

BBC Fake News on 5G Decoded: Health Impacts Denied Despite Overwhelming Scientific Evidence

By [Claire Edwards](#)

Global Research, August 25, 2019

Theme: [Environment](#), [Media Disinformation](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

Listen to BBC radio: *Under the Radar Episode 4 – 5G Friend or Foe?* (July 2019) [here](#).

Open letter to the “Under the Radar” BBC Programme Producer

I was hoping that I could leave it to others to refute the latest fake news on 5G from the BBC, but I feel obliged to wade in with the evidence since the BBC signally fails to provide it, perhaps corrupted like others by its recently rumoured collaboration with various telecommunications companies ([Transparency International: Investigating Corruption in the Media and Telecoms Industries](#)).

While I applaud your efforts to bring to public notice the concerns about 5G being rolled out without a single prior test to ascertain its implications for health or safety, and your success in finally persuading the BBC to at least *mention* some of those concerns, albeit via a rather minor and short radio programme rather than by doing this unprecedented planetary emergency justice by treating it in a full-length television programme, you seem oblivious to the bias evident in the production of the programme.

Let us examine how the impression is created in this programme that those who oppose 5G are somehow ignorant and foolish tin-foil-hat-wearers instead of who they really are: fully informed and intelligent individuals qualified and experienced in the field of electromagnetic fields (EMFs) who are seriously alarmed by the facts about 5G and its very real consequences extrapolated from the science on the devastating impacts of wireless generations 1-4.

First the presenter informs us that 230 scientists are concerned about the rollout, whereas in fact many thousands of scientists and physicians have expressed their concerns to date in at least 60 appeals: [Doctors & Scientists Appeals For Stronger Electromagnetic Radiation Regulations](#) and *International Appeal to Stop 5G on Earth and in Space* — 134,458 signatories from 198 countries as of 2 August 2019. The presenter deliberately disparages the 230 scientists mentioned by employing the vernacular phrase “What’s their beef?” in preference to the more formal and respectful, *What are their concerns?*

We hear from Dr Erica Mallery-Blythe, who tells us that 5G millimetre waves interfere with biology, that the research is incomplete and that there have been no public consultation and no proper health and safety testing of 5G.

The science on electromagnetic radiation

It is to be noted – although of course not mentioned in the programme – that Dr Mallery-Blythe’s statements are backed up by the extensive science that has irrefutably established the biological effects of electromagnetic radiation (*Irradiated: A comprehensive compilation and analysis of the literature on radiofrequency fields and the negative biological impacts of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (particularly radiofrequency fields) on biological organisms* ([416 pages](#)); University of Aachen [EMF Portal](#) with 28,000+ studies. Even the BBC was prepared to question the safety of WiFi once upon a time – oops! – did you think we’d forgotten? (BBC Panorama, 2007: [WiFi Warning Signal](#) but that was presumably before the BBC itself got into bed with the telecoms industry, as has the New York Times ([Who has NY Times in their pocket?](#); and [NY Times 5G ties uncovered](#)).

Dr Mallery-Blythe’s information is immediately undermined by the next segment, which takes place at a race track, where we hear in enthusiastic and excited tones reminiscent of the boys at *Top Gear* about 5G connecting to cars at very high speeds. This research relates to the development of autonomous vehicles, but we are not informed of this.

We hear from Peter Claydon, AutoAir Project Director, who tells us that the “international organisation” ICNIRP goes back to the 1960s and consists of a group of medical experts and that the UK bases the guidelines on installation of mobile technology on the ICNIRP recommendations.

ICNIRP: true status and extensive literature on ICNIRP corruption

The presenter fails to challenge Claydon on the inaccuracy of his assertions. ICNIRP is, in fact, an NGO under German law with no international legal status. It appoints its own members, none of whom is a medical doctor, operates with zero transparency and is accountable to no one. It disclaims all responsibility on its website for any of its information (see [this](#)), including its own guidelines, which are based on cherry-picked science that predates the advent of mobile phones. ICNIRP has been accused of corruption by countless people over many years, most recently by (1) Investigate Europe: [The 5G Mass Experiment](#) and [The ICNIRP Cartel: Who’s Who in the EMF Research World](#); (2) Dariusz Leszczynski, PhD: *Is ICNIRP Reliable Enough to Dictate Meaning of Science to the Governmental Risk Regulators?* (See [this](#)); (3) Joel M. Moskowitz, PhD: *The ICNIRP Cartel and the 5G Mass Experiment* (see [this](#)); and (4) Professor Emeritus Martin Pall, *Response to 2018 ICNIRP Draft Guidelines and Appendices on Limiting Exposure to Time-Varying Electric, Magnetic and Electromagnetic Fields (100 kHz to 300 GHz)* (see [this](#)) and *Eight Repeatedly Documented Findings Each Show that EMF Safety Guidelines Do Not Predict Biological Effects and Are Therefore Fraudulent* (see [this](#)).

