

Full Council Statement (Karen Churchill)

We would like to see Bath and North East Somerset Council take an active role in applying the precautionary principle to all wireless technology, including when making planning decisions about masts.

The current Public Health England guidelines rely on ICNIRP (the International Commission for Non-ionising Radiation Protection) but their suitability for protecting the public's health is under serious scrutiny from many angles.

As of 6 July 2020, 393 scientists have lodged an appeal to the EU regarding 5G.

ICNIRP were ruled unreliable by a court of Turin, particularly their assessment of the US National Toxicology Program study, which found electromagnetic fields from non-ionising radiation caused two types of cancer.

Italy, Poland and Russia have set safety exposure levels 100 times lower than ICNIRP.

ICNIRP are a very small self-appointed group, mostly engineers, and do not have health risk analysis specialists on their review board. They have been shown in a report from EU members of parliament published this month to have conflicts of interest with financial links to industry.

Their guidelines state that people with metal implants of any kind, including pacemakers, fillings, teeth braces and dental implants are not protected (please see below). The government are not informing us about this in their blanket assurances; already there are accounts of people with metal plates in their bodies experiencing burns and blisters after small cells were erected near their homes.

Michael Mansfield QC is currently leading a legal case which addresses ICNIRP's exposure levels being way too high to protect health, he has looked at all the evidence and judged there is a case to answer. (<https://actionagainst5g.org/>)

With all the other pressures we are all under, it is tempting to think other current COVID issues are more important, locally what can we do anyway?, it's not up to us to make a judgement call on the science etc.

It is tempting to believe the BBC when they say it is safe, but they are heavily invested in 5G and they are receiving multiple solicitors' letters for their factual errors about the science.

It is even tempting to fall into believing we need 5G to process health data and for tracking apps to help tackle the pandemic and climate emergency BUT if the so-called solutions using 5G and wireless technologies have devastating short term and long term health effects, we must bring this into the balance when weighing up the options.

We need to learn from the smoking and asbestos history. The government didn't have it handled then and they don't have it handled now. The scale of 5G makes it imperative we act now.

The consequences of not doing so are immense; the parallels with smoking end when you think of 100,000 satellites overhead. We will not have the "ban smoking in pubs" option to manage the health risks down the road after installing wireless tech everywhere.

While we wait for the Michael Mansfield court case to address this worrying situation, we appeal to you in Bath and North East Somerset to activate the systems of oversight you can apply, including asking all wireless suppliers to risk assess against science showing harm from non-thermal effects using ISO compliance which they are committed to. Please make the fitting decision, declare and activate the precautionary principle as outlined in the petition.

Martin Luther King's words: "Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter."

a) Metal Implant reference

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,

Official Journal of the European Communities 30. 7. 1999 L 199/59

(1999/519/EC) COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION of 12 July 1999 on the limitation of exposure of the general public to electromagnetic fields (0 Hz to 300 GHz)

13 "Adherence to the recommended restrictions and reference levels should provide a high level of protection as regards the established health effects that may result from exposure to electromagnetic fields but such adherence may not necessarily avoid interference problems with, or effects on the functioning of, medical devices such as metallic prostheses, cardiac pacemakers and defibrillators, cochlear implants and other implants; interference problems with pacemakers may occur at levels below the recommended reference levels and should therefore be the object of appropriate precautions which, however, are not within the scope of this recommendation and are dealt with in the context of legislation on electromagnetic compatibility and medical devices".