

Wireless "Revolution" Must Be Supported by Scientific Proof of Safety for Human Health and the Environment

Until the US takes steps to insure that the conflict between the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Telecom Act of 1996 are resolved, any further action by the FCC to increase the radio frequency exposure of the citizen population is an assault on the human rights codified by the United Nations, including the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

U.S. FCC guidelines are essentially being used as a weapon against the citizen population to justify assault on human health in pursuit of financial gain. The FCC's intent to fuel economic growth and competition, with no independent investigation of health and environmental issues, is inhumane and immoral.

In addition to violations of human rights, the unrelenting consumption of resources to build out infrastructure to fuel the demand for faster, more powerful, more ubiquitous coverage is an assault on the planet's natural resources.

Evidence of harm already exists and has been emerging for decades, including historical documents compiled by Zory Glaser of the US Navy, and the EPA. In addition, other nations recognize harm at levels far lower than the FCC limits.

When these technologies are subsequently accepted as unsafe, (because proof already exists that they are not safe, including the NTP study) further consumption of resources will be required to address safety.

The FCC's vision for the future does not represent progress. It is stupefying that a nation like the US with such an abundance of intellectual and scientific resources could be operating on invalid, outdated, insufficient assumptions regarding radio frequency exposure for so long, while ignoring direct evidence of harm.

I experience pain and torture as the result of inadequate protections for microwave radio frequency exposure. The sustained stress has had a significant impact on my quality of life, and the dis-regulation of my nervous system will most like restrict the length of my life.

As an informed environmentalist I oppose any further expansion of wireless technology in the US until appropriate investigation of health and environmental issues can be conducted in a fully transparent manner, with independent oversight, with binding liability assigned for any health damages, and accommodation under the protections of the ADA.

Thank you,
Patricia Burke