

RESPONSE TO; 'CALL FOR EVIDENCE' PLANNING REFORM (Closing date 4th November 2019)

EVIDENCE TO: HALT THE ROLL OUT OF 5G

CALL FOR: Risk Assessment and Safe Technology 1G, 2G, 3G, 4G, 5G

To inform all:

**Politicians, Councillors, Telecommunications, Professional
Decision Makers**

UK Citizens

Introduction

We are a working group whom recognise the need for further investigation into both existing and planned increases to EMF Radiation Levels of any measure. The standards used by Government and Industry are only for .Non-ionising Radiation on mobile phones and heating affect. There is ever increasing, scientific evidence showing – Biological Affect of which there are no standards. This has to be addressed and the following information should help you to understand why 5G must be halted for *Safe Technology* achievable with *Fibre Optics, Fast, Reliable* and *Secure*.

ICNIRP are a self appointing and self regulating, private group of thirteen, based in Germany, whom set the safety standard for Mobile Phone use in 1998 as described below.

Safety testing on mobile phones is based on a six minute call on heating affect only. There are no safety standard guidelines to date for biological effect, on *all forms of life* which has been shown in thousands of peer reviewed scientific papers.

What does the word '*Spin*' conjure? We would refer you to the Prime Minster Boris Johnson's speech (link below). In his address to the UN he reacts with alarm to the possibility of 5G being an 'attack' on our civil liberties with little or no security in place, which begs the question – why use a method of delivery that is not secure from the onset? Surely our security services are – *wired*? He then 'miraculously' realises that there is

a 'solution', as he proclaims that the UK is leading Industry with this technology and they will work hard to secure the rights to data security with the assistance of Global Leaders, inviting them all to London – **To Work it Out**. So, it looks like the present data collectors, Google, Apple, Amazon will be surprised also, when Governments take control of all data collection along with the implementation of inevitable new laws. The 'Internet of Things' translates to: *DATA* which translates to *Control* and ultimately *Money* – A quote '*Data is the crude oil of the new economy*'.

https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/fpfis/mwikis/essnetbigdata/images/f/f9/SGA-2_Final_technical_report.pdf ESSnet Big Data - Specific Grant Agreement No. 2 WP0 to WP9 – European Commission website.

The above link possibly, explains why Boris Johnson prioritises Data and Security in his speech to the UN?. It is from the European Commission website and gives insight into how your data will be collected and used. Methodologies and tools are explained in great depth categorised WP0 to WP9. Pay particular attention to Webscraping, Smart Meters and Mobile Phones. Copied below is an excerpt from their document: We urge you to 'visit' their website for more insightful information, some of which is 'access only' protected.

*Future perspectives: • Social media is very useful to find **the sentiment of the population** – this use case should be developed rather to provide information on whether people are **angry or not**, than to estimate the number of population. • One should not concentrate just of **Facebook or Twitter because they may not exist in the future.** • EU-SILC classification must be revised and for the social media sentiment analysis one should try to find the best to identify the **sentiment in reliable way.***

We include this document and reference's to Data and Boris Johnson as we believe it to possibly be, the 'Primary Driver and the Vehicle – 5G' and why Health is Seemingly - Expendable.

This said we invite you to review and research the content of the following information. *Do not accept the entirety of this document as presented without researching.* We are not conspiracy theorists and we have attempted to include as much scientific data as possible to give you the information required to think about the evidence, as we truly believe that you, like us had no idea. If you find anything to make you '*hesitate*' then,

we are asking you to halt all procedures to allow the rollout of 5G for a full Risk Assessment on 1G, 2G, 3G, 4G and 5G under the terms of **The Aarhus Convention and Nuremburg Code** (principles explained within document) .

Commencement

Under the auspices of the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, commonly called the – Aarhus Convention. See further:

<https://www.unece.org/env/pp/introduction.html>

<https://www.parliament.uk/documents/post/postpn256.pdf>

<https://www.unece.org/env/pp/treatytext.html>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uyhE9v2UnEQ>

This Convention, to which the UK signed in February 2005, was transposed into EU Directives. Directive 2003/35/EC transposed the second pillar of the Convention relating to public participation in decision making.

Article 1 of the Convention states its objective **“To contribute, to the protection of the right of every person of present and future generations, to live in an environment adequate to his or her health and wellbeing”**. Environmental equity and sustainability are considerations for participation, by every citizen. 5G is an environmental Issue first and foremost which may lead to health issues as exist in thousands of peer reviewed global scientific studies, on existing EMF to – *All Life*.

The Convention gives every citizen the right to participate in consultations in the spirit of the Convention and its ideals of linking environmental and human rights, including the concept of that which constitutes environmental justice.

Executive Summary

1. There are widespread concerns amongst the medical research communities around the world that the current ICNIRP (International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection) electromagnetic frequency (“EMF”) radiation guidelines are not fit for purpose, in that they only address EMF heating effects and not the many other potential effects at both cellular and physiological level. The ICNIRP guidelines are the default guidelines used by the UK government and government agencies to set limits on exposure to EMF’s.
2. There is already a substantial body of work by specialist biochemists, scientists and doctors, citing adverse effects on health of *prolonged exposure* to pulsed frequencies. EMF radiation at levels well below the ICNIRP recommended guideline maxima and the members of ICNIRP the EU's SCENHIR, WHO EMF Project; represent a *minority view* amongst scientists and health researchers. **Why is negative science, upheld against positive science?**
3. This situation should not be further exacerbated by the introduction of widespread millimetre wave band (mm/Wave) radiation into the public realm, as part of the next stage of 5G rollout, as is documented and proclaimed by both DCMS and Ofcom agencies. Definitive investigations have to be implemented, *immediately* at an internationally independent peer-reviewed level to establish the effects of, subjecting the public to potentially ubiquitous and enduring mm/Wave radiation alongside existing 1G, 2G, 3G, 4G, Wi-Fi, Smart Meter, and IoT, (Internet of Things) and *will not* result in any adverse health consequences or be proven to be causal effects or contributing to *existing* cancer, neurological and autoimmune conditions.
4. To date, it is understood that *No Research* is specifically addressing the potential biological health effects of 5G mm/Wave radiation on *all life* - human, animal, bird, insect and plant. It is not acceptable for *all life* to be exposed to **Millions** of small cell antennas, emitting mm/Wave radiation in the 26GHz, 40GHz and 66-71GHz bands, as part of the next stages of 5G rollout. Expansive, focussed and appropriate research has to be completed, to demonstrate there are **no** adverse biological health effects. Otherwise the government will effectively be treating the general population as live subjects in a

national 'in vivo' experiment on mm/Wave radiation which is in contravention of The Nuremberg Code (See further below).