The presenter invites Claydon, who is clearly a technical person and neither an EMF scientist nor a medical doctor, to “fundamentally reassure those people who are concerned that [5G] may affect human health that you don’t think it will”, despite the fact that Claydon is not qualified to provide a scientific or medical opinion. Claydon obligingly replies, “No ... the research that’s been done going back decades is equally applicable to 5G as it was to any other radio technology in the past”.

The devastating health consequences from 20 years of mobile phone use

Significantly, Claydon does *not* provide any assurance that 5G is safe. In fact, all wireless technology is unsafe, and the health results emerging now from the last 20 years of intense use of mobile phones is revealing the devastating health effects, including autism, ADHD,

catastrophic drops in fertility, early onset dementias and a phenomenal rise in suicides, among others (see, for example. the US Blue Cross Blue Shield health insurance association report of April 2019 entitled [“The Health of Millennials”](#) and *Are rises in Electro-Magnetic Field in the human environment, interacting with multiple environmental pollutions, the tripping point for increases in neurological deaths in the Western World?* in [Medical Hypotheses](#): Excerpt:

[W]e hypothesise that a major contribution for the relative sudden upsurge in neurological morbidity in the Western world (1989–2015), is because of increased background EMF that has become the tipping point ... The unprecedented neurological death rates, all within just 25 years, demand a re-examination of long-term EMF safety related to the increasing background EMF on human health. We do not wish to ‘stop the modern world’, only make it safer.”

Paul Brodeur, in his book entitled *The Zapping of America*, states

“Microwave radiation can blind you, alter your behaviour, cause genetic damage, even kill you. The risks have been hidden from you by the Pentagon, the State Department, and the electronics industry. With this book, the microwave cover-up is ended.”

Next we hear very briefly from someone who is disparagingly described as “A so-called WiFi refugee”, who is permitted a few seconds to tell us about his heart pain and headaches caused by wireless technology.

This is followed by a longer segment in which we hear [Senator Richard Blumenthal](#) establish at a US Senate hearing in February 2019 that the telecoms industry has invested zero dollars in health and safety testing of 5G, such that Blumenthal concludes, “So we’re flying blind here so far as health and safety is concerned”.

Once again, the facts are promptly undermined by the presenter assuring us emphatically that Marc Allera, CEO of major telco EE (and therefore highly unlikely to provide an unbiased opinion), “is *convinced* the new service is safe”. Marc Allera is a businessman and not a medical doctor and his assurance is obviously self-interested and carries no scientific weight. Allera talks of “the extreme rumours ... none of which are true”. “We’ve worked for more than 30 years with bodies like the WHO that create standards ...”.

Corruption at the World Health Organization (WHO)

The World Health Organization has conveniently forgotten that it co-organised a symposium in 1973 entitled [“The Biologic Effects and Health Hazards of Microwave Radiation”](#) (emphasis added). It has no prerogative to unilaterally endorse guidelines produced by a shady NGO in un-transparent circumstances. The WHO and its EMF project – about which Mike Repacholi, founder of ICNIRP and former director of WHO’s EMF project, revealed that up to half of WHO’s EMF project funding came from wireless and electric utility industry groups (see [this](#)) – have also been accused multiple times of corruption and co-option by industry (UN Human Rights Council, 22 February 2019: *5G is Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment Under Resolution 39/46* (see [this](#)); *The WHO Cover-Up That is Costing Us the Earth* (see [this](#)); [WHO Watch: Mike Repacholi and the EMF Charade](#), Microwave News, 2005.

Giving the impression that the facts of 5G's safety have now been definitively established – by sweeping, erroneous and unsupported assertions – the presenter marvels in a disparaging tone that, “Despite reassurances from the industry that 5G is just as safe as 3G, 4G and the technology before it, Dr Erica Mallery-Blythe isn't convinced”. The patronising tone implies that she cannot be quite right in the head to *still* be insisting that 5G is not safe, despite having heard the reassurances – from medically unqualified and self-interested individuals.

The presenter then adopts a very fast delivery as he admits that “No specific testing on the effects of 5G on human health seems to have been carried out ...”. The qualifiers “specific” and “seems to” employed here are redundant, misleading and inaccurate, for in fact *no testing whatsoever* on the effects of 5G on human health has been carried out prior to its rollout on Earth, in space and in the stratosphere.

