



BM Box ES-UK
London
WC1N 3XX
www.es-uk.info
Tel.: 0845 643 9748

xxxx,
Investigations Executive,
Advertising Standards Authority
xxxx

November 28 2019

Dear xxxx,

Complaint Ref: xxxx

ASA Draft Recommendation

Thank you for your email of November 21 2019 in response to mine of October 23 2019.

Under the ASA's Draft Recommendation heading 'Response' I can find no reference to the points I have repeatedly made to the ASA, including in my recent submissions to you:

- (a) The ASA is still failing to identify its scientific assessor, as previously requested. An anonymous set of unscientific claims as presented at the end of the ASA's Draft Recommendation, dismissing EM effects established by the weight of robust scientific evidence, has no weight scientifically.
- (b) The ASA's or its anonymous scientific assessor's Draft Recommendation is still failing to provide a single peer-reviewed study by the ASA or its anonymous assessor disproving the 70+ robust peer-reviewed studies provided previously. These studies fully substantiate the majority viewpoint adopted by this and previous information posters and thus cannot in any way mislead the reader.
- (c) The ASA's Draft Recommendation still relies on unscientific claims with views which are opinion-pieces and not peer-reviewed. These claims by the ASA are therefore unsubstantiated by the ASAs' own criteria.
- (d) The ASAs' Draft Recommendation still relies on unscientific claims promulgated by a minority-viewpoint cartel of the private single-opinion group ICNIRP and the WHO. This again is in contravention of the ASA's own requirement, namely that scientific evidence used in the information poster should be based on majority-viewpoint science, which it was as regards the poster, but not in the ASA's Draft Recommendation.

Additional comments on the ASA's Draft Recommendation:

1. The ASA dismisses scientific reviews. However, most scientists use scientific reviews as one contribution to their assessment of the current state of the science.
2. The ASA still quotes the non-peer-reviewed AGNIR 2012 Report, although this has been shown to be unscientific and unsafe in a peer-reviewed critique. The majority-viewpoint scientists consider that this seriously flawed report should have been retracted, as demanded in the debate by MPs at Westminster.
3. The ASA's Draft Recommendation appears to be mistaken in some of its references to the nature of the RF emissions from 5G, which in part are the same RF as 4G (hence '4G+') but with beam-steering and MIMO applied which intensify rather than reduce the amount of RFR energy deposited in a given location. Therefore the robust substantiation of the harm proven beyond reasonable doubt based on the current weight of evidence from 2G, 3G, 4G and similar RF studies is also applicable to most current 5G.
4. The ASA or the ASA's anonymous assessor does not seem to appreciate the way bioelectromagnetic assessments and guidelines are produced, in his/her claim that: "We considered many of the articles were not adequate because they concerned animal experiments (such as mice, rats and rabbits), rather than studies which specifically examined human health."
 - (i) It is unethical and illegal to use humans as test animals for RF experiments to confirm facts proven beyond reasonable doubt, such that RF causes neurological illness, cardiovascular harm, infertility and cancer, given that RF has been known since 1953 to cause cancer etc. All experiments, therefore, have to be on mice, rats and rabbits and other animals considered close to humans in their physiological make-up and cannot be on humans.
 - (ii) In fact, animal experiments were used to determine the outdated and obsolete 1998 ICNIRP short-term heating guidelines which the ASA's Draft Recommendation still quotes. These ICNIRP Guidelines are based on mice and rat etc. studies from the 1980s, before most mobile phones with their pulsed, polarised and modulated signals, let alone 5G with beam-steering, were in common use or tested as used. Even recent relevant long-term biological guidelines like EUROPAEM EMF 2016 and IGNIR 2018 are also based in part on animal experiments for the same reason. These long-term and biological guidelines are the relevant ones for 5G because they are not based on the irrelevant and invalidated hypothesis derived from heating of tissue by one degree over six minutes, like ICNIRP's unscientific and unprotective guidelines.
 - (iii) The gold-standard \$30 million NTP study, which was commissioned by the FDA to see if mobile phone radiation causes cancer, was conducted

on mice and rats for the same reason as with all similar toxicological studies, since an experiment on humans would be unethical and illegal. As included in my substantiation, but not in the ASA's Draft Recommendation, the definitive NTP study found 'clear evidence' (their highest cancer rating) of RF causing cancer, so it is extraordinary for the ASA's Draft Recommendation not even to mention this game-changing major study if the ASA's Draft Recommendation is meant to be an unbiased assessment. Only supporters of the wireless industry and parts of the media, especially where they are dependent of wireless advertising, have tried to dismiss it.

