

**Report of a threat from the ASA's ruling of January 8 2020  
on an information poster by the charity Electrosensitivity UK  
of July/August 2020.**

### **1. Summary of the threat**

- (a) The unscientific ruling of January 8 2020 by the ASA's Council endangered the excellent scientific standing of the charity Electrosensitivity UK.
- (b) The ASA's ruling was misleading with its unsubstantiated and unscientific claims, against the charity's aim to provide the public with accurate scientific evidence on the health dangers of non-thermal radio-frequency and low-frequency radiation.
- (c) The ASA's unscientific ruling on this information poster could bring the charities sector into disrepute.

As a charity, we would appreciate any help that the Charity Commission can offer to encourage the ASA to engage with the established mainstream scientific evidence instead of their current unscientific approach based on minority viewpoints, to prevent any further vexatious interference in, and threats to, the charity's work.

### **2. Details**

The charity's second version of the information poster entitled 'How safe is 5G?' presented the mainstream majority scientific viewpoint on radio frequency radiation (RFR), in compliance with the ASA's requirements, fully substantiated by robust peer-reviewed studies. The ASA Council's ruling instead preferred to adopt the invalidated minority viewpoint denying non-thermal health effects from RFR, without any robust substantiation or any peer-reviewed studies. The ASA followed the unscientific and outdated claims by the WHO which since 1959 has been legally subservient to the radiation industry (IAEA) in all matters on radiation and is therefore not at liberty to follow the mainstream and majority science in the area of radiation.

### **3. The extent of the threat from the ASA's unsubstantiated claims**

The extent of the threat from the ASA's unsubstantiated claims should be small, since the WHO's unsubstantiated claims which the ASA follows are in the minority:

- (a) IARC voted that non-thermal RFR is a 2B human carcinogen in 2011 by 29 to 2.
- (b) About 80% of thousands of robust studies show non-thermal RFR effects.
- (c) 250+ expert scientists have signed petitions to the WHO to adopt science-based evidence, against the minority cartel of 20-30 members of WHO and ICNIRP.
- (d) The European Parliament voted in 2008 to reject the WHO's ICNIRP short-term and heating-only guidelines as obsolete by 522 votes for, to 16 against.
- (e) All modern international long-term non-thermal guidelines are up to 10 million times lower than the WHO's short-term heating ones based on 1970s data.
- (f) In the Westminster debate of June 25 2019 MPs such as Ms Antoniazzi and Dr Drew reported on constituents harmed by denial of the mainstream science.
- (g) The UK has seen a doubling of serious brain tumours and France a quadrupling in recent years, so governments may soon limit RFR levels to prevent these injuries.
- (h) Underwriters refuse to cover RFR injury, classifying RFR like asbestos.

For further details, see:

['Majority-Viewpoint and Minority-Viewpoint Guidelines, and Non-Thermal Effects'](#) (2020).  
[Selected Studies on ES and EHS](#) (2018) of over 2,000 studies and references.  
[ES and EHS](#) (2013); [Chapter 47](#) (2015); ES-UK website: [Resources](#); [EMF Scientist](#); [EMF Call](#)

#### **4. Action already taken to mitigate damage by the ASA's unscientific claims**

##### **(a) Trustees**

This potential damage to the charity's high scientific standing based on mainstream and majority-viewpoint evidence was shared among trustees from September 23 2019, the date of the ASA's first email. Since then trustees have been kept informed and have together reviewed and contributed to correspondence by the chair with the ASA's agent, presenting the requisite substantiation against the ASA's unscientific claims.

##### **(b) The 800,000 people in the UK severely affected by RFR**

The charity was founded in 2003 to help the people in the UK, over 800,000 according to government-sponsored surveys, severely affected by RFR. We endeavoured to provide information to these people about this serious threat from the ASA's ruling by posting the charity's responses to the ASA on the charity's website ([Submissions](#)). This has enabled those with access to the internet to follow the situation which so closely affects their health, jobs and housing.

