

## Wired vs wireless

From the 2018 report '*Re-Inventing Wires: The Future of Landlines and Networks*', Timothy Schoechle PhD, Senior Research Fellow, National Institute for Science, Law and Public Policy, Washington DC:

*'The unstated industry motive is to force subscribers into more profitable wireless networks. The claims about obsolescence and the supposed need to “step toward to the 21st century” are a self-serving, false narrative put forward by monopolistic corporations and their political lackeys.'*

*'Wireless access has been artificially inflated by regulatory disparity. Present technology and a market trajectory of dependence on wireless are unsustainable as a long-term solution for many reasons, including: • Not efficient (energy or materials) • Not sufficient (economically or in performance) • Not self-sufficient (energy or materials) • Not sustainable (economically, in energy, environmentally, socially) • Vulnerable (hacking) • Growing health concerns'*

*'Wired infrastructure is inherently more future-proof, more reliable, more sustainable, more energy-efficient, and more essential to many other services. Wireless networks and services are inherently more complex, more costly, more unstable, and more constrained.'*

As well as *growing health concerns*, if wired infrastructure is *inherently more future-proof, more reliable, more sustainable, more energy-efficient, and more essential to many other services*, why is Britain instating wireless networks and services that *are inherently more complex, more costly, more unstable, and more constrained?*

*'5G Wireless Deployment and Health Risks: Time for a Medical Discussion in Australia and New Zealand': 'It is already late to educate the population on the risks of wireless radiation and to take public health measures such as those taken with tobacco to reduce exposure by recommending safer wired communications for regular use while leaving wireless communications for short emergency communications.'*