

May 6, 2020
Ms. Ruth Zowdu
Managing Editor
CBC News
Sent via email: ruth.zowdu@cbc.ca

Subject: Need for a balanced report versus the CBC report *Why are people attacking 5G mobile phone masts?*

Dear. Ms. Zowdu

We believe the report aired on May 2nd, *Why are people attacking 5G mobile phone masts?* does not meet the journalistic standards we expect and rely on from CBC News.

We request that you review the material we present here on 5G and pre-5G radiation, and subsequently broadcast a truly balanced story.

First, we want to make clear that we do not believe that 5G causes COVID 19 and that we condemn the burning of 5G towers and similar acts of violence.

To briefly provide you with our credentials, ABM is a physician-epidemiologist who worked on the monograph prepared by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) when it classified non-ionizing radiofrequency radiation (RF) as a 2B *possible* carcinogen. ABM has since written an update, published in a scientific peer-reviewed journal, providing the rationale for raising the classification to that of a Group 1, *known* carcinogen¹. Tobacco and asbestos are classified in Group 1. A balanced report would have mentioned that in 2019, IARC agreed that, based on new evidence, non-ionizing RF radiation should be a high priority for re-evaluation of the classification.²

FC is former president of Microsoft Canada and now CEO of the non-profit organization Canadians for Safe Technology³.

The May 2nd report lacked balance and downplayed many aspects of the serious concerns about this technology. We would like to direct you to the article written about 5G and the burning of towers (masts) by our colleague, Dr. Devra Davis, an epidemiologist with outstanding credentials. Dr. Davis, among other notable accomplishments, helped to have lead removed from gasoline and smoking banned from planes:

Burning 5G Towers Across Europe is Harming Health, Wildlife And The Climate

<https://www.ibtimes.com/burning-5g-towers-across-europe-harming-health-wildlife-climate-2961326>

This article outlines other factors that may lead some to the misguided destruction of 5G towers.

¹ Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102)<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0013935118303475?via%3Dihub>

² https://monographs.iarc.fr/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/IARCMonographs-AGReport-Priorities_2020-2024.pdf

³ c4st.org

There are many compounds in IARC Group 2B. Mentioned in your program were pickled vegetables and talc powder. These pickled vegetables are a specific type of Asian pickles. IARC makes an important distinction in its classification of talc powder and perineal use. In either case, we do not expose ourselves and our children constantly to these products, as will happen with radiation from 5G small antennas by our homes. Including references to engine exhaust (gasoline) and welding fumes would have been more comparable.

Your report disparages concerns about placing the cell phone against the head when cell phones were first introduced. The facts now show this is a realistic concern.⁴ The statement that tissue must be heated to be harmed has also been disproven. The discussion about non-ionizing radiation not being harmful is not correct. Hundreds of peer-reviewed scientific publications describe biological effects and harms with exposures far below Canada's limits (based on heating tissue), in humans, plants, laboratory animals and wildlife such as birds and pollinators;^{5,6,7,8}

The references to intensity and power levels are true from a physics point of view, but not very relevant. Biologists and epidemiologists are the experts raising concerns about the harmful effects from wireless radiation from non-ionizing RF radiation. Wireless transmitters emit RF radiation, which is scientifically demonstrated to cause or contribute to numerous health effects including cancers,^{9,10} sperm damage,¹¹ reproductive harms,¹² learning and memory deficits,¹³ and neurodegenerative, cellular and genetic damage.^{14,15,16}

⁴ Comments from the Russian group on Repacholi et al. "An international project to confirm soviet era results on immunological and teratological effects of RF field exposure in wistar rats and comments on Grigoriev et al. [2010]" <https://doi.org/10.3892/ijo.2018.4606>

⁵ Russell, C. L. (2018). 5 G wireless telecommunications expansion: Public health and environmental implications. *Environmental Research*, 165, 484–495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.016>

⁶ BioInitiative 2012 Report. (2012). A rationale for biologically based exposure standards for low-intensity electromagnetic radiation. Sections 5-11,14,15,20. C. Sage, and D.O. Carpenter (Eds) *BioInitiative Working Group*. <https://bioinitiative.org/>

⁷ Lázaro, A., A. Chroni, T. Tschulin, J. Devalez, C. Matsoukas, and T. Petanidou. "Electromagnetic Radiation of Mobile Telecommunication Antennas Affects the Abundance and Composition of Wild Pollinators." *Journal of Insect Conservation* 20, no. 2 (April 26, 2016): 315–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-016-9868-8>

⁸ Miller, A. B., Sears, M. E., Morgan, L. L., Davis, D. L., Hardell, L., Oremus, M., & Soskolne, C. L. (2019). Risks to Health and Well-Being From Radio-Frequency Radiation Emitted by Cell Phones and Other Wireless Devices. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00223>

⁹ Miller, A. B., Morgan, L. L., Udasin, I., & Davis, D. L. (2018). Cancer epidemiology update, following the 2011 IARC evaluation of radiofrequency electromagnetic fields (Monograph 102). *Environmental Research*, 167, 673–683. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.06.043>

