

AUTHORS: Frey AH:DATE: 1961TITLE: Auditory system response to radio frequency energy.SOURCE: Aerospace Med 32:1140-42

MAIN SUBJECT HEADING:

AN
ANALYTICSHU
HUMAN
EFFECTSAT
ANIMAL
TOXICITYIH
WORKPLACE PRACTICES-
ENGINEERING CONTROLSM
MISCELLANEOUS

SECONDARY SUBJECT HEADINGS:

AN

HU

AT

IH

M

Physical/Chemical Properties

Review

Animal Toxicology

Non-occupational Human
Exposure

Occupational Exposure

Epidemiology

Standards

Manufacturing

Uses

Reactions

Sampling/Analytical Methods

Reported Ambient Levels

Measured Methods

Work Practices

Engineering Controls

Biological Monitoring

Methods of Analysis

Treatment

Transportation/Handling/
Storage/Labeling

MR 1628

Auditory System Response to Radio Frequency Energy

Technical Note

ALLAN H. FREY

CLASSICALLY, the auditory and visual systems have been distinguished in part by the "fact" that the two systems respond to different types of energy, acoustic and electromagnetic, respectively. Our Laboratory, however, has obtained data which suggests that this fact may not be correct.

The textbooks state that sound energy is generated only by vibrating bodies and is transmitted by wave motion in a material medium, i.e., air, water, wood. In contrast to this, the visual system responds to electromagnetic energy. This energy is not transmitted by molecular motion in a material medium and does not need a material medium for propagation.

Our data to date indicate that the human auditory system can respond to electromagnetic energy in at least a portion of the radio frequency (RF) spectrum. Further, this response is instantaneous and occurs at low power densities, densities which are well below that necessary for biological damage. For example, the effect has been induced with power densities 1/160 of the standard maximum safe level for continuous exposure.

We have been collecting two lines of data on this effect in human subjects. One approach involves finding people who believe they have experienced this effect, interviewing them, evaluating their reports, and collating this information about a variety of RF transmitters. This type of information provides clues as to the nature of the effect and suggests experiments. The other line of data collection involves direct

experimentation and is summarized in this paper.

In our experiments to date we have used the two transmitters having the pertinent parameters shown in Table I.

TABLE I. TRANSMITTER PARAMETERS

	Transmitter A	Transmitter B
Frequency	1310 megacycles	2982 megacycles
Wavelength	22.9 cm.	10.4 cm.
PPS	244	400
Pulse width	6 microseconds	1 microsecond
Duty cycle	.0015	.0004

It should be noted that the auditory system responds to frequencies at least as low as 200 megacycles and at least as high as 3000 megacycles. In other words, transmitters broadcasting in P, L, and S bands have elicited responses.

The response of the auditory system to irradiation with transmitters A and B results in the subject reporting that he hears a buzzing sound. This perceived sound is referred to as the *RF sound*. The RF sounds induced by the two transmitters appear to be similar, but may not be identical. We have not yet been able to determine whether the perceived sounds are identical. With other transmitters, a knocking sound has been reported.

Eight points of experimental evidence are summarized:

1. It has frequently been reported that some people can detect radio programs through fillings in their teeth. To check this possibility, shields were interposed between the subject and RF source. When the lower half of the head was covered, including the maxillary dental area, the RF sound was per-

ceived. When the top half was covered, sound ceased.

2. With the transmitter's antenna in the radome and thus not visible to the subject, the antenna was rotated at various rates. The beam swept by the subject several times each sweep, he heard the RF sound and reported it. This report was with the needle deflection of our meter. The subject could not see. The subjects reported when they were swept by the RF beam they responded a moment before the instant the mechanism of the instruments has time. These subjects were over 100 feet from the dome and could hear no sound from it.

3. Subjects have been blindfolded with blacked-out goggles and have been panned by the RF beam. The beam was then broken in an irregular fashion by interposing a screen between the source and subject. The reports indicating when the sound was "off" correlated perfectly with the unshielded conditions.

4. Subjects were placed in pairs in a shielded room. A screen shield was placed between the head of one member of each pair. The sound immediately ceased for the shielded member but continued for the unshielded member.

5. The typical ambient noise level was 45 db. Earplugs rated to attenuate sound a 30 db were placed in the ears of subject. The subjects reported a reduction in noise level and an increase in the level of the RF sound. The latter observation was probably due to the earplugs.

6. A deaf subject had an average air conduction loss of 50 db. Bone conduction was good. He could hear the RF sound with power densities matching those needed for threshold by normal subjects.

7. When a screen shield was placed between the subject and the RF source, the energy which had passed the subject's head back on the subject, he reported an increase in volume of the RF sound.

8. With usual sounds, subjects localize the source quite well if given an opportunity to rotate their body freely. With the RF sound, this was not the case. The subjects typically reported when asked to localize the source of the sound that the apparent source was a short distance from their head. No matter how they rotate in the room, they localize the source in the same place.

With consideration of these eight observations, it was difficult to conceive that the perception of RF sound was not the same as that of ordinary sound.

From the G. E. Advanced Electronics Center at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

Presented at the Aerospace Medical Association Meeting, April 24, 1961, in Chicago, Illinois.

With this arrangement, however, the subjects invariably set the filter to cut out all frequencies below about 5KC audio and wanted maximum bandwidth to the high end.

Deaf Subjects: Only transmitter A was used with this series.




Fig. 1. Hearing loss in Subject 1.

Subject 1. The right ear was moderately scarred and thickened (Fig. 1). The left ear showed a clean radical mastoidectomy cavity. Subject 1 did not hear the RF sound even when the power density was 30 times that needed for the normal threshold.




Fig. 2. Hearing loss in Subject 2.

Subject 2. This person (Fig. 2) showed manifestations of otosclerosis.

He heard the RF sound at approximately the same power density level needed to induce threshold perception in normal subjects.

Subject 3. The diagnosis for this person was nerve deafness as a result of treating hepatitis with intra-

venous neomycin. A tinnitus persisted and was described as sounding like the hiss of escaping gas.

The subject (Fig. 3) did not hear the RF sound.




Fig. 3. Hearing loss in Subject 3.

Subject 4. This subject was not a clinical case and had normal hearing. He accompanied the investigator as an observer and participant in the experiment. He reported that he could not hear the RF sound. An audiometer check revealed the results (Fig. 4).




Fig. 4. Hearing loss in Subject 4.

It appeared from this series that a necessary condition for perceiving the RF sound was the ability to perceive audio above approximately 5KC, although not necessarily by air conduction.

Shielding.—Our preliminary studies indicated that the entire head, but for the temporal areas, can be shielded without attenuating the RF sound. If other areas are exposed, but the areas over the temples shielded, the RF sound is not heard.