



Chairman Mr. Brian Stein CBE,
EM Radiation Research Trust,
Chetwode House, Leicester
Road, Melton Mowbray,
Leicestershire LE13 1GA

25th May 2024

Sent via Email from Eileen O'Connor, Director EM Radiation Research Trust:
eileen@radiationresearch.org

To: Jayne Vincent Consultation and Engagement Lead, Sefton Council, Cllr Liz Dowd, Cllr Les Byrom, Cllr Karen Cavanagh, Simon Shaw, Judy Hardman, Bill Esterson MP, Peter Dowd MP, Cllr Carol Richards

Cc. Brian Stein CBE Chairman EM Radiation Research Trust
Local resident Maria Walsh

Dear Jayne, Councillors, Bill Esterson MP and Peter Dowd MP,

We are very concerned hearing about the rollout of 5G and the IoT. I would therefore like to request the opportunity to present at your public engagement meeting on 3rd June at 10.30 am at Magdalen

House. <https://modgov.sefton.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=498&MId=11491>

I have included some of the committee members who are due to attend Sefton Council meeting on 3rd June as listed on your page. I do not have email addresses for all attendees and would be grateful if you could please share the enclosed information with all attendees.

I am the co-founder and Charity Director for the EM Radiation Research Trust from 2003 to date: www.radiationresearch.org, Co-founder and Board member for the International EMF Alliance 2009 to date: www.iemfa.org. I was previously a member of the European Commission Stakeholder Dialogue Group on EMF from 2011 – 2014 and a member of the UK Health Protection Agency Radiation Protection Division EMF Discussion Group from 2006-2008 Chaired by the previous health Protection Agency Chairman Sir William Stewart. I was a co-founder for (SCRAM) Seriously Concerned Residents against masts 2002 – 2005.

I invite you to consider the important information and opening points raised by David Gee author of three “early warnings” about EMF/RF and possible head tumour risks (in 2007 , 2009 and 2011), published by the European Environment Agency (EEA). He served as Senior Adviser, Science, Policy, and Emerging Issues. The enclosed report was sent to Bexhill on Sea Council and opens with the following important **points for all councillors to be aware of are:**

1. Local authorities’ planning remit for telecoms masts can include health considerations.
2. Planning context: the proposed mast is close to a conservation area and a primary school.
3. There are health damage liability issues for telecoms companies and local authorities.
4. Expect some reductions in property values.
5. The standard setting body ICNIRP guidance is out of date and unreliable on EMF health risks and “safe” exposure limits.
6. Increased EMF exposures to the public are expected from 5G masts.
7. Increased evidence of health effects from living near masts.
8. Children are particularly vulnerable to EMF radiations.
9. Increasing evidence of cancer and reproductive effects from 2-4 G exposures; no health studies on 5G – we are “flying blind”.
10. The significant privacy and security risks from 5G.
11. Increased evidence of harmful effects on wildlife; and
12. The increased energy consumption from 5G and telecommunications: each 5G mast requires approximately 3 times more power than a 4G mast. Many more 5G masts will be required for the 5G rollout. The evidence in this paper will throw some light on the state of the science now.’ Download report here: <https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Sea-Rd-Bexhill-Mast-Objections-David-Gee-updated-Nov-9th-and-Nov-21-2022.pdf>

The Government’s primary responsibility is the protection of its citizens from harm.

The microwave emissions from a mass rollout of 5G and Wi-Fi presents a health hazard to the population according to many doctors and scientists. Microwave radio frequencies as

emitted by this technology are recognised as a class 2B carcinogen by the WHO:

https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208_E.pdf

The evidence of increased cancer risks has since been strengthened by further human studies, as well as toxicology studies in animals, which demonstrated clear evidence of tumours. The \$30 million US National Toxicology Program (NTP) RF studies and the Italian Ramazzini Institute ten-year research project both found clear evidence of malignant tumours. Two different institutes with laboratories in different countries, totally independent of each other and both producing parallel consistent findings, reinforces the validity of these ground-breaking animal studies. An external peer review panel of 11 scientists complimented the methodology of the NTP study and concluded that the results showed clear evidence of carcinogenic activity.

