

**Press Release and Response to the ASA Ruling of January 8 2020
by ES-UK on the Information Poster asking 'How safe is 5G?'**

1. The information poster's valid question 'How safe is 5G?'

The information poster's question 'How safe is 5G?' is not misleading or unsubstantiated. The CTIA, the wireless industry trade organisation, has a website section headed 'Is 5G safe?' These questions are very similar in wording.

2. The ASA's inconsistency

The ASA requires mainstream majority science, which the poster provided. The ASA's ruling then discounted this majority mainstream viewpoint by adopting a minority view based on unsubstantiated and non-peer-reviewed claims of the small cartel supporting the wireless industry. For the difference between the mainstream acceptance of the 80% of scientific studies showing non-thermal harm, and the ASA's minority viewpoint still denying non-thermal effects, see 'Majority-Viewpoint and Minority-Viewpoint Guidelines, and Non-Thermal Effects'.

3. The ASA's preference of a few complaints over the 800,000 people in the UK severely affected by RF radiation such as 5G

The ASA put a few sceptics' complaints over the 53 million people in the UK adversely affected unawares by EM radiation, including 5G, and the 800,000 people severely affected by EM radiation, according to surveys sponsored by the UK government, for whom the known dangers of 5G are fully substantiated.

4. The ASA's failure to note that non-thermal RF radiation has been proven beyond reasonable doubt to be a known carcinogen

The ASA's judgement fails to note that 5G uses RF radiation shown in 1953 to cause cancer. Since then robust studies have proven beyond reasonable doubt that RF radiation meets the criteria for a class 1 certain human carcinogen, as confirmed by the FDA's \$30 million NTP study to see if mobile phone RF radiation causes cancer. It found 'clear evidence' that it did. The ASA wrongly objects to animal tests: testing a known carcinogen like mobile phone radiation on humans is unethical and contravenes the Nuremberg Code. The ASA also wrongly considers 2G and 3G irrelevant. 5G uses similar pulsed, modulated RF radiation.

5. The ASA's failure to identify its assessor

The ASA's failure to appreciate aspects of the nature and toxicological testing of RF radiation such as 5G indicates the need for greater expertise in its scientific assessments if it is not to appear as censoring established scientific facts to support the wireless industry. The ASA has again failed to identify the person(s) on whom it relies while stating that it does not use an external scientific expert.

6. The ASA's failure to substantiate its own claims

The information poster relied on mainstream majority-viewpoint science on RF radiation including 5G. It quoted scientific experts recognised world-wide. In contrast, the ASA again failed to provide any peer-reviewed scientific studies to substantiate its claim that these mainstream scientific statements are wrong.