5. The "**Precautionary Principle**" must be applied. To do otherwise would expose the N.H.S to massive en-costs payable from the public purse.
6. It is noteworthy that Lloyds of London underwriters are excluding the potential effects of Non-ionising radiation from their terms of liability cover, as are Swiss Re.
7. The Department of Health and Social Care, Public Health England and the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) must urgently work together to define, sponsor and fund the necessary research including international experts, ***independent of any members of the minority-view international bodies, including ICNIRP, SCENHIR and WHO EMF Project.*** There must be *No Telecoms Industry Funding* in order to ensure that there are **No Conflicts of Interest.**
8. The government has received in excess thus far, **£3.7 billion** in proceeds from the 4G spectrum auction in 2013 and the 5G first-tranche spectrum auctions by Ofcom in 2018. It would be morally negligent of the DHSC/PHE/NIHR on behalf of the government not to secure funding from the Treasury to use a proportionate amount of these windfall funds for independent research.
9. Use of widespread mm/Wave bands must cease with immediate effect, until it is, **Proven Unequivocally** to be safe for long-term exposures to *All Life*, based on evidenced and peer-reviewed research. The DHSC must require DCMS to ask for, Ofcom to cease and desist from making any plans to release any portion of the 26GHz band for 5G use (whether experimental/trial or commercial). Any existing **Test Bed Trials** (*which constitutes – an experiment*) of the 26GHz band for 5G to supply small cell antennas nationwide, must *cease and desist* until confirmation of long-term irradiation of *All Life* transmitting, 26GHz, 40 GHz and 70GHz RF signals are a safe method of deliverance into the. 'Internet of Things'.

10. It is incumbent on all MP's, Local Councils and Telecoms to protect the public, where the evidence of safety is equivocal. From the contents of this note, you will see that there is a large body of evidence of harm from EMF's which is being ignored by ICNIRP, U K Government along with Telecommunications. At this juncture, negative science **must not** be described as '*positive*'. Positive means '*Evidence of Something*' Negative means '*Evidence of Nothing*'. Therefore only '*Spin*' may transpose '**Something into Nothing**'
11. <https://www.thenation.com/article/how-big-wireless-made-us-think-that-cell-phones-are-safe-a-special-investigation/> Report by two investigative journalists on 5G '*Spin*' explained within the '*audio file*'. Authors Mark Hertsgaard and Mark Dowie.
12. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/jul/14/mobile-phones-cancer-inconvenient-truths> Article Guardian 2018 on '*Spin*'
13. We would urge all authorities to suspend the roll out of 5G until such time as the evidence of safety, can be assured to include assessment, which has never been conducted on 1G,2G,3G,4G mobile phone use and router's. (See links below)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yYDmlq-nTn4>

Dr. Davra Davis explains dangers of device use, especially to children.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xtd-y2C9IH4> CBC News report on mobile phone use in 2010.

Note the Legal entry on every mobile device. **Keep Away From The Body.** A Mobile Phone **MAY NOT** be used as a mobile device, without exceeding SAR levels. You receive 2-3 times above the radiation safety guidelines when '*hand held*'. Definition '*hand*' '*the end part, of a person's arm beyond the wrist, including the palm, fingers and thumb*' – attached to the body. Mobile phones are miss-sold and we are misinformed as a mobile phone is in fact a **Static Device**. Definition: '*Lacking In Movement*'. Both Government and Telecommunications have a legal obligation to define: **Use**. (See link below)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hXGZ7Waa44s>

Trailer from: Mobilise film. Note Richard Branson comments.

14. In making decisions, it is important to understand conflicts of interests or connections to the mobile phone or 5G industries, especially when you consider the relevance of the above information.
15. We would like to thank you in advance for your urgent consideration of these potentially alarming public health issues.

1: What is 5G

- (a) Why are people concerned about health re 5G;
- (b) What do some doctors say;
- (c) The government and its agencies and health issues;
- (d) ICNIRP guidelines and what's wrong with them;
- (e) How do the UK agencies interact with the international agencies and ICNIRP;
- (f) Legal aspects;
- (g) Your obligations as an employer;
- (h) Government consultation on removing planning control from citing of mast and antenna;

1. What is 5G



Recording8.mp3

16. This is a recording explaining the difference in radiation output from an existing Macro Cell (cell tower) to a Small Cell (for lampposts). It is from an expert in his field, Trevor Marshall PhD. Use mouse to Start by 'left clicking' a couple times. Will not open on Ipad.



Recording12.mp3

17. This explains why 5G is needed to accommodate 'The Internet of Things' To access use mouse to Start by 'left clicking' a couple times. Will not open on Ipad.

18. Simply put, 5G stands for 5th Generation of the telecommunications network. These words describe the different stages of development of the carriage of data over waves. Each generation is an evolution of the network from the previous generation. 5G is a 'stand alone'

product providing data only. 1G, 2G, 3G, 4G will remain. 4G will be repurposed for **Test Bed Sites** to commence with as they will increase the antennas and numbers of existing macro sites (cell towers) to increase speed and connectivity. However Real 5G will only exist in its entirety, when small cells are placed every 250 feet on Lampposts, Street Lighting and seemingly every possible placement available.

19. 1G was the carriage of voice data, 2G brought international roaming, texts and sim cards (the data in bus shelters use 2G), 3G enabled voice, video and internet in a mobile scenario and 4G was the convergence of multimedia and technology.
20. 5G is a progression from 4G and brings multiple antenna, millimetre wave, small cells and all the new technologies from the previous decade together which could be used to give 10Gb/s to a user, with an unseen low latency, and allow connections for at least 100 billion devices. Speed of delivery to a device is said to be at least 100 times faster than 4G. We would add that Fibre Optic which is being used for 'back haul' would be *Safer, Secure and Ultra Fast*. The perfect solution to avoid over exposure to radiation levels.

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-22507512>

BBC report describing 5G technology as lucrative but with too much emphasise on speed when it is more to do with 'capacity crunch' to achieve 'The Internet of Things' race. Professor Tafazolli said '4G achieves a decent speed'.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oontpb6rtUM>

Frank Clegg, former president of Microsoft, outlining the dangers of wireless technology and 5G.

21. The debate about 5G has arisen from the use of a higher frequency of the wave spectrum to deliver its data. The higher the frequency, the bigger the data load which can be carried. 5G is set to use millimeter waves (microwaves which are the same as are used in your

microwave oven) to deliver its data load. There are no test studies or risk assessment on biological damage to *All Life*.

(A) **Why are people concerned about health issues with - 5G?**

22. There are people in the UK and abroad who suffer from the effects of electromagnetic frequencies (“EHS”). They suffer a range of symptoms when they come into contact with EMFs including headaches, fatigue, disturbed sleep, tingling, pains in limbs, head or face, stabbing pains, brain-fog and impaired cognitive function, dizziness, tinnitus, nosebleeds, palpitations and others. (see link below)
23. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F0NEaPTu9oI> Jerony Johnson a silicon valley engineer turned advisor on EHS
24. The biological effects at various frequencies set out in the Bio-initiative report (See link below) **Open link** and **Go to:** Editor’s Notes then **Go to:** ‘Do we know enough to take action’ then **Go to:** Recent Studies for updates on the science papers. ‘‘‘‘‘‘
25. <https://bioinitiative.org/table-of-contents/> Bio-initiative Report.
26. Dr Andrew Tressider: The Prevalence of People with Restricted Access to Work in Man-Made Electromagnetic Environments (See link below)
27. <https://www.omegaonline.org/article-details/The-Prevalence-of-People-With-Restricted-Access-to-Work-in-Man-Made-Electromagnetic-Environments/2402> Restricted access to work.

