



www.radiationresearch.org

Letter sent via Email to Sir Christopher John Bryant MP Minister of State for Data Protection and Telecoms Sent: 11 February 2025 13:48

Sent via email from Eileen O'Connor Director, EM Radiation Research Trust

For the attention of Sir Christopher John Bryant MP Minister of State for Data Protection and Telecoms

Dear Sir Christopher John Bryant MP

The EM Radiation Research Trust question the use of £500 million taxpayer funds for phone masts throughout the UK.

The EM Radiation Research Trust are concerned to hear that the taxpayer is now funding a government scheme to install phone masts to boost signals throughout the UK including 'non-spots', the countryside, Areas of Outstanding National Beauty and National Parks leaving no place left to escape for those who do not wish to be exposed to non-ionizing radiation and for those who suffer with electrosensitivity.

The UK Government is investing around [500 Million](#) into the 'Shared Rural Network', including £184 million to upgrade Extended Area Service (EAS) masts to provide coverage for all four mobile operators. The remaining funding will go towards eliminating 'non spots', places with no coverage. On 30th January, a taxpayer-funded mast was turned on as part of the Extended Area Service government scheme.

Has the UK Government received informed public consent to use taxpayer funds to expose men, woman, children, wildlife, and the environment to artificial Electromagnetic Radiation? Can you please provide details for the Public Consultations along with environmental impact reports preceding the roll-out of this £500 million government scheme?

The EM Radiation Research Trust call on you and your colleagues to protect the Human Rights of the public enshrined in [UN Law](#) and especially the rights of our children. We call on you to read the [International Declaration on the Human Rights of Children in the Digital Age](#). This Declaration calls for protection of children from involuntary exposure to non-ionizing radiation.

We would also like to draw your attention to a new peer-reviewed [scientific report](#) published on 30th January 2025 in [Heliyon](#) authored by Paul Heroux.

[A New Report Contradicts Telecom Industry Claim That Wireless Radiation Is Safe](#)

"A new peer-reviewed scientific report outlines a mechanism by which non-ionizing radiation can disrupt the biology of living systems, even at levels much lower than what's needed to heat tissues.

The telecom industry has consistently claimed that non-ionizing radiation is harmless to human health." 6 February 2025

We invited one of our scientific advisors Dr Shirin Joseph to provide her views on Paul Heroux's paper. She said "The conclusion of this paper is damning of the current agenda for the use of wireless technology and 5G masts over and above the protection of health. Heroux says that the use of wireless technology is supported by the military and convenience outweighs health and safety in the civilian realm which states **"If your environment is made to mimic a theatre of war, it will not be a theater of health."** The reason he says this is because currently governments are ignoring the massive amount of scientific data showing adverse effects of non-thermal electromagnetic radiation associated with masts. This is because the military are in support of the masts and civilians are fooled into accepting greater connectivity over safety, because government, media and telecoms do not advise them about the scientific evidence which predicts harm to the health of populations.

The harm caused to populations will be to their ability to fight chronic diseases like cancer, make them prone to Alzheimer's, Parkinsons, and diabetes, and cause infertility. Paul Heroux explains clearly the mechanisms whereby these diseases will be caused by radiation disrupting essential cellular processes like electron/proton transport, oxidative phosphorylation and affecting the levels of ATP.

Waiting ten or twenty years to correlate an increased incidence of all these chronic diseases will be like waiting for people to develop asbestosis from asbestos exposure. In both scenarios, you will be too late to save the health of the nation. All you will have are sicker people, who are good candidates for Big Pharma's latest drugs, all of which have side effects, and rarely cure the chronically ill.

Heroux provides alternative solutions to masts – optical fibre, wire twisting, earthing practices, and DC power, but these are clearly not adequate for military as drones need masts to enable them to work.

What do we value most – our health or the military industrial complex?"

Medical experts and practitioners from around the world have raised concerns regarding the health effects of escalating non-ionising radiation exposure. The [2020 Consensus Statement](#) of UK and International Medical and Scientific Experts and Practitioners on Health Effects of Non-Ionising Radiation calls for urgent action to protect the health of humans and wildlife.

