

I am hoping we are not too late to add our voice,

My wife and I agree with Sally Beare, when she states,

“Members of the public and policymakers have been made fully aware that the ICNIRP is a group which, despite purporting to be independent, is known to have financial conflicts of interest and to show bias regarding EMF emissions and health. Please note the following:

The ICNIRP was ruled biased by the Court of Appeal of Turin in 2020:

<https://www.globalresearch.ca/court-appeal-turin.../5701050>

The ICNIRP conflicts of interest have been fully exposed by two MEPs in the following report:

<https://www.michele-rivasi.eu/.../ICNIRP-report-FINAL...>

The ICNIRP bias and conflicts of interest are discussed in this article in the International Journal of Oncology: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28656257/>

Public Health England is currently the object of two legal cases regarding EMR emissions:

<https://actionagainst5g.org>, <https://www.crowdjustice.com/case/5g-judicial-review-2020/>

Public Health England’s own lawyers, DLA Piper, have stated in legal information that members of the public or other parties should use their own discretion, based on available evidence, when making decisions regarding RFR. Evidence available on request.

PHIRE Medical have produced this consensus statement, signed by 3500 medical doctors and bodies, stating that it is medical consensus that RFR from masts and devices causes harm to health.

<https://www.ofcom.org.uk/.../cat.../limiting-exposure-to-emf>

It is therefore unacceptable for Ofcom to proceed with proliferation of masts emitting EMR which has been shown in the majority independent science to cause harm to health, including serious harm such as cancer, based on the ICNIRP guidelines which are considered biased and even fraudulent by some of the world’s leading experts in the biochemical effects of RFR."