

## **Update on the threat from the ASA's unscientific ruling to Electrosensitivity UK**

**January 27 2020**

The charity Electrosensitivity UK is unable, on its own, to reduce the serious threat from the ASA's unscientific ruling of January 8 2020.

- (i) The vexatious and heavy-handed refusal by the ASA to follow robust mainstream and majority viewpoints in its scientific analysis continues to be a serious threat. It undermines and even partially negates the charity's attempt to fulfil its two aims of helping the 800,000 people in the UK (according to government-sponsored surveys) severely affected by Radio Frequency Radiation (RFR), and helping to inform with accurate mainstream evidence-based science the 53 million people in the UK who are affected by RFR unawares and who could go on, under further exposure to the very high levels of RFR currently permitted in the UK, to develop more serious symptoms of RFR exposure, such as infertility, cancer, electromagnetic hypersensitivity, and neurological and cardiovascular injuries.
- (ii) The dependence of the ASA and its CAP on money and influence from the mobile telephone industry means that the ASA and its CAP are not appropriately accountable to independent regulators and authorities.

The solution to this threat to the charity from the unscientific ruling of the ASA will come in two stages. Any help which the Charity Commissioners can provide in resolving these two threats will be much appreciated by the charity.

*(i) Stage 1: The ASA's need to adopt mainstream science*

The ASA needs to switch from its unscientific and minority belief still denying non-thermal effects, to mainstream and majority science accepting non-thermal effects.

*(ii) Stage 2: The ASA's need to become properly accountable*

The ASA needs to be made properly accountable, not just to advertisers like mobile phone companies who pay most of its costs.

At present, and since its legal constitution in 2012, one of the directors of the ASA's CAP has been Hamish MacLeod, also director of Mobile UK. This clear conflict of interests was not recorded on the ASA's ruling against the charity. Failure to record a conflict of interest may be classified as maladministration and bring into question the validity of the ASA's ruling.

Nevertheless, the mainstream scientific, legal and regulatory evidence continues to mount against the ASA's unscientific beliefs, as shown in the following examples since December 5 2019, when the ASA finalised its ruling released on January 8 2020.

**1. Many new scientific studies show adverse effects from RFR, including:**

- (a) [Adverse effects on bees](#) at frequencies used and proposed for RFR above 3 GHz.
- (b) [Evidence of calcium flux](#) from RFR at mm and THz frequencies as for future RFR.
- (c) [Thyroid cancer](#) caused by 7 genetic variants among mobile phone users.

## **2. Legal**

- (a) [The Turin appeal court](#) upheld the verdict that mobile phones cause brain tumours, the sixth Italian legal confirmation that RFR causes tumours and cancers. This judgement was based on majority and unbiased evidence, explicitly rejecting the bias in the WHO's ICNIRP and wireless industry studies, the very groups on which the ASA based its unscientific conclusion.
- (b) [Several expert groups](#) in the USA have announced that they will sue the FCC, the equivalent of the WHO's ICNIRP on which the ASA still relies, for failing to execute a valid review of the scientific evidence since the FCC adopted its unscientific guidelines in 1997 - the year before the WHO's ICNIRP also adopted its unscientific guidelines. Both were short-term and heating-only guidelines and were based on data from the 1970s now mainly irrelevant, because long-term and non-thermal effects are now fully established.

## **3. Regulatory**

- (a) [The NTP now endorses precaution for RFR](#), the first USA federal officials to so.
- (b) [Papua New Guinea has overturned its acceptance of 5G](#) and halted all 5G deployment, in order first to assess the safety of RFR.
- (c) [Paignton followed other UK towns in rejecting 5G](#) on the grounds of both visual degradation and health concerns. Local councillors are obliged to ensure the health and safety of the local population. They do not have legal authority knowingly to cause ill health among the local population by allowing the transmission of RFR, which has met the criteria to be classified as an established human carcinogen, even with the consent or knowledge of the population being irradiated. To permit RF irradiation without the consent or knowledge of the population being irradiated is in contravention of the Nuremberg Code.

Michael Bevington,  
January 27 2020