

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>Confidential? – N</p> <p>I agree with Sally Beare’s statement: ‘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/</p> <p>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/</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://www.ofcom.org.uk/.../cat.../limiting-exposure-to-emf</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,</p>

	<p>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>In addition, my personal observation is that these masts represent an aesthetic and environmental blight on the landscape. Is it responsible, is it ethical, to continue to build tall towers that resemble surveillance stations, that remind us of the telecoms’ ever-increasing presence in our lives? Are we implementing technology for technology’s sake, for the benefit of corporations, in the never-ending quest for profit and data on populations? I am no Luddite, I embrace a good invention if it adds to the value of our lives. However, I cannot see the benefit of 5G to people, when scores of scientists present analysis that clearly shows doubt as to its safety. Corporations tend to chase profit over safety, as we have seen with the tobacco, alcohol and oil industries: create a need, make it appealing through clever advertising, and the company reaps a profit. However, the public should not be considered fair game for profit, when their health and livelihoods are at stake. We must exercise true responsibility, towards community wellbeing, and also that of the wider environment, including animals and all biological life. Your tagline is ‘Making communications work for everyone’ – I expect you to fulfil your task.</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>Confidential? – Y / N</p>
<p>Question 3: Please provide feedback on the trial version of our EMF calculator, giving reasons for your response.</p>	<p>Confidential? – Y / N</p>