<https://www.cqlpe.ca/pdf/esuknewsMay15small.pdf> Article from ES-UK on different country policy updates to recognize EHS and advise on policy.
28. https://www.academia.edu/7146994/Scientific_and_Medical_Outcry_and_Appeals_for_Children Letter written by Amy L. Dean President of American Academy of Environmental Medicine to FCC stating their legal duty to EHS sufferers.

29. Other studies show reduced fertility, neurological damage, DNA damage, cell death (apoptosis), oxidative stress and cardiac effects which are but a few of those recognised by modern science. Accepted biological effects of EM fields include increased childhood leukemia, adverse effects on sperm production, pregnancy, embryo development and hormones. There are links to depression, Motor Neuron and Parkinson's disease, several Cancers, Behavioral Problems, Cataracts and Autism.
30. <https://einarflydal.files.wordpress.com/2018/04/pall-to-eu-on-5g-harm-march-2018.pdf> Prof. Martin Pall, explanation of how EMF affects the biology and the mechanisms involved, scientific references included.
31. <https://www.trevormarshall.com/> Prof. Trevor Marshall website citing many scientific studies on autoimmune diseases association with EMF.
32. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=37j2jDN8IVo> Prof. Trevor Marshall - 5th International Symposium, St Petersburg on EMF association to autoimmune pathways and EHS symptoms.
33. <https://phpa.health.maryland.gov/OEHFP/EH/Shared%20Documents/CEHPAC/Doctor%20Letters%20on%20Wi-Fi%20In%20School%20%20Full%20Compilation%20.pdf> Letter from Martha Herbert PhD in 2015 warning of health implications for children.
- <http://www.emfwise.com/science.php>
34. Mechanisms explained in (*above link*) include: changes in calcium influx, failure of repair of DNA breaks, blood brain barrier permeability, heat shock protein production, disruption of vital melatonin production, general sympathetic (stress) upregulation of the body and disruption of cell to cell signalling.
- <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmselect/cmenergy/161/161vw44.htm> Report by Dr. Andrew Goldsworthy on Health and EMF.

35. Please see the *'article below'*; referring to firstly, health impacts in Switzerland, arising from 5G rollout. The second 'link' is the Secretary General to the UN, laughing when a member of his staff, Claire Edwards draws his attention to the dangers of the radiation in their own building. Inappropriate behaviour and seemingly staged *'Spin'* given the woman in front, is *smirking*?

<https://mdsafetech.org/2019/07/20/the-first-report-of-5g-injury-from-switzerland/> Health impacts upon rollout 5G in Switzerland.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WTKMpQrgfekUN>

Secretary General of UN – laughing after Claire Edward's address to him. Are we to believe he was not briefed? Wi-Fi in his ceiling – really? *'Spin'*?

(B) What do some doctors say?

<https://www.indigoumbrella.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/ES-letter-Dr-Andrew-Tressider.pdf> Letter Dr. Andrew Tressider

36. See (links above) from Dr Andrew Tressider who is also a trustee of the ES-UK At its heart is the caution that EMFs cause illness in many people.
37. https://www.drmyhill.co.uk/wiki/Electrical_sensitivity Dr. Myhill report on how patients who are chemically compromised react to EMF
38. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wIMHFU4PP50>. Dr Mallery-Blyth from explaining the concept of 5G and implications for health.

It may also be helpful to point you to the European Commission's 'non-binding guidelines' on EMF. Pages 87 – 89 covers some possible symptoms, not just those associated with over-exposure (see link below)

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=14741&langId=en>

39. **See excerpt from 2013 published data relating to the (*above link*) here:**

High frequency fields (100 kHz to 300 GHz)

Exposure to high frequency fields below the relevant action level (AL) which may cause interference with the normal functioning of active implanted medical devices or body worn medical devices. Any malfunction could have potentially serious consequences.

Passive medical implants that are metallic may serve as absorbing antennas resulting in local increases in RF exposure of tissues and possible injury.

The first indication of exposure to high frequency fields may be the sensation of warmth as the worker or parts of their body are heated by the field. However this may not always be the case and feeling warm is not a reliable warning signal. It is also possible to 'hear' pulsed fields between 300 kHz and 6 GHz, so clicking, buzzing or hissing noises may be heard by exposed workers.

Prolonged exposure of the whole body can result in a rise in body temperature.

Increased temperature of only a few degrees can lead to mental confusion, fatigue, headache and other symptoms of heat stress. High physical workloads, or working in hot and humid conditions will increase the likelihood of these effects. The severity of the symptoms also depend on the physical condition of the worker, whether they are dehydrated or not, and on the clothing they are wearing.

Partial body exposure can lead to localised heating or 'hot spots' in muscles or internal organs, and also cause superficial burns which appear instantly on exposure. Serious internal injury is possible without obvious burns on the skin. Strong local overexposure may cause damage to muscles and surrounding tissues in exposed limbs (medial compartment syndrome), which develops instantly or within a few days at most. In general terms, most tissues can tolerate increases in temperatures for short periods without harm, but a

temperature of 41 °C for more than 30 minutes will produce damage.

A temporary lowering of sperm count is possible with exposures that cause substantial heating of the testis, and heating may increase the risk of miscarriage in early pregnancy.

The eye is known to be sensitive to heat, and very high exposure well above the ELV may cause inflammation of the sclera, iris or conjunctiva. Symptoms can include redness, pain in the eyes, sensitivity to light and pupillary constriction. Cataracts (opacities of the lens) are rare but a possible late effect of exposure, and can take weeks or months to develop following exposure. There are no reports of effects occurring years after exposure.

For higher frequency fields (around 6 GHz and above) energy absorption becomes increasingly superficial. These fields will be absorbed by the cornea of the eye, but exposures well above the ELV will be required to cause burns. The skin will also absorb these high frequency fields and at sufficiently high exposures this may result in pain and burns.

Workers may suffer electric shock or contact burns from touching working antennas or from contact with large metallic, ungrounded objects, such as cars, in the field. Similar effects may occur when an ungrounded worker touches a grounded metallic object.

These burns may be superficial or deep within the body. Metallic implants, including dental fillings and body piercings (as well as jewellery and some tattoo pigments), can concentrate the field leading to localised heating and thermal burns. High exposure of the hand may also result in nerve damage.

Case reports of overexposed workers suggest other symptoms may also be possible.

These include headaches, bowel upset, lethargy, and long-lasting feelings of 'pins and needles' in the exposed tissues.

Stress reactions may be associated with actual or suspected overexposure.

40. Do also see the article of the Europaevm Academy of Environmental Medicine. It sets out a number of illnesses associated with long term exposure to EMFs. (See *link below*)

http://ehsidaho.com/medical_science_on_ehs.aspx

41. You may also wish to review the site for Physicians for Safe Technology which has a whole section on 5G Telecommunications and lists numerous biological effects and impacts (*see link below*)

<https://mdsafetech.org/5g-telecommunications-science/> Physicians for Safe Technology

42. The 2018 European Commission Scientific Committee on Health, Environment and Emerging Risks (**SCHEER**) regularly updates emerging risks to public and environmental health. In their 2018 European Commission Statement on Emerging Health and Environmental Issues lists amongst others, **virtual reality and electromagnetic radiation, especially 5G technologies**. They state ***“The lack of clear evidence to inform the development of exposure guidelines to 5G technology leaves open the possibility of unintended biological consequences. (See below link at 4.1, 4.2)***

43. The excerpt from link below states at 4.4 page 14:

https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/scientific_committees/scheer/docs/scheer_s_002.pdf SCHEER Statement: Emerging Health and Environmental Issues 2018

“On the horizon, a new generation of even shorter high frequency 5G wavelengths are being proposed to power the Internet of Things (IoT). The IoT promises us convenient and easy lifestyles with a massive 5G interconnected telecommunications network. However, the expansion of broadband with shorter wavelength radiofrequency

radiation highlights the concern that health and safety issues remain unknown. Controversy continues with regard to harm from current 1G, 2G, 3G and 4G wireless technologies. 5G technologies are far less studied for human or environmental effects” (Russell, 2018).”

