450878
Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Don Maisch <dmaisch@emfacts.com>  
**Date:** 25 June 2011 9:46:06 AM NZST  
**********  
**Subject:** Re: Final Comments from Dr Black

Hi ....... Sue

Further to my last message note that David Black is also a Consulting Expert to iCNIRP, along with Anders Ahlbom (He is in good company). Here is what they give as his qualifications to be an international expert on RF health issues:

Dr. D. Black - University of Auckland, New-Zealand

David Black is an Occupational and Environmental Physician currently Senior Lecturer in the Department of Occupational Medicine at the Auckland Medical School. Dr Black originally trained in radio engineering, and worked in that industry for ten years before entering Medical School in 1977. He began an academic interest in Radiofrequency Safety while an academic at the university of Otago Medical School in 1986. Since that time he has qualified as a Specialist in Occupational Medicine. He has been involved in the development of the New Zealand and Australian RF standards, and has published in the area of biological and health effects relevant to standard setting. His practice is now divided between clinical and academic Occupational and Environmental Medicine and electromagnetic safety.  

[Link](http://www.icnirp.de/cm.htm)

---

**THE FACTS**

1) His involvement in "the development of the New Zealand and Australian RF standards" is marked by FAILURE as I pointed out in my last message.

2) Just what is his track record for published papers "in the area of biological and health effects relevant to standard setting" if his research activities is limited to a "minor assistance role"
With his lack of qualifications why does he get positions in ICNIRP and head of the Bioelectromagnetics Society? Because he knows what to say to please his masters. In the old TE/7 RF meetings whenever a decision had to be made he would leave the room to consult with someone on the phone on how to handle the situation. This was whenever the topic of a precautionary approach was being discussed and a decision was about to be made. My impression at the time was that he was nothing more than a puppet on a string.

...........

Don