We recognise, however, that those people most severely affected by RFR are sometimes forced to abandon their homes and live in tents or caravans in any remote areas of the UK they can find still free from RFR from phone masts, mobile phones and Wi-fi; such people may still be unaware.

#### **5. The nature of future threats from the ASA's unscientific claims**

##### **(a) The unscientific claims by the ASA's Council, in general**

The trustees regard the unscientific opinions of the ASA's Council, financed by advertisers including mobile phone companies and backed by a government anxious for mobile phone tax revenues, as an ongoing threat over which the trustees have no control until the ASA adopts mainstream science based on robust peer-reviewed studies. So far, since their first objections in 2017, the ASA has not provided a single peer-reviewed study proving its claim that non-thermal RFR is safe, or proving that the many thousands of peer-reviewed studies showing that RFR is unsafe are all wrong.

##### **(b) The ASA's unscientific claims denying the existence of non-thermal effects and thus denying the existence of the charity's raison d'être**

If the ASA still follows the WHO's minority and invalidated viewpoint in this area, as it states it does, then it also denies the existence of all adverse non-thermal RFR effects, despite mainstream scientific evidence of the last two centuries proving such effects beyond reasonable doubt.

This means that, in effect, the ASA denies the very reason for the charity's existence, as the WHO has done since 2005 in its support of the wireless industry and in accordance with the WHO's legal subservience to the IAEA and the industry in all matters of radiation.

#### **6. Future action to mitigate the threats from the ASA's unscientific claims**

The trustees will continue to take appropriate action to mitigate or minimise threats from the ASA by ensuring as far as possible that they continue to adopt the ASA's requirement of majority, mainstream robust science for information posters.

However, the trustees also recognise that, sadly, it is still impossible to predict the threats from the ASA's rulings when the ASA's rulings are not based on the majority and mainstream robust science but unsubstantiated claims.

In particular the trustees aim to:

- (a) continue to ensure that their information posters are substantiated by the mainstream majority-viewpoint science based on robust peer-reviewed articles;
- (b) continue to reject minority and fringe viewpoints which are unsubstantiated;
- (c) continue to ensure that all our information posters are legal, decent, honest and truthful and do not mislead anyone with unsubstantiated claims and wishful hopes;
- (d) continue to try to educate and inform the ASA about actual mainstream bioelectromagnetic science, such as VGCCs - of which they had no idea in 2017 - and the methodology of toxicology testing, where they failed to appreciate that it is unethical and in contravention of the Nuremberg Code to test a substance such as RFR, known as a human carcinogen since 1953, on non-consenting humans, meaning that it can be tested only on animals, as in the FDA's NTP 'gold-standard' \$30 million mobile-phone study which found 'clear evidence' (their highest ranking) of cancer.

## **7. Charity Commission support against the ASA's unscientific claims**

- (a) We agree with Helen Stephenson's call (16/07/19) for charities to remain true to their values and courageous advocates of their cause, with strong, open and moral leadership. We aim to continue to help and speak out for all the people dependent on our advocacy.
- (b) The ASA states that it will regulate 'taking account of the evidence-base'. However, sadly, the ASA has shown that its rulings contravene mainstream and majority robust science in this area.
- (c) The ASA has repeatedly failed to identify the author of its unscientific rulings which clearly reveal a serious lack of expertise in this area of science.
- (d) The ASA is unaccountable and lacks appropriate review and scrutiny in this area.
- (e) The charity does not wish to be curtailed by the ASAs' unscientific rulings in its role of helping the 800,000 people in the UK severely affected by RFR.
- (f) The charity does not wish to be curtailed by the ASAs' unscientific rulings in its other role of providing mainstream and substantiated information to the 53 million people in the UK affected by RFR unawares who could go on to develop more serious symptoms from continued exposure to RFR.
- (g) We would appreciate all the help which the Charity Commission can provide to change the ASA's approach, away from its heavy-handed endorsement of the minority and industry viewpoint, to embracing the mainstream and majority scientific acceptance of established non-thermal and long-term biological effects.

Michael Bevington  
 Chair of Trustees,  
 Electrosensitivity-UK, 1103018.  
 January 15 2020