

Your response

Question	Your response
<p>Question 1: Please provide feedback on the additions, amendments and clarifications we have made to the wording of the licence condition to implement our decisions on the scope of the licence condition in our October 2020 Statement, giving reasons for your response.</p>	<p>Ofcom have produced another 'consultation' proposing to go ahead with massive proliferation of 5G masts despite receiving hundreds of complaints in response to their last consultation.</p> <p>Not only do they defer entirely to the ICNIRP (International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection), a group known to have financial conflicts of interest and which disregards the 1000s of studies showing biological harm, but they propose to allow RFR emissions even HIGHER than the ICNIRP supposed limits (56 V/m, at which point burns begin; biological harm begins at 0.3 V/m and below).</p> <p>Note that the latest Case Update from the legal case shows that the legal team has 'gathered witness testimony from people who have suffered serious adverse physical effects in areas where 5G is present.'</p> <p>You can fill in the form on the consultation linked here.</p> <p>If you like, please adapt this info into your response:</p> <p>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:</p> <p>The ICNIRP was ruled biased by the Court of Appeal of Turin in 2020: https://www.globalresearch.ca/court-appeal-turin.../5701050</p> <p>The ICNIRP conflicts of interest have been fully exposed by two MEPs in the following report: https://www.michele-rivasi.eu/.../ICNIRP-report-FINAL...</p> <p>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</p>

	<p>object of two legal cases regarding EMR emissions: https://actionagainst5g.org, https://www.crowdjustice.com/case/5g-judicial-review-2020/</p> <p>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, <i>based on available evidence</i>, when making decisions regarding RFR. Evidence available on request.</p> <p>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://phiremedical.org/2020-nir-consensus-statement-read/</p> <p>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.</p> <p>PLEASE FILL IN THE FORM AND SHARE WITH LIKE-MINDED FRIENDS. IF WE SEND THOUSANDS OF RESPONSES SHOWING THAT WE KNOW THE ICNIRP IS UNFIT TO SET GUIDELINES, THAT SENDS A POWERFUL MESSAGE.</p> <p>https://www.ofcom.org.uk/.../cat.../limiting-exposure-to-emf</p>
<p>Question 2: Please provide feedback on the additions and clarifications to our 'Guidance on EMF Compliance and Enforcement', giving reasons for your response.</p>	<p>Ofcom have produced another 'consultation' proposing to go ahead with massive proliferation of 5G masts despite receiving hundreds of complaints in response to their last consultation.</p>

Not only do they defer entirely to the ICNIRP (International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection), a group known to have financial conflicts of interest and which disregards the 1000s of studies showing biological harm, but they propose to allow RFR emissions even HIGHER than the ICNIRP supposed limits (56 V/m, at which point burns begin; biological harm begins at 0.3 V/m and below).

Note that the latest Case Update from the legal case shows that the legal team has 'gathered witness testimony from people who have suffered serious adverse physical effects in areas where 5G is present.'

You can fill in the form on the consultation linked here.

If you like, please adapt this info into your response:

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.

	<p>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://phiremedical.org/2020-nir-consensus-statement-read/ 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. PLEASE FILL IN THE FORM AND SHARE WITH LIKE-MINDED FRIENDS. IF WE SEND THOUSANDS OF RESPONSES SHOWING THAT WE KNOW THE ICNIRP IS UNFIT TO SET GUIDELINES, THAT SENDS A POWERFUL MESSAGE. https://www.ofcom.org.uk/.../cat.../limiting-exposure-to-emf</p>
<p>Question 3: Please provide feedback on the trial version of our EMF calculator, giving reasons for your response.</p>	<p>Ofcom have produced another 'consultation' proposing to go ahead with massive proliferation of 5G masts despite receiving hundreds of complaints in response to their last consultation. Not only do they defer entirely to the ICNIRP (International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection), a group known to have financial conflicts of interest and which disregards the 1000s of studies showing biological harm, but they propose to allow RFR emissions even HIGHER than the ICNIRP supposed limits (56 V/m, at which point burns begin; biological harm begins at 0.3 V/m and below). Note that the latest Case Update from the legal case shows that the legal team has 'gathered witness testimony from people who have suffered serious adverse physical effects in areas where 5G is present.' Members of the public and policymakers have been made fully aware that the</p>

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://phiremedical.org/2020-nir-consensus-statement-read/>
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.
PLEASE FILL IN THE FORM AND SHARE WITH LIKE-MINDED FRIENDS. IF WE SEND THOUSANDS OF RESPONSES SHOWING THAT WE KNOW THE ICNIRP IS UNFIT TO SET



GUIDELINES, THAT SENDS A
POWERFUL MESSAGE.

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