He then rushes on, with a rapid “But” to imply that this complete absence of the legally required health and safety testing of 5G is a negligible matter that should not concern us, to introduce in a confident tone a rent-a-sceptic US equivalent of UK *biologist* Richard Dawkins, who is systematically invited onto the British media to debunk scientists from any field of science whose evidence contradicts corporate orthodoxy and impedes profit. The presenter clearly intends us to understand that this “expert” will definitively settle the matter. Brought on as the culmination of the programme, Dr Steve Novella, Assistant Professor of Neurology at Yale, informs us in an authoritative manner as follows:

The potential hazard from 5G is actually very, very low. It is an electromagnetic field, but it is non-ionising radiation – it's not strong enough to break chemical bonds, damage DNA, for example [1]. There's a lot of research into the biological effects of radiofrequency, electromagnetic waves and the only reproducible effect that's come out of this research is slight tissue heating [2].

That's it. So there really isn't particularly much of a reason to think that exposure to 5G through our technology is hazardous. There's no evidence of any risk from it, that it causes any actual harm [3].

When you think about it, we're getting bathed by the sun with higher frequency, more intense electromagnetic radiation every day than you're going to get exposed to through 5G!” [4]

Novella is 100% wrong: Particularly *much* of *numerous* reasons to believe exposure to 5G is *massively* hazardous

1. “*It is non-ionising radiation – It's not strong enough to break chemical bonds, damage DNA, for example.*”

University of Aachen EMF Portal, sample literature search for “DNA damage”: [623 articles were found](#); telco Swisscom filed a patent in 2004 on a method and system for reducing electrosmog in wireless local networks that states clearly that WiFi damages DNA (see [this](#)).

2. “*There's a lot of research into the biological effects of radiofrequency, electromagnetic waves and the only reproducible effect that's come out of this research is slight tissue heating.*”

Irradiated: A comprehensive compilation and analysis of the literature on radiofrequency fields and the negative biological impacts of non-ionizing electromagnetic fields (particularly radiofrequency fields) on biological organisms (416 pages; see [this](#)); University of Aachen EMF Portal with 28,000+ studies: see [this](#)). Even the corrupt ICNIRP admits in its 1998 guidelines that “Compared with continuous-wave (CW) radiation, pulsed microwave fields with the same average rate of energy deposition in tissues are *generally more effective in producing a biological response*, especially when there is a well-defined threshold that must be exceeded to elicit the effect (emphasis added; ICNIRP 1996; see [this](#)).

3. *“There’s no evidence of any risk from it, that it causes any actual harm.”*

University of Aachen EMF Portal: The core of the EMF-Portal is an extensive literature database with an inventory of 28,841 publications and 6,390 summaries of individual scientific studies on the effects of electromagnetic fields (see [this](#)).

4. *“We’re getting bathed by the sun with higher frequency, more intense electromagnetic radiation every day than you’re going to get exposed to through 5G!”*

According to Professor Olle Johansson, recently retired from the Karolinska Institute in Sweden, current public exposure to wireless radiation (*before* the addition of 5G) is approximately a quintillion times (1,000,000,000,000,000,000 or 18 zeros) greater than natural, background radiation (see [this](#)).

Natural background radiation is neither pulsed nor modulated, as scientist and co-author of the [5G Space Appeal](#) Arthur Firstenberg explains:

The harm has nothing to do with power levels. This is what nobody understands. Power level is relevant for only one type of effect: heating. For all other effects, it is completely irrelevant. There are effects at near-zero power, and for some effects, there is an inversepower relationship, i.e. the lower the power, the worse the harm. SAR [specific absorption rate, used to express the power absorbed per mass of tissue] is completely irrelevant for non-thermal effects.

It is not the power level that does the harm. It is the degree of coherence, type and depth of modulation, wavelength, number of frequencies, number of signals, bandwidth, shape of the waves, pulse height, pulse width, rise and fall time, and other properties of the radiation. The unimportance of power levels for effects other than heat has been shown many times. In Salford’s studies the lowest power levels caused the most leakage in the blood-brain barrier. Blackman, Bawin, Dutta, Schwartz, and Kunjilwar all in different laboratories, found that calcium efflux from neural and cardiac cells occurred at specific frequencies and exposure levels and did not increase with power. In Dutta’s study a 3,000-fold decrease in power caused a 4-fold increase in calcium efflux. Sadchikova and her Soviet colleagues found that workers exposed to the lowest power levels suffered more often from radio wave sickness. Belyaev found that genetic effects occurred at specific frequencies and the magnitude of the effect did not change with power level over 16 orders of magnitude. The assumption that wireless technology can be made safe by reducing the power is proven wrong.

