

MHCLG, DCMS, Ofcom and 5G HEALTH RISKS

An analysis of the response by the MHCLG and DCMS to their 2019 5G consultation.

The health of UK people will be harmed by enforcing a 5G rollout against the evidence of known dangers of RFR from 2G, 3G, 4G, Wifi and smart meters.

MHCLG and DCMS wrong on (1) public health and (2) protected characteristics

The response of the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) and the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS) to their 5G consultation 'Proposed reforms to permitted development rights to support the deployment of 5G and extend mobile coverage' was published on July 22 2020. There was a total of 1,896 responses - 1,096 personal, 548 'campaign' on the impact on National Parks, and 252 other responses. Up to 85% of personal responses, nearly half the total number of responses, *"stated their opposition ... due to their general opposition to the deployment of 5G, in particular on public health grounds"*.

The MHCLG and DCMS response is flawed on two grounds: (1) public health and (2) 'protected characteristics' as regards the 800,000 people already severely affected by RFR like 5G.

1. Established dangers for public health and the environment

The response evaded the established dangers for public health and the environment by attempting to pass responsibility to Public Health England (PHE): e.g.: 63. *'Setting aside the concerns relating to public health and wildlife populations, which are referred to above at paragraph 18.'* Paragraph 18 claimed that these concerns *'did not relate to the specific proposed planning changes that views were sought on'* while paragraph 19 stated that PHE *'takes the lead on public health matters'* for RF EMFs.

However, (a) PHE still follows ICNIRP's theory, invalidated since 1930, denying long-term thermal effects, against the established weight of mainstream scientific evidence, and (b) neither ICNIRP nor PHE has assessed the known environmental harm from RFR. Therefore PHE's advice (a) does not, and cannot, relate to the known public health harm from RFR and EMFs which is essentially long-term and non-thermal, and (b) PHE has no authority or appropriate expertise to advise on environmental harm. The European Environment Agency in 2013 warned of 'industry inertia' and government failure to take action to 'protect public health' from EMFs.

The MHCLG and DCMS are not freed of responsibility by trying to blame PHE, a pro-wireless government agency. PHE supports and has members in ICNIRP, another pro-wireless group and a private cartel which still believes in Schwan's unscientific and invalidated theory of 1953. Thus PHE upholds ICNIRP's RFR guidelines which mainstream experts classify as unscientific, unprotective, and which make ICNIRP guilty of 'scientific misconduct' (Hardell L et al, Oncol Lett., 2020).

2. Established dangers for people with 'protected characteristics' such as EHS

Question 6, *'Do you have any views the potential impact ... on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010?'* had 931 responses. Main themes were that *'amending permitted development rights could have negative health impacts on people with protected characteristics. ... children, the elderly, disabled people and pregnant women could be disproportionately affected by increased levels of radiation as a result of 5G deployment and could adversely affect their standard of living.'* The response by MHCLG and DCMS in paragraph 73 - *'Concerns raised in relation to public health grounds are referred to above at paragraph 18'* - fails to note that PHE, because it follows ICNIRP, does not, and cannot, comment on people with 'protected characteristics' who will be injured by more RFR.

The reason that PHE cannot comment on EMF ‘protected characteristics’ is that PHE, like ICNIRP, still holds the minority fringe theory, invalidated since 1930, that these established long-term and non-thermal effects do not exist. This is despite mainstream scientific evidence in thousands of peer-reviewed studies, numerous common NHS therapeutic procedures in daily use, and essential military applications underlying electronic warfare, all in frequent use. These all involve the same type of long-term and non-thermal effects which are also evidenced in the EMF ‘protected characteristics’ referred to in question 6. Therefore all these EMF ‘protected characteristics’ referred to in question 6 exist outside of PHE’s and ICNIRP’s guidelines and remits. This makes the conclusion of paragraph 75 extraordinary:

‘We are satisfied that there is evidence to demonstrate that the proposed reforms would have a direct positive impact on all persons, including those with protected characteristics and that any potentially negative impacts can be mitigated effectively.’

This claim is absurd on two counts:

- (a) The increase in 5G will have negative, not positive, impacts on people with protected characteristics such as EHS.
- (b) The potentially negative impacts [what are these?] such as RF radiation can only be mitigated by
- (i) elimination of the RF radiation or
 - (ii) very expensive shielding
- as the 800,000 people in the UK already severely affected by RF radiation like 5G know to their personal cost.

This document is an unscientific and damaging response by MHCLG and DCMS to their own consultation. They admit that up to 85% of personal respondents opposed 5G on health grounds, yet relegate their denial of this viewpoint to PHE and ICNIRP, two groups which have opposed mainstream science in this area since 1930 and adopt a fringe heating theory in order to keep their existing industry limits, denying all non-thermal harm. In the sorry saga of government and industry denial of mainstream scientific evidence, this consultation counts as one of the most blatant whitewashes in history.

(Anon.: “Government response to the consultation on proposed reforms to permitted development rights to support the deployment of 5G and extend mobile coverage A summary of the responses to the consultation and the Government’s response” Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, and Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport, July 22 2020)

DCMS’s Ofcom 60 GHz Liverpool Radiation Measurements:

- **118,800 % higher than International Long-term Safety Guidelines**

Measurements from a 60 GHz antenna on a lamp post in Liverpool, as if for a person on the top of a bus, show that 5G 60 GHz at 2.5m exceeds long-term non-thermal guidelines by 118,800 % (av).

DCMS Ofcom 60 GHz measurements, Liverpool (2020)							
Power Density ($\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$)							
$100,000 \mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2 = 0.1 \text{ W}/\text{m}^2$							
Distance	Back-ground Safe Level	DCMS Ofcom measurements		IGNIR (2018)		ICNIRP (2020)	
Metres		Average	Maximum	Long-term Non-thermal Limit	Average (percent)	Short-term Heating Limit	Average (percent)
1.5m	0.000001	118,800	125,800	100	118,800 %	40,000,000	0.29 %
5m		2,600	3,100		2,600 %		0.0065 %