“5G networks will soon be rolled out for mobile phone and smart device users. How exposure to electromagnetic fields could affect humans remains a controversial area, and studies have not yielded clear evidence of the impact on mammals, birds or insects. The lack of clear evidence to inform the development of exposure guidelines to 5G technology leaves open the possibility of unintended biological consequences”

(C) The Government and its Agencies are upholding outdated safety regulations.

There is no doubt that 5G will have massive commercial benefits. The production and connectivity of over 100 billion devices, autonomous cars, nano-technology, remote medical interventions and futuristic applications. Government has *failed* in their duty to inform the public of a National unprecedented experiment. *Why?* Exiting the European Union has been ‘covered’ daily by both government and media for nearly two years, whilst a military style operation has been strategically planned and executed for 5G. *Why?*

The Prime Minister’s position on 5G was set out, in his speech to the United Nations in September, 2019. (See *link below*)

44. <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-speech-to-the-un-general-assembly-24-september-2019>. Ordinarily Boris Johnson struggles to deliver any semblance of a ‘coherent speech’ and yet here, is a precision P.R. exercise on ‘*Perception of Risk*’? The European Commission website holds many documents on ‘Big Data Extraction’ entitled: WP5 stating how ‘Webscrape tools’ will be used to collect data from websites. This will be used in principle for statistics on ‘*people movement*’ and possibly Consensus, providing that every citizen is ‘*using a mobile phone*’ in addition to many other applications. This would explain why his talk to the UN was solely about – 5G and data collection. It would also explain the term; ‘Race’ used by both UK and US governments. Has anyone

stopped to consider how all of these ‘things’ will work? Do they not have to be ‘plugged in? And are we not being ‘sold the idea’ that Smart Meters are to encourage us to monitor and use less electricity? ‘Spin’?

45. At present, neither the government nor its agencies are prepared to take account of the health impacts found in over 1800 scientific papers – a list and explanation of those papers are set out in the 1557 pages of the BioInitiative Report. *Why?*
46. There are many government agencies tasked with ensuring that our environment is free from harmful agents and in the main they *fail miserably* on all counts, which is why we now demand a seat on these councils under the **Aarhus Convention**. We have the right to be involved in environmental decisions and we now claim that right with 5G and serve you notice under: ‘Annex 1’ of this document. *All* are operating from outdated regulatory rules and **MUST** now be held to account and 5G halted, for safe technology. (See links below)
47. <https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=17994> Parliamentary Assembly: *Resolution 1815/2011 Final version*. **Pay particular attention to this document** at: 5, 5.6, Then 8 to 8.5 recommendations. **Lastly 8.5.8 mentions our civil right to the Aarhus Convention principles**. This entire document recognized the immediate changes that needed to be made especially to the Precautionary Principle and called for ‘*early science warnings*’ to be heeded. ICNIRP were also criticised – **all back in 2011**
48. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/5g-technologies-radio-waves-and-health/5g-technologies-radio-waves-and-health> Public Health England update **October 2019** on ‘5G Technologies and Health’. Note ‘*several decades*’ is quoted and 5G is ‘*new*’. It uses MM/Wave from Small Cell Antennas which have never been used in the public domain. There have been no tests or Risk Assessment carried out by Industry or Government.

49. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/mobile-phone-base-stations-radio-waves-and-health/mobile-phone-base-stations-radio-waves-and-health> Public Health England updated 'Mobile Base Station; guide in **May 2019**. Note they say testing has been over 'several decades'. Mobile phone technology was only introduced over last twenty years and remember radiation is accumulative much like the 'Smoking Debate' which lasted for decades. ***Why are all these agencies being directed by THIRTEEN people whose policies are ignoring, positive science? Common sense must prevail and the, Precautionary Principle applied.***
50. The government and its agencies justify their positions by stating that they operate within the international ICNIRP guidelines which do not encompass biological affect from EMFs below the limits which, ICNIRP set.
51. <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPnote2019.pdf> ICNIRP NOTE 2018 – Challenging the NTP study and Ramazzini Institute Study. ICNIRP quote: 'Relevance of NTP and Ramazzini institute exposures to public health. Should the claims of NTP (2018a) and Falcioni et al. (2018) be valid, the degree to which their exposure conditions were relevant to public health **would be an important consideration**'. In another claim they state that the science has to be repeated before it is accepted and this is what the NTP and Ramazzini Institute studies both did. The NTP study was designed with reverberation chambers to allow for the animals to roam free instead of being confined in a stressful environment. They even found a way to give them water so their head did not heat whilst drinking. They worked out the amount of full body radiation that would mimic the life time of a human. This was two years in the life of mice/rats. The FDA commissioned this 25 Million Dollar Toxicity Report of which Mobile Phones was a two year study – the life of the animals. The test design was implemented by a Swiss company approved by the FDA. When the results were presented it then took three days to peer review. The review was positive but the FDA decided that there were design worries and that the result could not be applied to humans. All pharmaceutical testing by the FDA is by design on – animals. No Risk Assessment followed,

which should have been standard procedure on positive findings.
Why has this not been challenged?

https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/consultation_upload/ICNIRP_RF_Guidelines_PCD_Appendix_B_2018_07_11.pdf
ICNIRP Appendix B Update July 2018. **Please read carefully and note how negative results always take precedence over positive results showing health issues.**

52. <https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/go/cellphone> NTP Report 2018 –
testing 2G and 3G only

https://www.fda.gov/NewsEvents/Newsroom/PressAnnouncements/ucm624809.htm?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+FdaUpdates+%28FDA+Updates%29 Letter dated 1st November 2018 from Jeffrey Shuren, Director of FDA. Note the claim ‘*several decades*’ testing. Mobile phones have not been used for that amount of time and if they had, we would probably be seeing more consequences. Whilst they accept that there were unusual findings of rare cancer to the heart they decided **‘So, these findings should not be directly extrapolated to human cell phone usage’**. As explained above the study design and exposure rate was approved by the FDA.

53. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29530389> Ramazzini Institute Study August 2018. Showing same results as the NTP Study – 2G and 3G only.

54. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325971202_Brain_Tumours_Rise_in_Glioblastoma_Multiforme_Incidence_in_England_1995-2015_Suggests_an_Adverse_Environmental_or_Lifestyle_Factor
UK study showing brain cancer increase June 2018 How can ICNIRP/Governments - IGNORE this?

55. <https://www.powerwatch.org.uk/science/studies.asp> List of Scientific Studies from Powerwatch.org.uk website.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/597421/07.03.17_5G_strategy_-_for_publication.pdf DCMS is responsible for 5G implementation – Paper March 2017. *Who knew?*

56. Above is the Governments plan for our future, of which there has been no consultation, no debate and no involvement with the citizens of the U.K. And yet, we were asked if we wished to stay/leave the European Union. Did our Government believe that we would not find this very strange especially given the precision planning of 5G, ‘veiled’ behind the complete chaos of leaving the EU. Where was the precision planning here? An equally important event that involved the Nation and yet it appeared that pre-school children were handling the planning and execution to exit? What happened to right to ‘choice’? Choice to have every item chipped, choice to decide on the ethics of data collection, choice to have autonomous cars, choice to have doctor consultation via a video link, choice to use a mobile phone, choice to use the internet but most of all, the choice to **REDUCE RADIATION IN OUR OWN HOMES.** There will be no choice to protect our families from, as WHO have stated and published ‘Possibly Carcinogenic 2B Radiation’ by switching off our home modem, whilst we sleep. An essential process of healing takes place in this realm, where accumulated burdening toxins are expelled. Will there be a **SWITCH** on the lampposts, street lights, buildings that we may have a choice to **TURN OFF**?
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JKaoLxw0qJl> The 5G Mass Experiment – Big promises Unknown Risks.

A Risk Assessment is a legality and requirement, not just by PHE, but also by each Local Council whose workers are placed within the public spaces of the borough and exposed to radiation. (See link below)

<http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/indg163.pdf> Health and Safety Executive: Risk and Assessment

57. Whilst the (above link) relates to The Control of Electromagnetic Fields at Work Regulations 2016 in the context of medical MRI (specifically for pregnant women) but also applies to EMFs generically. The link to the regulations are at: *(See link below)*
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2016/588/regulation/4/made>
Legislation Gov.UK
58. The requirements are addressed but has the implementation been upheld of a risk assessment by either the mobile service operators, PHE or any Local Councils?
59. Any risk assessment which should have been undertaken, is required to take account of all *current science* and not merely outdated and industry biased guidelines. Even without the legal grounds, on a simple moral basis, if society is to be taken on a voyage, it would be nice to know that the ship was seaworthy, the captain sober, the crew alert and competent, the navigation aids effective, all relevant charts consulted, the ships log current and a good lookout kept for icebergs, (even for unsinkable ships)... (We had one of those a hundred years or so ago...).
60. Ministers Parliament, Councilors, Telecommunications and Professionals, as employers, you are not expected to anticipate unforeseeable risks, however you have now been told in these submissions of one serious risk and you cannot now *'not know'*. *And we now serve Notice upon you, as detailed in 'Annex 1'*
61. As an employer, your employees work in the public arena. They will be affected by these excessive microwaves and it is your duty to implement a full risk assessment in order to assess the risks and ensure your employees, safety.
62. The Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport responded in July, 2019 to a petition to Parliament asking for a suspension of the roll out of 5G current until 28th December 2019. DCMS replied with the standard response of, 'No Evidence of Heating. This outdated regulation *MUST* be changed to encompass biological interference (see link below)

63. <https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/262842> **Petition to halt 5G closes 28th December 2019**

64. Telecommunications have no safety testing procedures, as they simply follow the outdated, ICNIRP guidelines.

65. https://ee.co.uk/content/dam/ee-help/Help-PDFs/Business-PDFs/ALFs%20parliamentary%20briefing_FINAL_August_2015.pdf

E.E. License Fees. Government acquire annually from one provider.

66. <https://www.btplc.com/Thegroup/Policyandregulation/downloadcentre/2018/DCMS/BTDCMSCoEMainResponse.pdf>

BT's Response to 'Call for Evidence' to DCMS for 5G

67. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/727833/BT_Group_-_180212Mobile_annex_5FINAL.pdf

BT's Annex 5. Showing the amount of additional Macro Cell sites (cell phone towers) and Small Cell Antennas to include placement on Lampposts, Bus Stops, Buildings and Public Corridors, highways, trains and public buildings. These will be every two hundred and fifty feet as an approximation. **Who knew?** (Page 7 copied below)

The mobile aspect of any future 'converged network' is therefore likely to comprise:

- tens of thousands of macro cell sites as in the current infrastructure competition model ensuring geographic coverage**
- many more thousands of small cell sites (on lamp posts, bus stops, external building walls, etc) in population centres, traffic corridors, etc, providing very high speed and capacity within this wider coverage**
- a greater number (perhaps millions) of additional 'in-building' sites providing in-fill and focussed coverage and capacity in commercial and other buildings as required by the business/building owner. These in-building cells will need to connect seamlessly with the wider geographic network**

the availability of, and approach to, the use of publicly owned assets. We anticipate that street furniture, for example, will be attractive. We would urge local authorities to think strategically about how they allow access to these sites and the benefits to residents. Viewing them solely as revenue-raising opportunities and selling concessions to third parties may mean these assets are effectively priced out of the market.

68. Now, the government intend to 'relax planning' rules in preparation for 5G by lifting existing planning law for Telecoms to have 'Carte Blanche' on placement. And the consultation for those plans **Opened 27th August 2018.** (See link below)

69. <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/proposed-reforms-to-permitted-development-rights-to-support-the-deployment-of-5g-and-extend-mobile-coverage> Consultation paper 'Call for Evidence' on planning reform in preparation for 5G. **Closes 4th November 2019.**

70. The government wants to remove the right to peaceful enjoyment of property by permitting mobile service operators to demand entry into the property of renters to put up their equipment even if the persons renting object. Reference to "Providing Operators with a 'right to entry' to flats, business parks, office blocks and other tenanted properties to allow those who rent to receive fast, reliable connectivity, from the right supplier at the best price" in the *Future Telecoms Infrastructure Review: (See link below)*

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/forging-a-full-fibre-broadband-and-5g-future-for-all> Forging a full fibre broadband and 5G – Gov.UK

71. For the reasons set out in these submissions it appears that this is a targeted assault on the rights of citizens, their property and their human rights. The right to live in our own homes, without the '*Fear of Assault*'.

72. All health concerns '*cease to exist*' with ICNIRP guidelines. EMF Radiation has been simplified into heating only and all the science is then seemingly irrelevant. All concerns regarding health are ignored but this has to now be addressed. Blanketed, constant, accumulative exposures to EMF radiation to *all life* on a biological level with no standards are an act of insanity. Why are citizens being ignored, along with scientists? Who is '*acting*' on behalf of the '*majority*'? Or perhaps it has always been an **Act**, performed so well that we not only paid for a front row seat but applauded. The final curtain on performances we believe has reached a finale. To cover this country and around the world with excess radiation for '*things*' will be explained in text books as 'The work of '*Sociopaths*' – *likened to Hitler*; (See link below)
73. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yJPJw_Rj_5U A reminder of how a '*different view*' by a minority, changes outcomes for the majority.
74. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PYG47wLPuto>
UKIP Conference 2019 – John Kitson - comprehensive talk on 5G.
75. Every government agency, some Members of Parliament, are all given the ICNIRP directives, 'WHO' held an 'EMF Risk Perception and Communication' meeting in **1998** due to the public concerns. WHO, Industry and P.R. came together to work out ways to '*Spin*' the wording in a subsequent hand book. *An inside view to decision making. (See link below)*
76. <http://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/reports/ottawa.pdf> Who paper on EMF Risk Perception and Communication. '*Spin?*
77. https://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/en/EMF_Risk_ALL.pdf
Establishing a Dialogue on Risks from Electromagnetic Fields - Hand book. Published from the above to '*Spin*' the wording for the general public.
78. *Pay particular attention* to the woman listed in the attendees on WHO consultation from London who has a P.R. company. Public concern was evident twenty years ago and a book of '*Spin*' was directed, written and published by WHO, an agency responsible for World Health and until now - *we trusted*.
79. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8627134> DNA strand breaks high frequency EMF by Lei and Singh in April 1996.

80. <https://www.rfsafe.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/cell-phone-radiation-war-gaming-memo.pdf> Leaked memo in December 1994 written by Motorola responding to above science from Lei and Singh. They talk about 'War Gaming' to change the data. This is a term used to commission opposing science. 'Spin' changes the outcomes.
81. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/cell-phones-brain-cancer_b_3232534 Article in Huff post by Dr. Devra Davis describing 'War Gaming' in May 2013
82. <http://patentscope.wipo.int/search/en/WO2004075583> Swiss Patent 2003 applied for by Swiss Teleco. 'The invention relates to method and system for reducing electro smog in local area networks'. They proceed to describe in great detail the Biological Effects. **Probably the most revealing document of all within this evidence.** (See **Description** within link)

<http://www.neilcherry.nz/document-downloads.html>

Dr. Neil Cherry Scientific papers on EMF

83. Above link contains all published papers on EMF by Dr. Neil Cherry to include evidence that Motorola paid for 'bad science' to sabotage Lei and Singh's work (above link). Critique also of ICNIRP in a paper for the New Zealand Government which is damning on every level. *You may need to go to: Dr. Neil Cherry original website, as the above will not always open the links.*

(D) **ICNIRP guidelines and what's wrong with them**

84. There are some fundamental criticisms of these guidelines, not least of which is that these guidelines were set for short term exposure and not for long term exposure to EMF. The guidelines are, therefore, outdated and need to be reviewed given the average person/child is using a device for 4-6 hours each day. A government brochure was published in 2011 which is clearly showing the 'Precautionary Principle' on use – *who knew?* Today 48% of our children are recorded as anxious/depressed, announced on a T.V. reality show and a two minute silence was observed for children at home to 'talk'. What is wrong with this picture? Surely alarm bells must be ringing? Kids are using devices for increasingly longer amounts of time, so this alone should ensure new safety rules but this time on accumulative

biological affects with a risk assessment study. ICNIRP exact standards were based on a six minute call, using a dummy head filled with liquid. The mobile phone was held away from the head and because it did not heat, it was declared safe. We would add that this 'dummy' was based on the average head of a six foot army person A child's head is smaller and the skull thinner.
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/147418/dh_124899.pdf.pdf Guidance brochure 2011 child safety use. *Who knew?*

85. There are other criticisms which state that the ICNIRP has dismissed scientific research linking cancer to those living near phone masts. They have been criticised by a number of professionals. Some are set out below.
86. One such criticism is from the Council of Europe in 2011 as below:

*"it is most curious, to say the least, that the applicable official threshold values for limiting the health impact of extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields and high frequency waves were drawn up and proposed to international political institutions (WHO, European Commission, governments) by **ICNIRP, an NGO whose origin and structure are none too clear and which is furthermore suspected of having rather close links with the industries whose expansion is shaped by recommendations for maximum threshold values for the different frequencies of electromagnetic fields**" (The rapporteur's memorandum attached to a resolution adopted by the Standing Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in May 2011)*

87. Another is by US Scientists after National Toxicology Programme (See link below)

<https://ehtrust.org/us-scientist-criticizes-icnirps-refusal-to-reassess-cell-phone-radiation-exposure-guidelines-after-us-national->

[toxicology-program-studies-show-clear-evidence-of-cancer-in-experimental-animals/](#)

Environmental Health Trust

88. Sarah Starkey sets out a blistering, detailed and reasoned critique of the IGNIR guidelines 2012. **We would advise you to study this document in its entirety to understand the ‘interplay between the agencies summarized below, responsible for our safety.** (See link below)

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311246078> Inaccurate official assessment of radiofrequency safety by the Advisory Group on Non-ionising Radiation September 2016

89. <https://www.electrosensitivity.co/world-health-organiz..html> Critique of ICNIRP, IARC, WHO and EU on Electro-sensitivity Website.
90. http://www.beperkdestraling.org/images/stories/Documenten/Blootstellingsnormen/ICNIRP_guideline_critique_Dr._Cherry.pdf
Dr Neil Cherry - Critique of ICNIRP

(E) How do the UK agencies interact with the international agencies and ICNIRP.

<https://www.investigate-europe.eu/publications/how-much-is-safe/>

Above article has an interactive graph explaining the cross continuum between these groups and conflict of interests.

91. Many of the people involved belong to the groups which make up the PHE, COMARE, WHO AND ICNIRP.
92. PHE relies on ICNIRP.
93. COMARE relies on WHO which relies on ICNIRP.

94. WHO will produce its EHC which will form the basis of ICNIRP's revision - but they're mostly the same people.
95. The following is a helpful interface of PHE, DHSC, ICNIRP and WHO as at October 2019.
96. NRPB/HPA/PHE, the UK's agency concerned with public health and radiation and sponsored by the Department of Health and DHSC, adopted the 1998 ICNIRP guidelines following the EU 1999 recommendation.
97. The ICNIRP guidelines are based on ICNIRP's general approach and principles, published in 2002.
98. These principles include the adoption by governments of guidelines lower than ICNIRP's short-term ones based on the heating hypothesis to protect vulnerable groups.
99. NRPB/HPA/PHE has adopted precautionary advice over children, one of the vulnerable groups.
100. It is reasonable to understand that in adopting certain guidelines that one accepts the principles on which these guidelines are based; otherwise there is no basis for adopting these guidelines rather than some other guidelines.
101. The World Health Organization does not set guidelines. It has entrusted this role to the private self-elected group ICNIRP comprised of 13 individuals whom, self appointment, spun out of another private group concerned with nuclear radiation group.
102. WHO will produce a new EHC which will inform the next ICNIRP guidelines.
103. ICNIRP 1998 guidelines (*See link below*)

<https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPemfgdl.pdf>

104. ICNIRP 2002 general approach (*See link below*)

<https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPphilosophy.pdf>

105. WHO 2006 (RF) reliance on ICNIRP (See *link below*)

<https://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/facts/fs304/en/>

106. WHO 2007 (ELF) reliance on ICNIRP (See *link below*)

<https://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/facts/fs322/en/>

107. PHE complies with ICNIRP and adopts ***precautionary advice on children, 2017, 2018*** [in line with ICNIRP general approach 2002] (See *link below*)

<http://www.mardenvillage.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/PHE-RF-Advice-Summary-12-May-2017.pdf>

108. PHE's COMARE reliance on WHO, 2018 (minutes, 2.12) (See *link below*)

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/786270/COMARE_121_minutes_-_final.pdf

109. Some information on the various bodies above is below:

**COMMITTEE ON THE MEDICAL ASPECTS OF RADIATION
IN THE ENVIRONMENT (COMARE)**

121st meeting, Thursday 22nd November 2018

Skipton House, London

2.12 The Chair informed members that there had been continued correspondence from the UK & Commonwealth EMF Action Group on several issues, including attendance at

meetings as observers and interest in the formation of a working group for non-ionising radiation (NIR) issues. The Chair has discussed the working group suggestion with DHSC in regard to the committee's work programme. While health issues associated with electromagnetic fields (EMFs) are within COMARE's remit, the formation of a NIR working group now is not considered a productive use of the committee's time. COMARE has received no specific requests for advice on NIR issues. The Chair reminded members that the World Health Organisation (WHO) is currently undertaking a review on radiofrequency electromagnetic fields and the committee would not wish to duplicate this work. It was proposed that following publication of the WHO report, the committee could review the document and produce a statement. Members were advised that there is UK engagement with WHO through the international EMF project. Members discussed the remit of the committee for NIR work and the balance with work on ionising radiation issues. Members were content with the proposal to review the WHO report and to maintain a watching brief on NIR issues.

**WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTE**

Téléphone Central /Exchange (+41 22) 791 21 11
direct /+4122)791

In reply please refer for: E15-445-11
Prière de rappeler la référence:

Gruppe Hans U. Jakob
Flühli 17
CH 3150 Schwarzenburg
Switzerland

14. September 2001

Dear Sir

ICNIRP is an independent scientific commission of eminent scientists established by the International Radiation

Protection Association (IRPA) to provide advice on non-ionizing radiations in the same way as the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) has done for ionizing radiation for over 65 years. It is an independent and separate organization. It is not "under-organization of WHO" as stated in your letter.

However, ICNIRP is one of a very large number of NGOs in official relations with WHO and it has been working with WHO on matters related to the protection of people from exposure to Non-Ionising radiation. These radiations include EMF, UV, static fields and ultrasound. ICNIRP uses WHO's health risk assessments to draft guidelines on human exposure limits, which have now been accepted for guidance or mandated into law in many countries.

...gez.

Ann Kern

Executive Director, Sustainable Development
and Healthy Environment

cc:

M. Marta Mauras, Deputy Secretary-General 'Office, UN,
New York

Mr. Patrizio Civili, Assistant Secretary-General for Policy,
Coordination and Inter-Agency Affairs

Government response to the Stakeholder Advisory Group on extremely low frequency electric and magnetic fields (ELF EMFs) (SAGE) recommendations

2009

5. The UK adopted the 1998 ICNIRP⁵ EMF public exposure guidelines in terms of the 1999 European Recommendation (1999/519/EC)⁶. The electricity industry currently complies with these guidelines on a voluntary basis.

13. The same NRPB 2004 publication recommended the adoption in the UK of the international (ICNIRP) guidelines

based on the known science but also **“that government should consider the possible need for further precautionary measures.”** Precaution is mentioned because of the uncertainty in the science.

29. The Government recommends that the electricity industry takes appropriate action to identify any homes and schools that do not currently meet the ICNIRP requirements because of the proximity of high voltage power lines, and addresses the need for remedial actions to ensure that exposures do not exceed the relevant ICNIRP guidelines.

42. It is for EU Member States to determine the circumstances in which the adoption of the ICNIRP guidelines is appropriate in terms of the EU recommendation. In this regard, the UK Government considers that exposure for potentially significant periods of time might reasonably be regarded as referring to residential properties, and to properties where members of the public spend an appreciable proportion of their time. The ICNIRP guidelines are formally incorporated into the planning system for radio telecommunications but not in regard to overhead power lines, so in taking forward actions in response to the SAGE report the Government will take the opportunity to consider this matter further.

In the light of the above advice, we recommend that the electricity industry take steps to identify any existing homes and schools that do not meet the ICNIRP requirements because of the proximity of high voltage power lines and to consider what remedial actions might be taken to ensure that exposures do not exceed the relevant guidelines.

Summary of Advice from Public Health England on Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields

12 May 2017

Central to PHE advice is that exposures to radio waves should comply with the guidelines published by the International

*Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). ICNIRP is formally recognised by the World Health Organization (WHO). PHE has also issued **precautionary advice to discourage the Non-essential use of mobile phones by children.** (See link below)*

<http://www.mardenvillage.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/PHE-RF-Advice-Summary-12-May-2017.pdf>) Public Health England May 2017

Summary of Advice from Public Health England on Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields

[February 28 2018]

*Central to PHE advice is that exposures to radio waves should comply with the guidelines published by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). ICNIRP is formally recognised by the World Health Organization (WHO). PHE has also issued **precautionary advice to discourage the non-essential use of mobile phones by children.***

Electromagnetic fields and public health

Exposure to extremely low frequency fields

Backgrounder 322

June 2007

<https://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/facts/fs322/en/>

Electromagnetic Fields and Public Health June 2007

International exposure guidelines

Health effects related to short-term, high-level exposure have been established and form the basis of two international exposure limit guidelines (ICNIRP, 1998; IEEE, 2002). At present, these bodies consider the scientific evidence related to possible health effects from long-term,

low-level exposure to ELF fields insufficient to justify lowering these quantitative exposure limits.

1. Electromagnetic fields and public health

a) Base stations and wireless technologies

Backgrounder 304

May 2006

<https://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/facts/fs304/en/>

Electromagnetic Fields and Public Exposure May 2006

Protection standards

International exposure guidelines have been developed to provide protection against established effects from RF fields by the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP, 1998) and the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE, 2005).

*National authorities should adopt international standards to protect their citizens against adverse levels of RF fields. **They should restrict access to areas where exposure limits may be exceeded.***

a. **ICNIRP** provides a **disclaimer** to its guidelines as below:

“ICNIRP undertakes all reasonable measures to ensure the reliability of information presented on the website, **but does not guarantee the correctness, reliability, or completeness of the information and views published. The content of our website is provided to you for information only. We do not assume any responsibility for any damage, including direct or indirect loss suffered by users or third parties in connection with the use of our website and/or the information it contains, including for the use or the interpretation of any technical data, recommendations, or specifications available on our website.**”

110. This does beg the question “Who is ultimately liable”. Here is an agency which is advising the world’s governments of safety of their people and it does not accept responsibility for its work. Therefore, who is responsible for due care and diligence along with deliverance? **This issue needs urgent attention.**

(F) **Legal aspects**

Human rights

111. The Danish Institute for Public Health and the Council for Health-Safe Telecommunications has prepared a legal document related to the broad harm from 5G as well as other wireless technologies. They state:

“The legal opinion is based on the rules of law in the European Convention on Human Rights, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, the EU directive on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora, the EU directive on the conservation of wild birds, on the precautionary principle as well as on the Bern- and Bonn- conventions on the protection of animals and plants.”