It is common knowledge, and supported by peer reviewed evidence that phone mast radiation and the ICNIRP guidelines raise health & safety concerns, as follows:

- Can disrupt and disable medical devices such as pacemakers. (Outside scope of ICNIRP guidelines.) <https://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPrfgdl2020.pdf>
- Not suitable for those suffering with Electrosensitivity. <https://www.es-uk.info/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/ES-UK-information-leaflet.pdf>
- ICNIRP based on thermally heating effects only. <https://www.powerwatch.org.uk/science/intguidance.asp>
- Masts emit pulsed microwave radiation. [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(00\)03243-8/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(00)03243-8/fulltext)

- RF/microwave radiation is recognised as a class 2B carcinogen by the WHO.
https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208_E.pdf
- **Phone masts are fire hazards.** <https://www.radiationresearch.org/news/5g-phone-mast-fire-london-8th-november-2024/>
- ICNIRP conflicts of interest stated by a judgement at the Turin Court of Appeal.
https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Turin-Verdict-ICNIRP_Judgment-SUMMARY-of-the-Turin-Court-of-Appeal-9042019_EN-min.pdf
- Scientific evidence invalidates health assumptions underlying the FCC and ICNIRP exposure limit determinations for radiofrequency radiation: implications for 5G
<https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-022-00900-9>
- Paolo Vecchia, ICNIRP Chair from 2004 until 2012 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.” Slide no (16) https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/021145_vecchia.pdf

Research that has shown significant adverse health effects **including four-fold increases in cancer for people living near masts** that emit radiofrequency radiation. Here is a link to a list of peer-reviewed scientific studies of human health around mobile phone masts as of the end of 2020. Out of 33 studies, 32 report health problems. <https://www.radiationresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/scientific-studies-of-human-health-around-mobile-phone-base-stations.pdf?>

Five recently published case studies in Sweden are now demonstrating 5G rapidly caused harmful health effects. <https://www.radiationresearch.org/news/fifth-case-study-shows-5g-rapidly-caused-harmful-health-effects-published-18-november-2023-by-radiation-protection/?> The key paragraph to note from the Swedish Radiation Protection Foundation is:

“The ICNIRP limit protects only against immediate harmful effects due to heating. It does not protect against all adverse health effects that are not due to acute heating, i.e. when the radiation is so intense that it heats up the body within one hour. This means that the ICNIRP limit does not protect against the symptoms of microwave syndrome, such as headaches, difficulty sleeping, cardiac effects, abnormal fatigue, etc. It lacks protection against cancer, neurological diseases and other chronic diseases resulting from prolonged exposure at levels lower than those that do not cause immediate heating.”

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/>

Both the ICNIRP 1998 and 2020 advice on the risk of certain individuals with metallic implants is beyond the scope of the guidelines. The UKHSA has not addressed the fact that there is a potential impact on people with medical devices. **The court found that the authority’s failure to address potential impacts on medical implants was an error, as EMFs could interfere with the function of such implants** reported via CaseMine:
<https://www.casemine.com/judgement/uk/663a735283075d3d98341c7b?>

At least two legal rulings in the UK have set a legal precedent for those suffering with Electrohypersensitivity also known as microwave sickness. The Upper Tribunal Judge in August 2022 in the case against East Sussex County Council found that a child with EHS should be considered disabled under the Equality Act 2010 and ruled that the Council MUST secure special Education, Health and Care Plan. <https://phiremedical.org/news/>

Campaigners have already successfully claimed against Brighton and Hove Council with Hutchison 3G as the interested party in the landmark legal ruling in November 2021 at the Planning Court, Queen's Bench Division, High Court of Justice, London with The Honourable Mr Justice Holgate who overturned the local authority approval for the 5G mast to be sited close to a primary school. The ruling found that the Council "**failed to address the health impacts**" of the mast and was ordered to pay claimants costs of £13,340. <https://rinfo.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Consent-Order-02.11.21.pdf>

The case of Yasmin Skelt vs Secretary of State (John Prescott) and Three Bridges District Council and Orange (2003), made it clear that it is not acceptable for local planners to accept an ICNIRP certificate according to a High Court Judge who highlighted "**failure to adequately consider the weight to be given to the health concerns of the claimant in his decision letter.**" The First Secretary of State offered to concede the case and to pay reasonable costs.

[Hertzgaard and Dowie \(2018\)](#) state that " the wireless industry has obstructed a full and fair understanding of the current science, aided by government agencies that have **prioritized commercial interests over human health** and **news organizations that have failed to inform the public about what the scientific community really thinks**. In other words, **this public-health experiment has been conducted without the informed consent of its subjects, even as the industry keeps its thumb on the scale.**"

This **untested** technology has been implemented in this country without public consent and without full knowledge as to the dangers it is placing mankind under. This is **irresponsible** and needs to be addressed as a matter of **great urgency** by you and our government and all our regulatory health bodies.

We ask if you personally, Government officials and the UKHSA will stand by any reassurances of safety regarding exposure to 2G to 5G and the Internet of Things (including within the ICNIRP guidelines) so much so that you will accept liability if anyone with metal or medical implants, those with electrosensitivity or children with their inherent vulnerabilities suffer harm or adults who live close to masts and develop cancer or other serious illness associated with this technology – including, but not limited to, loss of life.

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely and without ill will, vexation, or frivolity,

Eileen O'Connor Director for the EM Radiation Research Trust

And

Brian Stein CBE Chairman for the EM Radiation Research Trust