The presenter sums up the findings of the programme:

“I’ve seen why people are getting so excited about the rollout globally ... But while many feel that 5G is the best thing since sliced bread, there are still those who believe that if the technology continues to be rolled out without the testing they demand, we could all soon be toast!”

Sound distortion is applied as this is delivered; that, plus the trivialisation of “we could soon be toast”, and the intonation implying ridicule of the idea that people can really be so petty-minded as to demand that the national and international laws requiring prior testing, environmental impact assessments and application of the precautionary principle be adhered to.

So there we have it! The BBC programme actually admits that no health or safety testing has been done on 5G, while failing to inform the public that this is actually illegal under EU and international law and under the Nuremberg Code and completely ignores the precautionary principle, which is endorsed by the EU in its resolution 1815 of 2011 (see [this](#)). A legal opinion given by a Danish law firm states that rolling out 5G is illegal under EU and international law (75 pages; see [this](#)):

It is the conclusion of this legal opinion that establishing and activating a 5G-network, as it is currently described, would be in contravention of current human and environmental laws enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, EU regulations, and the Bern- and Bonn-conventions. ... This also applies when the radiation remains within the limits recommended by ICNIRP and currently used in Denmark as well as broadly within the EU.

Programme contributors who are actually qualified and justified in demanding health and safety testing of 5G technology prior to its rollout by virtue of (a) a medical qualification and knowledge of this field of medicine, (b) personal experience of the deleterious effects of wireless technology, and (c) legal knowledge, are portrayed as being unreasonable, unbalanced, petty-minded and extreme. No doubt they will soon be characterised as terrorists – watch this [BBC] space!

By contrast, the pro-5G speakers, who have technical but no medical or scientific qualifications or studies carried out in the field of EMFs, are warmly encouraged to expound their vacuous and valueless opinions on the safety of 5G. Each one speaks after each anti-5G speaker in order to undermine whatever they have said, and together they are allotted double the time given to the anti-5G speakers. Subtle cues including choice of language register, vernacular phrases, trivialisation and disparaging intonation are further employed to undermine the anti-5G speakers.

As Gandhi said, “First they ignore you, then they laugh at you, then they fight you, then you win”. The fake news on 5G emanating from the corrupt telco-industry-funded or -co-opted media outlets in the English-language and foreign media is exposed for what it is: a heavy-handed, pitiful, belated attempt by a greedy telecoms industry – which thought it could roll out 5G on an unsuspecting public without being caught – to compound their contempt for the public by attempting to con them again with blatant lies and manipulation. I have news for you, guys: this genie is not going back in the bottle.

No matter how many times you invite your carefully selected rent-a-sceptic contributors to refute the vast evidence pointing to probable catastrophic consequences from allowing 5G

to be rolled out on Earth, in the stratosphere and in space in order to irradiate every inch of the planet with no escape for anyone of any age or health condition, and even unborn fetuses – a plan described by Professor Emeritus Martin Pall as “the stupidest idea in the history of mankind” – and to assert that this overwhelming body of evidence is not “real”, “proven”, “valid”, “solid”, “convincing”, “conclusive”, or “established”, the public is not going to believe you, BBC.

You can continue blaming the unqualified rejection of 5G by an appalled and outraged public on Russian disinformation in order to deflect attention away from the criminals who planned its rollout and are therefore really responsible for this reckless technological fiasco, but you are on a hiding to nothing.

Your BBC executives, staff and programme contributors had better quickly start adhering to the law and telling the truth or they may soon find themselves held liable for wilful, calculated and malicious conspiracy to aid and abet genocide and ecocide. Top Nazis were hanged for crimes against humanity after the WWII attempted genocide. To my knowledge, no one has yet been tried for conspiracy to commit omnicide. Let us hope that you will forthwith cease and desist from your hubristic and arrogant determination to be among the first.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Claire Edwards, BA Hons, MA, worked for the United Nations as Editor and Trainer in Intercultural Writing from 1999 to 2017. Claire [warned the Secretary-General](#) about the dangers of 5G during a meeting with UN staff in May 2018, calling for a halt to its rollout at UN duty stations. She part-authored, designed, administered the 30 language versions, and edited the entirety of the International Appeal to Stop 5G on Earth and in Space (www.5gspaceappeal.org) and vigorously campaigned to promote it throughout 2019. In January 2020, she severed connection with the Appeal when its administrator, Arthur Firstenberg, joined forces with a third-party group, stop5ginternational, which brought itself into disrepute at its foundation by associating with the Club of Rome/Club of Budapest eugenicist movement. She is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from End of the American Dream

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Claire Edwards](#), Global Research, 2019

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Claire Edwards](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca