

1

re the benefits of our technology really worth the damage they are doing to our health? According to the World Health Organization (W.H.O.) in 1985 the global population of diabetics was thirty million, 0.6% of the world population. This increased to one hundred and seventy one million, (2.8% of the global population) by 2000 and it is expected to more than double to three hundred and sixty six million, (4.5% of the global population) by 2030. Doctors attribute this rise in diabetes to poor diet and limited exercise, resulting in obesity and seldom look for causes other than lifestyle and genetics. Is this explanation good to enough to provide the answers to the following newspaper headline in 2010, "One in ten Chinese adults are diabetics". The article went on to say, "with 92 million diabetics, China is now home to the most cases worldwide, overtaking India. The change is happening very rapidly".

There appears to be only one cause — diet. But have the Chinese and Indian diets changed that much? Is it not possible this diabetic catastrophe has as much to do with access to new technology as it does to the food they eat. In my very limited experience with travelling to the Far East, I would have said their diet has barely changed over the last century; most of the population still eat a traditional diet. Very few of them eat Western style food with its added salt and sugar content. This is particularly true with the rural community in China who survive on an income as little as \$2 a day and who have no access to Western style foods. These people are suffering from diabetes at a greater rate than their urban counterparts. Unless there is evidence their diet has changed significantly, this can't be the exclusive reason why there is such an epidemic in new cases of diabetes. There has to be another factor.

One scientific paper does show there is another cause of diabetes, one which has been brought upon us all inadvertently, so called "dirty electricity". Magda Havas produces overwhelming evidence there should be a new shift in the way we look at diabetes. In addition to type

2