

## Power and authority vs science

### **The implacable loop**

The extremely large body of science evidencing non-thermal radiation effects is suspended in an implacable loop that revolves around a closed bureaucratic system, which, despite considerable effort, independent scientists are finding impossible to penetrate.

**Thermal risks only (included in the closed system): ICNIRP: 13 members; SCENIHR Report: 2 members + 10 external experts.**

**Non-thermal risks (excluded from the closed system): Scientists' 5G Appeal: 406 international scientists and doctors.**

### **Article: Journal of Molecular and Clinical Oncology**

Published online Jan 22 2020: '*Appeals that matter or not on a moratorium on the deployment of the fifth generation, 5G, for microwave radiation*'. Prof. Lennart Hardell and Prof. Rainer Nyberg (signatories of the Scientists' 5G Appeal)

Excerpts:

*'There seems to be an 'unholy' alliance between the telecom industry and certain scientists, organizations (even WHO), and some politicians, thus reducing the potential for precautionary actions' ... 'ICNIRP seems still to hold the view which is clearly beneficial to the industry'*

*'.. the majority of countries rely on guidelines formulated by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP), a private, German non-governmental organization. ICNIRP relies on the evaluation only of thermal (heating) effects from RF radiation, thereby excluding a large body of published science demonstrating the detrimental effects caused by non-thermal radiation. The fifth generation, 5G, for microwave radiation is about to be implemented worldwide in spite of no comprehensive investigations of the potential risks to human health and the environment. In an appeal (**The 5G Appeal**) sent to the EU in September, 2017 currently 260 scientists and medical doctors (**now 406 signatories**) requested for a moratorium on the deployment of 5G until the health risks associated with this new technology have been fully investigated by industry-independent scientists. The appeal and four rebuttals to the EU over a period of 2 years, have not achieved any positive response from the EU to date.'*

### **Bureaucratic loop-the-loop**

**From the first EU reply to the 5G Appeal**, written by Mr. John F. Ryan, Director of the European Commission Public Health, country knowledge, crisis management directorate, 13th October 2017: '*There is consistent evidence presented by national and international bodies (International Commission on Non Ionising Radiation Protection - ICNIRP, Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks - SCENIHR) that exposure to electromagnetic fields does not represent a health risk*'.

First rebuttal to the EU: '*In the 5G-Appeal we urge EU to appoint a truly independent expert group of EMF-and-health researchers (contrary to ICNIRP and SCENIHR) to decide about new safe guidelines for EMF exposure. It is imperative to immediately apply EU's*

*Precautionary Principle (and ALARA - as low as reasonably achievable) enabling rapid response to stop distribution of 5G products in order to diminish the harm that has already been proven by scientists.'*

**From the second EU reply**, European Commission, Cabinet of Commissioner Vytenis Andriukaitis, Head of Cabinet Brussels, written by Arūnas Vinciūnas, 29th November, 2017: *'The Commission services are confident that the advice provided by the Scientific Committees (ICNIRP and SCENIHR) is unbiased, accurate and scientifically sound and therefore do not feel it necessary to appoint an independent expert group of EMF-and-health researchers to discuss new safe guidelines for EMF exposure'.*

Second rebuttal to the EU: *'Despite the conclusive evidence presented in our letters, both Director Ryan and Mr. Vinciūnas gave generic responses and continued to claim that EMF "does not represent a health risk". In doing so they only refer to ICNIRP and SCENIHR opinions without explaining why they disregarded the compelling evidence and references under the 5G-Appeal headline: "Harmful effects of RF-EMF exposure are already proven." ... The ICNIRP exposure limits are dependent on an unproven hypothesis that "only heat from EMF can cause health hazards". This hypothesis has clearly been rejected in a large number of scientific studies'.*

**From the third EU reply**, written by Mr. Arūnas Vinčiūnas 27th April 2018: *'Finally, let me refer to the previous correspondence you have had with John F. Ryan, Director of Public Health and me (29 November 2017, 13 October 2017 and 19 February 2018) ... It is my view that we have now extensively deliberated on the matter and that we should refrain from further repetition'.*