Clear evidence of cancer from mobile radiation from National Toxicology Program:

<https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/whatwestudy/topics/cellphones/index.html>

Clear evidence of cancer from mobile radiation from the Ramazzini cancer research institute:

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29530389>

The BioInitiative Working Group reviewed thousands of scientific papers that show biological harm from such radiation emissions. This group of experts calls for the precautionary approach and urgent action due to chronic EMF-related diseases that are a potential risk for everyone. <https://bioinitiative.org/conclusions/>

There has been an increase in radiofrequency radiation (RFR) of up to (quintillion) times higher than natural, background levels of RFR in the last four decades. This will continue to increase with 5G.

Published: Bandara P, Carpenter D (2018). 'Planetary electromagnetic pollution: it is time to assess its impact'. The Lancet Planetary Health; Vol 2, Issue 12.

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/article/PIIS2542-5196\(18\)30221-3/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanplh/article/PIIS2542-5196(18)30221-3/fulltext)

The following article highlights **ten** new studies details health risks of 5G. <https://expose-news.com/2024/04/14/ten-new-studies-detail-health-risks-of-5g-analysis-by-dr-joseph-mercola/>

The article also refers to the Minister for Communications, Hon Paul Fletcher MP asked the Committee to complete an inquiry into the deployment and application of 5G in Australia In September 2019. In response, Paul Barratt on behalf of ElectricSense, submitted a document, stating, in part: "**5G is dangerous and will harm every living being.** Thousands of studies link low-level wireless radio frequency radiation exposures to a long list of adverse biological effects, including:

- **DNA single and double strand breaks**
- **Oxidative damage**
- **Disruption of cell metabolism**
- **Increased blood brain barrier permeability**
- **melatonin reduction**
- **Disruption to brain glucose metabolism**
- **Generation of stress proteins**

Barratt goes on to list reasons to be concerned about 5G radiation, including:

- **Denser electrosmog**
- **Skin diseases and pain, as “analyses of penetration depth show that more than 90% of the transmitted power is absorbed in the epidermis and dermis layer”.**
- **Eye damage**
- **Effects on the heart, including impacts on heart rate variability and arrhythmias.**
- **Reduced immune function.**
- **Depressed cell growth rates and alterations in cell properties and cell activity**
- **Increased risk of antibiotic-resistant pathogens**
- **Necrosis in plants, and the possibility that plant foods may become unsuitable for human consumption.**
- **Atmospheric effects and fossil fuel depletion**
- **Eco system disruptions**

Harm to Children

The ICNIRP standards are woefully inadequate in offering protection in the real world or real-life settings. The EM Radiation Research Trust is concerned for the health of children. Report by Professor Tom Butler – On Clear Evidence of the Risks to Children from Non-Ionizing Radio Frequency Radiation: The Case of Digital Technologies in the Home, Classroom and Society. <https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/On-the-Clear-Evidence-of-the-Risks-to-Children-from-Smartphone-and-WiFi-Radio-Frequency-Radiation-Final-20201.pdf>

I encourage you to review **The International Declaration on the Human Rights of Children in the Digital Age** here: <https://www.thechildrensdeclaration.org/>

This important **Declaration** covers screen time addiction, **Involuntary exposure to non-ionizing radiation (NIR)** and commercial exploitation. I presented for this group in December 2023

https://www.thechildrensdeclaration.org/_files/ugd/2cea04_4987eddb77974a4f8a87367f4d6590f4.pdf

My December 2023 presentation includes advice from previous Health Protection Agency Chairman Sir William Stewart. He was the Chief Scientific Adviser to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who was called upon in 2000 by Tony Blair’s government to examine mobile phones, masts, and their impact on our health. The clear advice from Sir William Stewart to the government on mobile phone masts was that he couldn’t rule out biological effects such as cognitive function, cancer inductions or molecular biology changes within the cells and said the beam of greatest intensity should not fall on any part of the school grounds, unless the school and parents agreed.

