

Dear

Thank you for your help and advice on the telephone today.

As I explained, I am a private individual with deeply felt misgivings about the proliferation of mobile masts across the Island. I am not a scientist and my knowledge of the subject is only that of a (hopefully!) reasonably intelligent person drawing on information in the public domain. It so happens that many others share these same concerns, including a number of people who are grouped together under the banner "JMMCG". I am however writing this note to you in my personal capacity only and not as a representative or spokesman for any body of persons.

I understand that the new Scrutiny Panel that is to look at this issue will meet tomorrow at which time they will address initial issues such as their Terms of Reference, will scope the extent of their Scrutiny, and deal with other related preliminaries. It is against that background that I have asked if I might address the Panel on these issues and you have very kindly indicated that you would be prepared to assist me by tabling this explanatory note for the Panel's consideration. I will try to be brief in what follows.

My reason for wishing to address the Panel at this preliminary stage is that, having had a number of contacts with media and politicians on this subject, I still find that my concerns are not well understood. This has not just led to my views being misrepresented, but to the responses that I have received being at best less helpful than I would have hoped, at worst quite irrelevant. I am anxious, therefore, that the Panel should have the opportunity, if I am able to persuade them to my view, to at least understand my concerns, though I appreciate of course that they will undoubtedly look at other issues as well.

I regard the health issue concerning these masts to be, in one sense, quite straightforward. Some politicians have described them as "proven" to be safe, but this is not, as a matter of fact, the case. Indeed, at a recent public meeting at Grouville the representatives of the mobile phone industry acknowledged this to be the case. The misunderstanding that the masts are proven safe is usually based on reports that take as their focus the perceived threat of thermal effects, but the health concern of those like me is in relation to biological, not thermal, effects. The proponents of this technology when pressed are, quite properly, careful not to exaggerate their claim. Their language is, again quite properly, carefully chosen and if not subject to close scrutiny may mislead, but the fact is that it is not yet possible to prove mast safety. Equally, however, I am bound to acknowledge that the masts are not "proven" to have adverse health effects either: some think otherwise but it is enough for my argument to accept that the question is still unresolved. Thus there is doubt. I think it is fair to say that thus far I have said nothing that is controversial or really open to rational challenge.

What I do maintain, and will be happy to demonstrate to the Panel if they require, is that there is a substantial and growing body of scientific opinion and evidence that points to the probability that coherent radiation from mobile masts is the most likely (or only possible) cause of identified instances of adverse health effects in some more sensitive people. Leading, reputable scientists are able to point to a rational explanation for this, and to demonstrate the principles at work in scientific tests and trials. Witnesses can be introduced to the Panel, individuals of the highest calibre and standing in the scientific community, who will testify to this and who can assist the Panel to distinguish the science that has misled some people. I submit it is not necessary for the Panel to get too involved in the science: it has challenged dedicated scientific experts for many years so we are unlikely to progress this in the next few weeks!. The Panel can not, of course hope to evaluate the science involved, which is a matter for the scientific community at large, but perhaps only to satisfy themselves that the arguments are real, and by real people, and thus deserve to be given weight.

I therefore maintain that, given the existence of this doubt, and given that the proposed erection of masts as planned will saturate the island with radiation in such a way that individual members of the community will be unable to exercise any choice to escape its effects, what has been proposed amounts to nothing less than a gross violation of our rights as individuals. I believe that these circumstances require the States to adopt a precautionary approach to the mast health issue until such time as the scientific doubt is resolved. What that precautionary approach might entail is more difficult and is best addressed once the issues above are agreed upon, but surely must include de minimis a cessation of the erection of masts and issuing of additional licenses.

I would very much like the opportunity to flesh this out and perhaps to answer any questions to resolve any ambiguities in what I have said. I shall be grateful for any assistance you can give me.