



BM Box ES-UK
London
WC1N 3XX
www.es-uk.info

BBC Complaints,
PO Box 1922,
Darlington,
DL3 0UR

March 13 2020

Dear Sir/Madam,

BBC Complaints - Case number CAS-5953472-Y9T9V7

Thank you for your email reply of March 5 2020 to my online complaint of March 4 2020. The reply stated: "We've read your feedback and it doesn't appear to have any obvious link to the BBC" and referred to p.19 of BBC Complaints Framework and Procedures (October 2017), but this did not seem to contain anything obviously relevant.

I should be grateful if you could let me know to whom I should address my concerns about a BBC News report being inaccurate and misleading, if not to BBC Complaints.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Michael Bevington'.

Michael Bevington
Trustee, Electrosensitivity UK
www.es-uk.info

Complaint to the BBC about a BBC News 5G report:

"UK's 5G network well within safety limits, Ofcom tests find" (Rory Cellan-Jones, BBC News, February 24 2020. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-51613580>)

This BBC headline and report were inaccurate and misleading. The 'safety' limits to which it referred are not for long-term health effects. Mainstream science has established that people are harmed at the radiation levels found by the Ofcom tests. The headline should have included the term 'ICNIRP' or 'short-term and heating-only' before the word 'safety', and the article should have explained the unscientific and unprotective nature of ICNIRP short-term heating-only limits.

1. Ofcom used ICNIRP short-term heating-only limits, not international long-term non-thermal safety limits

"The first UK safety tests of 5G base stations has found radiation levels are at "tiny fractions" of safe limits. The highest result Ofcom found for the 5G band was 0.039% of the recommended [ICNIRP] exposure limit."

- The ICNIRP limits are not safe. They are short-term heating-only, based on Schwan's 1953 mistake. 0.039% of ICNIRP's limit of 9,200,000 $\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$ is 3,500 $\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$, over a thousand times above international long-term biological safety limits, e.g. 3 $\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$ for children (Bioinitiative), and millions of times higher than the safe background level of 0.000002 $\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$. It is misleading to compare Ofcom's measurements with ICNIRP's invalidated short-term heating limits, instead of appropriate international long-term biological limits. People suffer non-thermal, not just heating injuries, and stay at home, school or workplaces longer than ICNIRP's 6 or 30 minutes.

2. Non-ionising radiation can damage DNA

"non-ionizing meaning the type that does not damage DNA and cells."

- It has been known that non-ionising radiation can damage DNA since 1994.

3. Ofcom's tests prove that 5G is unsafe, not the BBC's claim that 5G is safe

"The councils and campaigners have been calling for evidence 5G is safe. Now, Ofcom has provided some."

- Ofcom has not proved, and cannot prove, that 5G is safe. Nor can anyone else. Radio frequency radiation (RFR), as used by 5G, has been shown to cause cancer at non-thermal levels since 1953. In fact Ofcom's tests prove that 5G is dangerous, since it exceeds the international safety limits by over 1,000 times and safe background levels by over a billion times and uses a 2B carcinogen.

4. Ofcom found mobile radiation in Canary Wharf a hundred billion times above safe background levels

"the highest strength for all mobile bands was in London's Canary Wharf, at 1.5% the safe limit"

- The Canary Wharf 1.5% is 138,000 $\mu\text{W}/\text{m}^2$ of ICNIRP's limit, or 46,000 times above the long-term non-thermal safety limit for children, and a hundred billion times above safe background levels.

5. The BBC report omitted known symptoms of RFR such as cancer

- The report omits established symptoms caused by non-thermal effects of RFR, such as cancer, cardiovascular and neurological harm, electrosensitivity, and infertility, all proven beyond reasonable doubt and accepted by the majority-viewpoint mainstream scientists, but not by the minority cartel of ICNIRP still clinging to Schwan's invalidated 1953 hypothesis.

6. The BBC report omitted any reference to the 800,000 people in the UK severely affected by RFR

- The report omits the 800,000 people in the UK (1.2%) already severely affected by RFR, according to government-sponsored surveys. These people lack the same access to work and society as the rest of the population.

Further information on how ICNIRP guidelines are unscientific and not protective:

www.es-uk.info/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/03.11-ICNIRP-Guidelines-Unscientific-and-Not-Protective.pdf