- a. LEGAL OPINION – on whether it would be in contravention of human rights and environmental law to establish the 5G-system in Denmark - FINAL DANISH VERSION TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH by Christian F. Jensen attorney-at-law (L) (See link below)

<https://mdsafetech.files.wordpress.com/2019/07/5g-danish-legal-opinion-jensen-2019.pdf>

Other laws and potential breaches of laws

Health & Social Care Act 2012 which states that:

'The Secretary of State's duty as to protection of public health:

(3) Subsection (4) applies in relation to any function under this section which relates to:

a) The protection of the public from Ionising or Non-Ionising radiation.

12) Duties as to improvement of public health

2B) Functions of local authorities and the Secretary of State as to improvement of public health:

Each local authority must take such steps as it considers appropriate for improving the health of the people in its area'

- (b) The HSE 2016 legislation and planning laws does not cover non-thermal effects since both specifically refer to ICNIRP and therefore the Secretary of State is failing to control radiation frequencies as required under the Health and Social Care Act 2012.
- (c) The failure to conduct an Environmental Risk Assessment for 1G, 2G, 3G, 4G and 5G, both for *All Life*.
- (d) Since the European Environment Agency has recommended the '*Precautionary Principle*', which would mean a moratorium on 1G-5G and the precautionary principle is enshrined in EU law and the UK government is ***Acting illegally*** by not adopting the '*Precautionary Principle*
- (e) The DHSC says it follows ICNIRP guidelines. The ICNIRP 2002 warns governments to provide non-thermal guidelines to those that need them. Therefore, the government **is failing** to protect these people. This means that the DHSC is failing to protect the 1.2% or 1.6% of the population who are already severely affected.
- (f) **Common Assault:** since it is proven that RF causes EHS symptoms, and then to deploy RF without consent is **Assault**.

(g) The government is *failing* in its Public Equality Duty under s. **149 Equality Act** by *failing* to recognise that there are EHS sufferers. 5G will exacerbate their suffering by ensuring they have no way to escape the situation.

b. Whilst it is not a breach of the law as such, it should be noted here that insurance companies will not insure against harm caused by EMFs. Has provision been made for this from the public purse, as **Real 5G** is rolled out, as there will need to be accountability for harm?

(G) Your obligations as an employer

c. The Control of Electromagnetic Fields at Work Regulations 2016 above and some of the provisions are set out in Schedule 6. Compliance as a necessity should be applied in your review, for implementation.

d. In addition to these, you have health and safety obligations to your workers under the health and safety at work legislation. Council workers work in public places and will be working where the 5G EMFs will be if 5G is rolled out. These should also be taken into account.

Each Council will be personally liable for damage to their employees from 5G as it will be making the decision to roll out that equipment in the public realm, which is their workplace.

(H) Government consultation on removing planning control from citing of mast and antenna

e. The government has embarked on public consultation to remove planning control from local councils relating to the siting of masts.

112. This means that telecommunications companies will install millions of small cell antennas on streetlights, lamp posts, post boxes, buildings, public corridors etc without prior consent or informing you.

113. For the reasons set out above, it is important to make representations to the government consultation. We hope that we have demonstrated from the above the difficulty that EHS sufferers have in getting anyone to believe them
114. The ICNIRP guidelines are for **Exposure at 1mw/m2 for 6 minutes only**, so even by the ICNIRP guidelines – not accepted by the vast majority of modern science as set out above – *this is a breach*. ICNIRP *KNOW* that Children are using phones in excess of 4-6 hours every day, with recorded data of 48% with anxiety and depression. We include a parliamentary paper published in January 2019 which is damning on ethics alone... (Below under children).
115. The Health and Social Care Act 2012 states that Local and National Government have a duty to protect the public from ionising and Non-ionising radiation.

STATEMENT

If you accept the submissions in this document, we would suggest to you that we are all being used as guinea pigs in a giant experiment. The Nuremberg Code prohibits experiments on humans without their consent. (See link below)

<https://history.nih.gov/research/downloads/nuremberg.pdf> Nuremberg Code.

(H) The Nuremberg Code was introduced in August 1947, after the Nuremberg Trials. In these trials, Nazi doctors were convicted of the

crimes committed during human experiments on concentration camp prisoners. It attempted to give clear rules about what was legal and what was not when conducting human experiments.

(I) The code consists of ten points. The first and most important is that anyone participating in an experiment must give informed consent. This means nobody can be forced to participate in human experiments. All participants must understand the potential risks.

- (J) The code also gives rules for running the experiments. For example, participants can leave the experiment if they want. Doctors must stop the experiment if they realise it can harm the patient. Also, no experiment may be made where the risks outweigh the benefits that can be had from it.
- (K) There is a lot of opposition to 5G from those around the world that have realised the meaning and implications, including many thousands, in the US, Australia, Switzerland and other countries. Brussels have suspended the roll out of 5G. Remember also, those that have 'found out' what Real 5G means are in the minority, due to the 'cover up'. England has conquered many other countries during warfare but never have we 'knowingly; experienced 'War Gaming' within our own shores, until now.

CHILDREN

We believe *Our Children* are already suffering the effects of these additional toxic pollutants 1G, 2G, 3G, 4G, Wi-Fi, DECT Technology and Smart Meters.

Let us ask you

How many children do you know of with AUTISM?

How many children do you know of with ADHD?

How many children do you know of with CANCER?

How many children do you know of with DEPRESSION/
ANXIETY?

<https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/On-the-Clear-Evidence-of-the-Risks-to-Children-from-Smartphone-and-WiFi-Radio-Frequency-Radiation-Final-2019.pdf>

Professor Tom Butler: Report on Risk to Children from RF Radiation. A quote from this document (*See below*):

“To be a scientist is to be naive. We are so focused on our search for truth we fail to consider how few actually want us to find it. But it is always there whether we see it or not, whether we choose to or not. The truth doesn’t care about our needs or wants—it doesn’t care about our governments, our ideologies, our religions—it will lie in wait for all time...Where I once would fear the cost of truth, now I only ask what, is the cost of lies.”

HOUSE OF COMMONS MEETING – CHILDREN.

Entitled: Impact of Social Media and Screen-Use on Young People’s Health – Fourteenth Report of Session 2017-19. A copy of this document has been sent to all listed as current members.

<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmsctech/822/822.pdf> House Commons Science and Technology Committee Report

House of Commons Science and Technology Committee (above) were printed this January 2019. A government report outlining, in-depth and extremely worrying issues, concerning *Children and Screen Time*. **We urge you to study this and then ask yourself – ‘Why was this disturbing and serious debate necessary’?** Please also note the ‘inference and transference of responsibility’ to parents and teachers? We are asking – Where are the Government and Decision Makers responsibilities and indeed - Liabilities?

A government paper with evidence, highlighting every possible negative effect on our children and yet they still propose to add to their misery with encouraging them to buy new mobile phones to access 5G with advertisements of 'Speed'. We believe this word is apt given that our children are addicted to this technology and this was – by design and known. *Who, apart from us, is attempting to protect our children and future generations?*

<https://vimeo.com/54189727>

Resonance: Beings of Frequency.

Closure

We all have to believe that common sense will prevail and that amazing things will happen. Pioneers for safe technology and Innovators will come forward as they realise, as Einstein said

'We can't solve problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them'

A call for ICNIRP and the associated agencies to be dissolved would ensure a 'different way of thinking'.

We thank you for your kind attention and patience and submit this to you on behalf of all of the citizens in the United Kingdom that have yet to know - Real 5G