

January 2020

Dear Chief Executive/Director/Head of Department/Councillor/Committee Member

Matt Warman MP, Under Secretary of State for Digital and Broadband, recently issued the enclosed letter to all Local Authority Chief Executives in the UK. Whilst his letter promotes the economic potential of 5G, it fails to fully inform you regarding the growing debate about the health impacts of this technology.

We are writing to you as concerned residents of West Sussex who believe you should know why an increasing number of expert scientists, medical professionals, public servants and the general public do not consider the current guidelines for EMF exposure produced by ICNIRP and adopted by PHE to effectively safeguard human and animal health.

ICNIRP (International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection) is a German NGO consisting of 13 members who are self-selecting. Please visit www.icnirp.org for more details about this organisation. As confirmed by the current Chairman of ICNIRP Eric van Rongen in an interview titled 'ICNIRP Chair doesn't know why guidelines are accepted' (see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=92rHT48F5u4>), members review only limited studies as ICNIRP is simply not large enough to do a full review of all the studies. There are a great many peer-reviewed published studies that do not form part of ICNIRP's review when determining EMF exposure guidelines. Does this concern you?

In our research we have come across many studies showing clear evidence of harm below the ICNIRP safety thresholds. Importantly, there is much evidence of adverse biological effects. The ICNIRP guidelines are based on only thermal effects since they do not recognise any mechanism to enable biological effects. Among the adverse effects noted are: brain tumours, gliomas and other cancers, headaches, insomnia, cognitive impairment, neurological and neuro-developmental disorders, ovum abnormalities, impaired sperm motility, quality and morphology, heritable single- and double-strand DNA damage, oxidative tissue damage, blood cell damage, cardiac stress, skin diseases, eye lens opacity, damage to plants and animals especially insects and pollinators. We would be happy to provide full references to the studies showing these effects. Please email us to request these so you can do your own research.

Mr Warman's letter links to www.emf-portal.org/en where he says we will find "well over 3,000 studies informing these [over 100 expert reports on EMF] and the existing scientific exposure guidelines". The EMF Portal is the website of RWTH Aachen University which (at time of writing) has an inventory of 30,439 publications and 6,634 summaries of individual scientific studies on the effects of electromagnetic fields. A number of studies on this website evidence that the safety issues surrounding the 5G roll out are far from conclusive, as was implied by Mr Warman's references. We consulted expert Dr Sarah Starkey, MSc (Neuropharmacology), PhD (Neuroscience), who highlighted the following examples of studies showing evidence of harmful effects:

- 5G wireless telecommunications expansion: Public health and environmental implications <https://www.emf-portal.org/en/article/34950>
- The Radiation Safety of 5G Wi-Fi: Reassuring or Russian Roulette? <https://www.emf-portal.org/en/article/37087>
- Effects of Millimeter Waves Radiation on Cell Membrane <https://www.emf-portal.org/en/article/22363>
- Dual effects of microwaves on single Ca(2+)-activated K+ channels in cultured kidney cells Vero <https://www.emf-portal.org/en/article/291>
- Modulation of neuronal activity and plasma membrane properties with low-power millimeter waves in organotypic cortical slices <https://www.emf-portal.org/en/article/18837>
- The interaction between electromagnetic fields at megahertz, gigahertz and terahertz frequencies with cells, tissues and organisms: risks and potential <https://www.emf-portal.org/en/article/34128>
- Millimeter waves or extremely high frequency electromagnetic fields in the environment: what are their effects on bacteria? <https://www.emf-portal.org/en/article/29297>

The "over 100 expert reports" referenced in Mr Warman's letter are sourced from the GSMA website. The GSMA represents the interests of mobile operators worldwide – see www.gsma.com/aboutus You may question whether this organisation can produce independent reports with the intention of safeguarding public health and without being biased by economic gain. Indeed, you may also have questioned why an Under Secretary from DCMS is advising councils regarding a major public health issue. You will be aware that current Health Secretary Matt Hancock was formerly DCMS Secretary, so perhaps there is a link.

In 2012 the Health Protection Agency (now part of PHE) published a response to the 2012 AGNIR (Advisory Group on Non-Ionising Radiation) Report which stated “HPA’s view is that the continuing possibility of: (a) biological effects, although not apparently harmful, occurring at exposure levels within the ICNIRP guidelines, and (b) the limited information regarding cancer effects in the long term, together **support continuation of the UK’s long-standing precautionary approach to mobile phones**. Excessive use of mobile phones by children should be discouraged, while adults should make their own choices as to whether they wish to reduce their exposures, but be **enabled to do this from an informed position**” (our highlights).

We are not aware of any attempt by HPA or PHE to actively inform the public of the risks of using mobile phones to enable such an ‘informed position’. The French health and safety agency ANSES issued an advisory warning to the public on 21 October 2019 not to carry mobile phones in shirt or trouser pockets. This was followed by a statement from the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health which included advice on safer use of mobile phones. Do you think PHE should be issuing similar public health warnings to protect the public, and especially children, from harm?

Dr Sarah Starkey gives a succinct and expert review of the HPA response to the 2012 AGNIR report highlighting the inadequacy and inaccuracy of its conclusions, upon which public health now depends. Her 28 minute presentation also looks at the clear conflict of interest found within ICNIRP, AGNIR, WHO, PHE and other key organisations involved in determining the public safety guidelines for EMF exposure. We recommend you watch Dr Starkey’s presentation here <http://phiremedical.org/dr-sarah-starkey-official-advice-radiofrequency-radiation-risk-assessment-adverse-effects-2018/> and read her published paper covering the AGNIR report here <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27902455> Let us know your comments on Dr Starkey’s review.

Mr Warman’s letter quotes the PHE statement published on 3 October 2019 which says “It is possible that there may be a small increase in overall exposure to radio waves when 5G is added to an existing network or in a new area. However, the overall exposure is expected to remain low relative to guidelines and, as such, there **should** be no consequences for public health” (our highlight). We are not assured by the word ‘should’ as this clearly shows the technology is not fully safety tested and that the public will be exposed on an experimental basis. We do not consent to being experimented upon and are sure the public, were they to be fully informed of the known health risks, would also not consent to such experimentation. Experimenting on the public in this way contravenes the Nuremberg Code which states that informed consent must be given before humans are experimented upon. What is your view on this?

We are aware that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states “Local planning authorities...**should not**...set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure” (our highlight). If the material consideration of public health is being ignored in favour of the dictates of the NPPF where can the public go with their well-founded concern about the safety of ever increasing wireless radiation in our environment?

You will also note the closing date for the consultation regarding proposed reforms to permitted development rights to support the deployment of 5G that Mr Warman references had passed by the time you received his letter. Were you aware of this consultation prior to receiving his letter and did you submit a response?

We would like to know how the planned DCMS workshops for council officials will help you answer the public’s questions relating to the new ICNIRP guidelines published in 2018, in particular the simultaneous exposure to multiple frequency fields which will be the reality of 5G. The current ICNIRP guidelines look at short term exposure from a single source and do not consider the ‘additive’ effects of different frequencies; these are considered in the new guidelines. Would you let us know how this is addressed in the workshops?

The DCMS ‘Future Telecoms Infrastructure Review’ talks about a “greater deployment of small cells” along with the upgrading of existing phone masts. The 5G roll out will mean **no-one** can escape being irradiated.

Thank you for taking time to read our letter. We welcome your feedback and urge you to do your own research.

With our kind regards

Concerned residents of West Sussex
5Gaction-westsussex@protonmail.com