

From: Gillian Jamieson
Subject: Your letter ref: ZA60757
Date: 15 September 2023 at 15:02
To: SUNAK, Rishi rishi.sunak.mp@parliament.uk

GJ

Dear Mr Sunak,

I very much appreciate your reply to my invitation to the radio-frequency radiation conference as well as your response to my situation in asking for a formal reply from ministers on my dilemma.

This [article](#) will give you an idea of the content that this conference covered and may I draw your attention in particular to the New Hampshire Commission section. A Professor of electronic engineering (Kent Chamberlain) who was on this commission in that capacity and who was in favour of a fast rollout of future technology, completely changed his mind when he heard the evidence on health effects presented by other experts and in particular when he heard the method by which the present guidelines were arrived at, by ICNIRP, as described [here](#). He spoke at the conference last week and I had the pleasure of meeting him 2 days ago in York.

I would very much like to speak to you in person, to have the chance to give a fuller picture of my situation, talk about the research on health effects and to answer any questions you might have. I do however appreciate that your time will be in short supply, so in the meantime, I would like to address a few issues which your letter raised in my mind. I shall quote certain passages and comment.

“We must be guided by independent science on radio waves”

1. The UK adopts ICNIRP guidelines. The Court of Appeal, Turin, found ICNIRP-influenced studies to be [invalid](#), because of conflicts of interest and found that a worker’s acoustic neuroma was caused by the use of the mobile phone.

2. A long [report by 2 MEPS](#) exposed the conflicts of interest in ICNIRP, in the WHO EMF Project and other international groups.

"Advice is clear that exposure to electromagnetic fields is not new"

The best quality studies are epidemiological and those are only possible after several decades. Therefore *because* exposure is not new, we now have the evidence. In 2019, an international expert team led by Canada’s most senior cancer epidemiologist Professor Tony Miller ([Miller et al.](#)) summarised that “human epidemiological evidence linking human breast and brain tumours, male reproductive outcomes and child neurodevelopmental conditions to RFR exposures” and found “compelling evidence of carcinogenesis, especially in the brain and acoustic nerve, as well as the breast, from strong RFR exposures to previous generations of mobile phone transmissions”.

"There is no credible evidence of an impact of 5G on public health"

That is true. *There is no evidence it is safe* because studies have not been done. The effect of the combination of new technologies combined with present and higher frequencies [has not been tested](#).

Professor Lennart Hardell has begun [single case studies](#), which suggest clear harm, but are not sufficient in number to create conclusive evidence.

The Government is keen to “blanket the country” with wireless coverage

1. The Government also stands by the results of the Stewart Report 2000 and states [here](#) ‘adults should be able to make their own choices about reducing their exposure should they so wish, but be able to do this from an informed position’. How will this be possible if the country is blanketed? Smart devices and Wifi are now everywhere where there are people. Will you inform people where coverage is lightest, if they wish to reduce exposure? Will you

make sure that non-smart transactions are always possible? Will you ensure that some areas will always have landlines and are smart meter and smart camera free? And so on.

2. If the country is blanketed, what happens to the rights of those disabled by electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS) in terms of section 6 of the Equality Act? A case has already been won in the UK, where a local authority has been mandated to provide RFR/EMF free education for a child with EHS.

"There are plans to make the UK a world leader in 5G"

Why not become a world leader in caring for the health of the nation? Do for Europe what the New Hampshire Commission has done for the US?

The 5G millimeter wave is blocked by obstacles such as the human body, but at the point of impact, it deposits increased energy. The skin, the most important organ of the body and the eyes will be affected. This will lead to other adverse health reactions and this needs to be the subject of intense research before 5G goes any further.

I recommend www.ehtrust.org for further research as well as the UK physicians site: phiremedical.org. I strongly recommend that you listen to the recent conference when the video becomes available [here](#).

However, it is important to me that I meet you at your constituency office and I hope this can be arranged over the summer.

Best Wishes,

Gillian Jamieson