

To
Sub Panel,
Mast Review
Scrutiny office
States of Jersey.
25th January 2007

To All Members of the Panel

We all know that there are known and unknown dangers with many types of radiation which will not be manifest for a very long time like decades before they will become obvious.

So is the case with electromagnetic radiation from the telephone mast .

The radiofrequency waves emitted by these are at best of times can't be measured accurately and the levels mentioned by the commercial telephone companies may be harmful and its effect will take ages to evolve.

As with smoking and radiation (ionising) it takes 10-20 or more years for its adverse effect to manifest and we still call it as an association rather than a causative factor. However, for all practical purposes we now accept it as a causative factor, although in scientific parlance it is still an association with those agents.

We also know that active growing tissues (in dividing phase) are more vulnerable to these radiation for example organs in children.

All these telephone companies compare radiation from the mast to household appliances and try to convince or cloud our thought with lot of jargon or "electromagnetic smog" . However, they should take into account the time of exposure which is going to be round the clock for people who live close by and to everyone if these masts start mushrooming if these companies succeed in their plans - who have only one agenda future growth and it s financial vision for their company.

As with most medical research (animal and Human studies) there are so many factors or variables, and the time lag involved is enormous making it difficult to zoom on to a single cause and this is where the companies are harping on saying there is no definitive evidence. My question to them would be -Can you show us the proof that Radiofrequency waver does not cause harmful effects. Further if they (Chairman/CEO of the companies) are so convinced about it being harmless are they willing to have it located over their houses or garden in the best possible disguised manner?!!! (those executives with young children).

Against the above background some countries and policy makers have taken a rational and logical stand or approach to only allow locating of these mast away from residential areas, schools with an exclusion zone ranging from 300-1000 metres. I understand Jersey has policy of Exclusion zones around school and if it does why not include residential area where children live and play in these exclusion zones

So my appeal to the sub panel is take into account the difficulties in gathering proof , potential harmful effects especially to the innocent , unsuspecting children (future)of the island. I plead to the panel to take a sensible, logical and a precautionary approach and recommend to the policy makers to create exclusion zones especially around schools and residential area where children live and play before it is too late.

It will be decades before the harmful and irreversible damage is evident and the debate will rage on but until then a sensible and practical precautionary recommendation of about 300 m exclusion zone is not difficult to enforce and the immediate cost wont be any if we see potential benefit for the health of the Island (its children),the well being both psychological and physical of the Island as such.

I think the above sensible and precautionary approach is proactive, not dogmatic and not detrimental to anybody 's interest including those of communication industry.

All citizens of this Island deserve to live without the constant fear of potential harm lurking next to them as a basic fundamental right.