A percentage of the population is sensitive to and affected by microwave emissions as used in modern life and need to avoid mobile phones, wireless routers, bluetooth, emitting masts

and smart devices. <https://mdsafetech.org/problems/electro-sensitivity/electrosensitivity-history/>

I would like to draw your attention to a 15-year-old electrosensitive schoolgirl Jenny Fry who committed suicide in 2015. Jenny was suffering with tiredness, headaches and bladder problems when exposed to Wi-Fi at school. Her mother accused the school of failing to protect her. [Teen Allergic to Wi-Fi Commits Suicide, Parents Say \(yahoo.com\)](https://www.yahoo.com/health/teen-allergic-wi-fi-commits-suicide-parents-say-123456789.html)

Please note details regarding a **successful Electrosensitivity court claim for a child in the UK In [2022]**. The Upper Tribunal ruled that a council must secure special educational provision for a child who has electromagnetic hypersensitivity and is particularly sensitive to Wi-Fi signals. Upper Tribunal Judge Jacobs found that the child should be considered disabled by her condition under the Equality Act 2010 and that she required an Education, Health, and Care Plan (EHCP). Source: <https://phiremedical.org>

More facts/information regarding concerns for children. Here is a selection of 151 published research references to papers in connection with children and adolescent's exposures to electromagnetic fields compiled by Powerwatch UK.
<https://www.powerwatch.org.uk/library/downloads/children-phones-3-research-2019-03.pdf>

Non-consensual Assault

RF/EMF emissions should not impact or penetrate the body of persons within range, (e.g. ICNIRP standards inform that 6GHz frequency penetrates tissue to a depth of 8.1 mm [ref.])
Successful 'cease and desist' notices have been issued against authorities and emitters on grounds of assault against the person. Barrister Ray Broomhall (Australia) explains: 'What this has come to is humanity is being assaulted. These wireless frequencies are an assault on the human body. **This is where the battle lines are.** The Crimes Act in NZ 1961 – Under Section 2 – gives and interpretation – An assault means the act of intentionally applying or attempting to apply force to the person of another – directly or indirectly or threatening by any act or gesture to apply such force to the person of another. Electromagnetic radiation is a force and if you do not consent to it – then whoever is touching you or penetrating you – must stop. Otherwise, it is an offence under the Crimes Act 1961.' <https://www.ourplanet.org/greenplanetfm/ray-broomhall-global-deployment-of-100000-5g-satellites-continues-what-are-the-health-effects>

Microwave emissions constitute a force that acts upon and penetrates a person's body from which there is no escape. For the electrosensitive this nonconsensual force acting upon and in their persons is akin to physical, mental, and emotional torture. Assault against the person is a criminal offence. Government should not be party.

→ **Guidance**

- a. Government should protect all citizens equally and not discriminate against certain groups in terms of health and well-being.
- b. Government should uphold the right of citizens to enjoy their property free from harm or the threat of harm from irradiation being imposed upon them in their home.

c. Government should uphold the rights of all citizens to be free from the physical force and penetration of non-consensual irradiation and should not endorse policy that gives ground to assault against the person.

Irrelevant Safety standards

It seems highly unwise for the Government to rely on ICNIRP's guidelines which have little -- if any--relevance in the real world. The guidelines issued by this invitation-only, unelected private member's group are irrelevant when thinking about this form of irradiation for the following reasons:

Thermal heating only is irrelevant.

- i. ICNIRP guidelines relate to thermal heating, shocks, burns and heatstroke, and do not take into account typical harmful health effects including electrosensitivity, cancer, immune suppression, neurodegenerative diseases including Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and ALS, behavioral problems, learning disabilities, birth defects and infertility and many other health issues.
- ii. **6 Minute Exposure is irrelevant.**
- iii. ICNIRP testing for thermal heating to a patch of skin is averaged at just 6 minutes exposure.
- iv. The public will be exposed to this form of radiation 24/7 for a lifetime.
- v. **Health Hazard for medical devices Radiofrequency EMF's can fatally disrupt/disabled medical devices, including pacemakers** "some exposure scenarios are defined as outside the scope of these guidelines". 'EMFs may also interfere with electrical equipment more generally (i.e., not only implantable medical equipment), which can affect health indirectly by causing equipment to malfunction. This is referred to as electromagnetic compatibility, and is outside the scope of these guidelines (for further information, see IEC 2014' <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPrfgdl2020.pdf>

