McGill | Faculty of Medicine

2022-04-06

Esteemed Pittsfield Officials,

I feel competent in commenting on the situation opposing Verizon and its South Street tower to Pittsfield residents, because of my background both in industry and in health research over the last 40 years.
The position taken by Verizon and the FCC stems from an old assessment of the effects of Electromagnetic Radiation on human health. Not only is this assessment based on experiments on monkeys and rats that lasted at most 1 hour, they are also based on the notion that Electromagnetic Radiation of any kind, that is, AM, FM, TV, WiFi and cellular phone signals, is spite of the obvious differences between them, are all equivalent. Supposedly, their toxicities can be gauged according to one single variable, the amount of heat they generate. But heat is not what the residents living near the 877 South Street Verizon tower are worried about.

Please direct your attention to a similar problem that science has already settled, the issue of toxicity of chemicals. In the assessment of chemicals, experiments are performed to find out how a particular chemical affects groups of animals under different doses. We determine the level at which no effect is detected on the group of animals, and we reduce this level by factors of 10, 100 or 1000, according to circumstances, to obtain the “Safe Human Dose”. The toxic effects observed are clearly dependant on the particular chemical. There are big toxicity differences between cyanide (26 g/mol), mercury (201 g/mol), botox (149,323 g/mol), chalk (100 g/mol), water (18 g/mol), sucrose (342 g/mol) and albumin (2,754 g/mol).
If I could be convinced that the toxicity of chemicals could be appropriately gauged by one single variable, their molecular weight, I would obtain the following table.

Chemical	Grams per Mole
Water	18
Cyanide	26
Chalk	100
Mercury	201
Sucrose	342
Albumin	2754
Botox	149323

However you would wish to rank toxicity from this single variable (g/mol), considering either water or botox as the least toxic, this classification system runs into trouble because of its lack of sensitivity to detail: molar weight does not reflect actual toxicity, in the same way that heat does not reflect injury from electromagnetic radiation exposure.

No doubt you have been told that the cell phone radiation from the South Street tower is much less in amount of heat delivered than the radiation we get from the Sun. But cell phone radiation is different from the Sun's radiation. It is different in frequency, in polarization, in duty cycle, and most importantly, in impulsiveness. When evaluated by the National Toxicology Program and the Ramazzini Institute, cell phone radiation has been found to have unexpected biological impacts, incompatible with the heat metric promoted by the FCC.

The Supreme Court on the United States has already pointed out that FCC metrics, which Verizon uses to justify its position, has ignored large areas of science (https://childrenshealthdefense.org/wp-content/uploads/chd-v-fcc-we-won-decision.pdf).
The State of New Hampshire has already published its recommendations relative to 5G and related EMR exposures (https://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf).
Should you make the decision to protect Pittsfield residents from a hostile electromagnetic exposure, you will clearly not be alone.

Paul Héroux, PhD paul.heroux@mcgill.ca

Professor of Toxicology and Health Effects of Electromagnetism
McGill University Medicine
Department of Surgery, McGill University Health Center
InVitroPlus Laboratory, Tel. (514) 767-5556