¹⁰ Hardell, L., & Carlberg, M. (2018). Comments on the US National Toxicology Program technical reports on toxicology and carcinogenesis study in rats exposed to whole-body radiofrequency radiation at 900 MHz and in mice exposed to whole-body radiofrequency radiation at 1,900 MHz. *International Journal of Oncology*. <https://doi.org/10.3892/ijo.2018.4606>

¹¹ Houston, B. J., Nixon, B., King, B. V., De Luliis, G. N., & Aitken, R. J. (2016). The effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation on sperm function. *Reproduction (Cambridge, England)*, 152(6), R263–R276. <https://doi.org/10.1530/REP-16-0126>

¹² Magras, I. N., & Xenos, T. D. (1997). RF radiation-induced changes in the prenatal development of mice. *Bioelectromagnetics*, 18(6), 455–461. <https://bit.ly/2wPRfTL>

To highlight the proposed 5G connection to the Coronavirus is inappropriate. Even the doctor you quoted said he hadn't researched the facts and it was only a theory that connected 5G, impacts on the immune system and the Coronavirus. All the scientists involved suggest this is a very early theory that needs much work.

As of April 30, 2020, 253 EMF scientists from 44 nations have signed an appeal to the WHO and United Nations member states¹⁷ expressing their concerns about the effects of wireless radiation on humans, including 5G. These scientists have published over 2,000 studies on non-ionizing radiation in the peer-reviewed literature. The 5G Appeal¹⁸ was prepared by scientists and doctors who are urgently calling for the EU to halt the roll out of 5G due to serious potential health effects from this new technology. As of April 29, 2020, 361 scientists and medical doctors have signed the appeal. The BioInitiative Group¹⁹ has reviewed 1,800 studies that show harm to humans and our environment from wireless radiation without heating tissue.

Statements on your program such as "there is no scientific evidence any of this is true" and "dangerous lies" are false. Other statements such as "a new toy to play with" and "it won't kill you" said in mocking tones do not belong in a report as serious as 5G and its potential harmful effects on humans and our environment. There is published scientific research on this topic that we would be happy to review with you if you are serious about reporting on the issue of why people are concerned about 5G.

5G has not undergone any long-term health safety testing. That is not disputable. What we know about the pre 5G frequencies (2G, 3G and 4G) is of great concern. 5G will use these pre 5G frequencies as well as others not widely used previously for modern day devices such as cell phones. A well-balanced program of 5G fully exploring the health issues would be timely, and we urge you to consider another program in this topic.

We would be glad to be interviewed in a program on 5G and health risks. Please contact us for more information or for suggestions on others you could interview.

¹³ Aldad, T. S., Gan, G., Gao, X.-B., & Taylor, H. S. (2012). Fetal radiofrequency radiation exposure from 800-1900 mhz-rated cellular telephones affects neurodevelopment and behavior in mice. *Scientific Reports*, 2, 312. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep00312>

¹⁴ Panagopoulos, D. J. (2019). Comparing DNA damage induced by mobile telephony and other types of man-made electromagnetic fields. *Mutation Research/Reviews in Mutation Research*, 781, 53–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mrrev.2019.03.003>

¹⁵ National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. (2018). Toxicology and carcinogenesis studies in Hsd: Sprague Dawley SD rats exposed to whole-body radio frequency radiation at a frequency (900 MHz) and modulations (GSM and CDMA) used by cell phones. *NTP Technical Report 595*, 384.

¹⁶ National Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Sciences. (2018). Toxicology and carcinogenesis studies in B6C3F1/n mice exposed to whole-body radio frequency radiation at a frequency (1,900 mHz) and modulations (GSM and CDMA) used by cell phones. *NTP Technical Report 596*, 260.

¹⁷ International EMF Scientists Appeal. <https://www.emfscientist.org/>

¹⁸ <http://www.5gappeal.eu/about/>

¹⁹ <https://bioinitiative.org/>

Yours sincerely,



Dr. Anthony B. Miller

136 Charles Street,

Port Hope, ON,

L1A 1T3



Frank Clegg

Canadians For Safe Technology

P. O. Box PO Box 33

Maple Grove Village Postal Outlet

Oakville, ON, L6J 7P5

Dr. Miller, Professor Emeritus at the Dalla Lana School of Public Health of the University of Toronto, is a physician epidemiologist specializing in cancer etiology, prevention, and screening. He has been a longtime advisor to the WHO and was Senior Epidemiologist at the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). He served as Director of the Epidemiology Unit of the National Cancer Institute of Canada and Chair of the Department of Preventive Medicine and Biostatistics at the University of Toronto. He has been awarded the Medal of Honour by the WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer, and in 2019 was named a Member of the Order of Canada.

Frank Clegg has spent his 40 career in the technology industry, most recently as President of Microsoft Canada. He cofounded Canadians for Safe Technology. C4ST is a volunteer coalition of parents, scientists and citizens whose mission is to educate Canadians and policy makers about the dangers of exposures to unsafe levels of radiofrequency/microwave radiation from commonly used wireless devices and cellular antennas and to provide information on how to use wireless devices more safely. C4ST works with all levels of government to create healthier communities for children and families.