ICNIRP standards since invalidated. The relevance of ICNIRP's guidelines based on studies from the 1980's involving 40–60-minute exposures in 5 monkeys and 8 rats are no longer valid in the 21st century. <https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-022-00900-9>

ICNIRP conflicts of interest. The Turin Court of Appeal judgement confirms acoustic neuroma is linked to the use of mobile phones. The Judgement states: "conflicts of interest were for both ICNIRP and or SCENIHR members, who received, whether directly or indirectly financing from industry." https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Turin-Verdict-ICNIRP_Judgment-SUMMARY-of-the-Turin-Court-of-Appeal-9042019_EN-min.pdf

Trust in Government **agencies** is at an all-time low. The term '**captured agencies**' is often used. Advisory bodies such as Public Health England, ICNIRP and the now disbanded group AGNIR - Advisory Group on Non-ionising Radiation (AGNIR) provide inaccurate misleading advice offering guidelines that are invalid according to many doctors and scientists. Please

read the important published paper by neuroscientist Dr Sarah Starkey:

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27902455>

The government's use of ICNIRP is the primary issue. Important message from Paolo Vecchia, ICNIRP Chair from 2004 until 2012. Presented at the EM Radiation Research Trust 2008 conference. He said: **“the ICNIRP guidelines are neither mandatory prescriptions for safety, the “last word” on the issue nor are they defensive walls for Industry or others.”** **The decision to adopt the ICNIRP guidelines as “sufficient to protect public health” is therefore political.** Slide No (16): https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/021145_vecchia.pdf

→ **Guidance**

- a. Government need to recognise ICNIRPs 6 minutes as irrelevant for the real world.
- b. Government need to recognise ICNIRPS ‘thermal only’ basis as irrelevant for real world effects.
- c. Government should protect the vulnerable, including children and users of medical devices from harmful radiation emitted from RF/EMF.

→ **Action**

- a. Government should abandon ICNIRP’s guidance as no longer relevant in setting standards for public health and safety.
- b. Government should seek advice from independent doctors and scientists who are experts in the field of non-thermal impacts associated with this form of radiation.

We are often told by industry that radio waves have insufficient energy to damage DNA. Here is an important commentary by Professor Denis L Henshaw, Fellow Collegium Ramazzini Emeritus Professor of Human Radiation Effects Atmospheric Chemistry Group School of Chemistry University of Bristol. He said, In summary **“The idea that since cell phone radio waves do not have the quantum energy to damage DNA and therefore cannot cause ill health is a fallacy.** It is flawed at a number of levels, from the very physics upon which it is supposedly based, to chemistry and biology. Most of all, the idea is not born out by the tens of thousands of peer-reviewed studies reporting biological effects from exposure to electric, magnetic, and electromagnetic fields and electromagnetic radiation, including those associated with radio wave frequencies used by cell phones.” <https://ehtrust.org/an-enduring-fallacy-cell-phone-radio-waves-have-insufficient-energy-to-damage-dna-by-denis-l-henshaw/>

Phone mast fire hazards - On Monday May 20, 2024, a Panel of USA legal experts discussed risks associated with **cell towers and wildfires**. They claim ‘new scientific findings are uncovering unique wildfire risks associated with the proliferation of wireless small cell and macro towers, smart meters and other IoT devices. At the same time, empowered local communities are innovating to address these grave risks. This is a foreseeable and avoidable catastrophe. It is also a matter of profound social and environmental justice and basic human rights.’ <https://www.radiationresearch.org/news/may-20-evolutionary-conversation-wildfire-risks-in-an-age-of-climate-turbulence-and-cell-tower-densification/>

The introduction of 5G technology in Glastonbury has been opposed by town councillors until further information has been obtained on the health effects on residents.

