

ICNIRP and 5G

The British Government: 5G: Health Hazards - response to written question - 176372 - Margot James MP: *'The Government expects that existing UK technical standards will be adhered to throughout the development and deployment of 5G products and networks. These standards draw on the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection, which takes into account the well-researched effects of radio waves.'*

Matt Warman MP: *"Provided the ICNIRP guidelines are followed, there is no convincing evidence that 5G is dangerous".*

ICNIRP's 2020 safety guidelines:

ICNIRP: *'5G exposures will not cause any harm providing that they adhere to the ICNIRP (2020) guidelines.'*

Ronald L. Melnick Ph.D: *'The 'P' in ICNIRP stands for Protection. One must wonder who this commission is trying to protect – evidently, it is not public health.'*

ICNIRP's first major failure to protect public health: Thermal/non-thermal effects.

ICNIRP guidelines relate to short-term (averaged exposures over 6 minutes/30 minutes), thermal (tissue heating) effects. They dismiss long-term, cumulative, non-thermal effects. Dr Oleg A. Grigoriev, Assoc. Prof., Head of the Scientific Department of Non-Ionizing Radiation, Federal Medical Biophysical Center of Federal Medical Biological Agency of Russia: *'It has just come to our attention that the WHO RF Working group consists mainly from present and past ICNIRP members. ... In particular, the private self-elected organization ICNIRP does not recognize the non-thermal RF effects, which represent the main concern of widespread exposure to mobile communication, and is upholding guidelines from 1996, which are based on RF thermal effects only.'*

ICNIRP's second major failure to protect public health: Biological/health effects.

ICNIRP statement, 2020: *'It is important to note that ICNIRP bases its guidelines on substantiated adverse health effects. This makes the difference between a biological and an adverse health effect an important distinction, where only adverse health effects require restrictions for the protection of humans.'*

Although related health effects are becoming evident, the current stage in the etiological/epidemiological evolution of wireless radiation effects does not yet involve clear identification or classification of *substantiated adverse health effects*. **The present stage largely involves the insidious creep of nascency and latency and a totally unacceptable level of risk to public health from long-term exposure to non-thermal radiation that's been clearly shown, in thousands of research studies, to cause harmful biological effects. These effects include single and double strand DNA breaks, induction of reactive oxygen species, formation of the cytotoxin peroxynitrite, mitochondrial/cell membrane damage, chromosome aberrations, which are identified precursors of, but have not yet developed into, substantiated adverse health effects.**

So, as the non-thermal, nascent, latent enemies approach insidiously from the left, the thirteen ICNIRP members are shouting "eyes to the right!"