From the third rebuttal to the EU: *'With this communication we touch upon three points:' i) 'Firstly, we request in the 5G Appeal to EU ([www.5gappeal.eu](http://www.5gappeal.eu)), of which you are a public servant and representative, to declare an immediate moratorium on 5G deployment. ... According to PP (56) and EU IP/00/96(59) "protection of health takes precedence over economic considerations."' ii) 'Secondly, we ask for groups of truly industry-independent researchers to establish new guidelines for exposure. 'Thirdly, with this letter we are formally requesting, in accordance with Art. 42(61) on EU Fundamental Rights, access to all documents in your possession, either created by you or at your disposal, related to the effects of EMF to human health and the environment. Once in possession of such a list, we will decide which of those documents, if any, are of interest and show that 5G is safe.' ... 'Research confirms 5G to be a risk to all life on earth'.*

**From the fourth EU reply**, written by Arunas Vinciunas, 5th September 2019: *' .. please be referred to the opinion of the Commission's Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks (SCENIHR) of 20 January 2015 on potential health effects of exposure to electromagnetic fields (EMF)'*

From the fourth rebuttal to the EU: *' ...it can be further specified from this side that we need the list of documents related to EMFs created by RF/Radiofrequencies and even more specifically, to the list of those documents based on which the Commission is basing its current position that 5G should not be stopped nor subject to a moratorium. ... formally, we are entitled to receive from you such a list of documents based on which the Commissioner determined that 5G is safe. Based on that list we will decide which of those documents are of interest. Please provide such list by email no later than October 31, 2019. This is urgent'*

**From the fifth EU reply**, written by Martin Seychell, European Commission Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety, 19th December 2019: *'Further to our previous correspondence, I can now confirm that the revised guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection will be published very shortly. Once the new guidelines are out, the Commission could refer them to the Scientific Committee on Health, Environment and Emerging Risks for an opinion'*

The article conclusion: *'This article demonstrates that the EU has given mandate to a 13-member, non-governmental private group, the ICNIRP, to decide upon the RF radiation guidelines. The ICNIRP, as well as SCENIHR, are well shown not to use the sound evaluation of science on the detrimental effects of RF radiation, which is documented in the research discussed above. These two small organizations are producing reports which seem to deny the existence of scientific published reports on the related risks.'*

The 5G Appeal - EU replies and appeal rebuttals:

1. First reply from EU: [http://www.5gappeal.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/reply\\_ryan.pdf](http://www.5gappeal.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/reply_ryan.pdf)

First rebuttal: <https://www.environmentandcancer.com/letter-to-vytenis-andriukaitis-13-11-2017/>

2. Second reply from EU: [http://www.5gappeal.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/reply\\_vinciunas.pdf](http://www.5gappeal.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/reply_vinciunas.pdf)

Second rebuttal: <https://www.environmentandcancer.com/letter-to-vytenis-andriukaitis-and-donald-tusk-17-01-18/>.

3. Third reply from EU: <https://www.environmentandcancer.com/answer-from-arnas-vinciunas-27-04-2018/>

Third rebuttal: <https://www.environmentandcancer.com/letter-to-vytenis-andriukaitis-20-05-2019/>

4. Fourth reply from EU: <https://www.environmentandcancer.com/answer-from-arnas-vinciunas-05-09-2019/>

Fourth rebuttal: [https://www.environmentandcancer.com/letter-to-arnas-vinciunas-24-10-2019\)](https://www.environmentandcancer.com/letter-to-arnas-vinciunas-24-10-2019/)

5. Fifth reply from EU: <https://www.environmentandcancer.com/answer-from-martin-seychell-19-12-2019>

The full article - *Appeals that matter or not on a moratorium on the deployment of the fifth generation, 5G, for microwave radiation*: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7016513/>