- (iv) In addition, experiments on animals are essential because they are required, together with human epidemiological studies, for RF like 5G to be classified as a class 1 certain human carcinogen. I explained in my submissions to the ASA that both these criteria have now been met and therefore the RFR (2G, 3G, 4G and 5G) has met the requirements of a known class 1 certain cancer agent. It appears reprehensible that the ASA's Draft Recommendation does not explain this established and robust scientific evidence and its implications for everyone in the UK, along with the fact that the WHO's IARC now lists RFR (2G, 3G, 4G and 5G), currently classified as a 2B human carcinogen, as a high priority for reassessment.
 - (v) If the ASA's implication is to be understood as requiring that there should be experiments on humans, and this includes experimenting with RFR (2G, 3G, 4G and 5G) on non-consenting populations such as much of the UK, then the ASA's Draft Recommendation would be in contravention of the Nuremberg Code. It thus seems untoward that the ASA is apparently endorsing or condoning such unethical and illegal experiments on a large proportion of the UK population.
 - (vi) Since there have been no human epidemiological studies on 5G yet, it is illogical for the ASA to dismiss earlier RF studies without providing peer-reviewed evidence that 5G RF is so different from similar RF that it must inevitably be safe, against the thousands of robust peer-reviewed scientific studies which already provide clear proof beyond all reasonable doubt that RFR (2G, 3G, 4G and 5G) is not safe.
5. It seems inconsistent for the ASA to require that any information poster adopts the majority scientific viewpoint, here represented by the 250 scientists who are signatories to the International EMF Scientist Appeal who state that RFR (2G, 3G, 4G and 5G) is not proven safe, and then for the ASA to adopt the minority viewpoint, represented by the cartel of some 20-30 members and advisers to ICNIRP and the WHO supporting the wireless industry, who claim without any robust scientific evidence at all that RFR (2G, 3G, 4G and 5G) is safe. The information poster was designed to comply with the ASA's requirements in this matter and for the ASA to adopt the opposite approach in its adjudication makes it impossible for an information poster to meet both criteria at the same time. In

fact, as I explained in my previous letters but not noted in the ASA's Draft Recommendation, those approving the content of the information poster could not allow material to be published which is not legal, decent, truthful and honest and this therefore prevents the adoption of the unscientific minority viewpoint adopted by the ASA's Draft Recommendation.

6. It is very sad that ASA's unscientific approach in its Draft Recommendation does not even mention the 800,000 people in the UK (1.2%) who are already severely affected by RFR (2G, 3G, 4G and 5G). It is a low point scientifically for the UK if an information poster cannot warn people of the dangers of also becoming severely affected by 5G and similar radiation and developing electrosensitivity, a condition proven beyond reasonable doubt by robust scientific studies since 1932.
7. It is also very sad that ASA's unscientific approach does not allow an information poster to warn the approximately 53,000,000 people in the UK (79%) who are negatively affected by RFR (2G, 3G, 4G and 5G) but are unaware of the cause and of the relevant robust scientific proof.

I cannot imagine that when the ASA was established in 1961 it was intended that the ASA should gag or censor majority-viewpoint robust science in order to help particular industries or government tax revenues. If this is the unstated but effective role of the ASA, then its mandate and operation need urgent revision. It is unacceptable to censor an information poster which uses the best robust peer-reviewed and majority-viewpoint mainstream science by preferring unscientific and minority claims supporting the wireless industry.

The ASA requires that adverts are legal, decent, honest and truthful. We can find no robust scientific evidence that RFR (2G, 3G, 4G and 5G) is categorically, convincingly or conclusively safe, only assertions and hope, based on unprotective safety limits set by a private body, ICNIRP. In contrast there are many robust peer-reviewed scientific studies which show harm (see e.g. [Select Studies on ES and EHS](#)). The insurance industry also has concerns about the lack of proof of safety for RFR (2G, 3G, 4G and 5G), such that many insurers will not insure against health risks from EM fields ([EMF Exclusion](#), 32), except as an additional high-risk pollution like asbestos.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Bevington

Chair of Trustees,
Electrosensitivity UK

The charity's name and postal address is:
Electrosensitivity UK,
BM Box ES-UK,
London
WC1N 3XX