‘For months, members of the community have raised concerns with the council about the safety of the technology, claiming that it is hazardous to human health and the environment due to the higher radiofrequency. A motion proposed by councillor Mike Smyth read: “This council has a social responsibility to protect the public and environment from exposure to harm, albeit unpredictable in the current state of scientific knowledge, and therefore opposes the roll-out of 5G in the Parish of Glastonbury – based on the precautionary principle – until further information is revealed from a newly convened 5G advisory committee.” <https://www.somersetlive.co.uk/news/local-news/glastonbury-council-opposes-5g-roll-2998413>

I call on Sefton Council to launch a full investigation similar to **Glastonbury Town Council** who resolved unanimously to adopt the recommendations of their ‘5G Advisory Committee’ which was set up in 2019 to explore the safety of 5G technology. The recommendations include writing to MPs asking them to establish an inquiry into the safety of 5G. Calling for the UK Government and Public Health England to undertake an independent scientific study into the non-thermal effects of 5G and electromagnetic hypersensitivity and lobbying the ICNIRP to take into account the non-thermal effects of radiofrequency EMFs in their guidelines on limiting exposure to electromagnetic fields. <https://glastonbury.gov.uk/5g-report/>

How could personal liability arise for a councillor?

Here is an important document prepared by solicitor Jessica Learmond Criqui about the harmful effects of electromagnetic radiation (“EMR”) emitted from, among other things, mobile masts, antennae, small cells and the like. There are essentially two ways in which councillors’ personal liability could arise:

- (a) You sit on committees and one of them has been: (i) planning matters permitting masts and antennae to be approved; or (ii) making decisions about health, safety, and wellbeing matters.
- (b) misfeasance or misconduct in public office which is a criminal offence.

Before commenting briefly on these, it may be helpful to note that whereas normally councillors would be indemnified by the local authority in relation to their acts, the following are relevant circumstances where an indemnity cannot be provided to a member:

- Criminal acts (of which misfeasance in public office is one)
- Recklessness. A. Sitting on committees.

1. All councillors sit on committees, and you may have been involved with planning or health committees in your time as a councillor. Potential liabilities from knowledge of harm to health which are ignored include: (
2. a) Prosecution for gross negligence manslaughter.

(b) Corporate manslaughter.

2. These are explained in brief below

[Personal liability for a councillor \(1](#)

You may wish to seek an alternative opinion from your legal experts. However, any final legal decision would be taken in a court of law by a judge or jury.

Does Sefton Council hold any information regarding public liability insurance for claims directly or indirectly arising out of, resulting from, electromagnetic fields/ wireless RF radiation, microwave radiation?

NOTICE OF FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 REQUEST

Under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, you are requested to please provide the following:

1. Copies of all commercial Sefton Council public liability insurance policy certificates providing details of cover, policy numbers, providers and underwriters held by Sefton Council. In particular, anything regarding 'pollution liability', 'policy enhancement' and 'schedules of exclusions' documents in relation to the commercial public liability insurance policy held by Sefton Council.
2. Copies of the 'certificate of indemnity' from Sefton Council that may include the public insurance provider and underwriters, confirming that any injuries, damages, or adverse health effects directly or indirectly arising out of, resulting from, or contributed to by electromagnetic fields, electromagnetic radiation, electromagnetism, radio waves or noise, wireless RF radiation, microwave radiation, non-ionising radiation emitting devices and equipment.

This Notice of Liability and the enclosed information are presented with honourable and peaceful intentions and are expressly for your benefit to provide you with due process, due diligence, and an opportunity to remedy this most serious matter. This lawful notice of liability is designed to be used as evidence in court if needed and intends to enlighten you and protect you from attracting civil and criminal liability in relation to your action(s).

I call on Sefton Council to consider and include information/research provided in this letter which also includes court decisions and fire risks in connection with concerns for this technology. You are our last line of defense and I therefore call on you as our representatives

to safeguard the health and future of our children, bird, bees, plants, all wildlife, and the environment as a whole and for future generations.

Sincerely and without ill will, vexation, or frivolity,

Eileen O'Connor
Director
EM Radiation Research Trust

The EM Radiation Research Trust is an educational organisation funded by donations. An independent Charity Registered No. 1106304 © The EM Radiation Research Trust 2003-2004
Website: www.radiationresearch.org