

# **A Critique of the New York Times' Coverage on Smartphone Radiation by RF Safe - November 16, 2023**

## **The Crucial Role of Expertise in Scientific Reporting:**

**Introduction** In an era where the dissemination of scientific information is as crucial as the research itself, the role of media in presenting complex scientific issues to the public is of paramount importance. A recent article by the New York Times on the potential health risks of smartphone radiation provides a compelling case study. This post critiques the article, drawing on the expertise of Dr. Dariusz Leszczynski, a renowned expert in the field of electromagnetic radiation and its health implications.

**Highlighting Expertise and Experience** Dr. Dariusz Leszczynski's credentials are formidable. His roles in pivotal discussions on cell phone radiation at the Parliament of Canada and the US Senate, and his participation as an invited expert in the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) Working Group, speak volumes about his expertise. These platforms have not only amplified his voice in the scientific community but also underscored his commitment to public health and safety. His critique of the NYT article carries the weight of years of experience and a deep understanding of the nuances of electromagnetic radiation and its biological effects.

**Contrasting Expertise** The expertise of the scientists quoted in the NYT article, while substantial in their respective fields, does not specifically align with the intricacies of non-ionizing radiation, a key element in understanding the health impacts of smartphone use. Dr. Leszczynski's background in non-ionizing radiation research offers a stark contrast. He underscores the need for media to consult specialists whose expertise is directly relevant to the topic at hand, to avoid oversimplification or misrepresentation of complex scientific matters.

**Insight into Policy and Research** Dr. Leszczynski's contributions extend beyond academic research; his involvement in policy formulation offers a unique perspective on how scientific findings are translated into public health guidelines. His participation in high-level discussions has helped shape policies that balance scientific understanding with practical health recommendations. These experiences provide him with a comprehensive view of the challenges and responsibilities inherent in communicating science to the public.

**Implications for Scientific Journalism** The critique of the NYT article by Dr. Leszczynski brings to light broader issues in scientific journalism. He advocates for a more nuanced approach, where journalists are not just conveyors of information but are also interpreters who understand the complexities of various scientific fields. This involves seeking out the most qualified experts and presenting information in a way that is both accurate and accessible to the general public. It is a delicate balance, one that requires a deep appreciation of the subject matter and a commitment to integrity in reporting.

**Promoting Informed Public Discourse** Dr. Leszczynski's critique is not just about one article; it's a call for a shift in how scientific issues are discussed in the media. He advocates for the inclusion of more qualified experts in media discussions, particularly on topics that have significant public health implications. By bringing experts like Dr. Leszczynski to the forefront, media outlets can foster a more informed and nuanced public discourse, ultimately leading to a better-informed public.

**Conclusion** The critique of the NYT article by Dr. Dariusz Leszczynski is a timely reminder of the critical role that expertise plays in the accurate and responsible reporting of scientific issues. His experience and insights provide a valuable framework for understanding the challenges and responsibilities inherent in scientific journalism. As we navigate an increasingly complex world, where the interpretation and understanding of scientific information are integral to public health and safety, the need for rigorous, expert-informed journalism has never been more essential.

**Read what Dr. Dariusz Leszczynski has to say!**

[New York Times' Caroline Hopkins and scientists interviewed for the story "Do I Need to Worry About Smartphone Radiation?" should be embarrassed](#)

[NYT Story: Do I Need to Worry About Smartphone Radiation?](#)



## **RF Safe's Public Comments on the Potential Risks of Cell Phone Radiation:**

### **Reevaluating NYT Expert Opinions**

In the ongoing discourse about cell phone radiation and its health implications, it's imperative to critically assess the expertise of those who provide public guidance. While the insights from Professors Gayle Woloschak, Emily Caffrey, and Dr. Howard Fine, are valuable, their backgrounds in radiology and medicine primarily involve ionizing radiation, not non-ionizing radiation which is emitted by cell phones. This distinction is crucial in evaluating their perspectives on the safety of cell phone radiation.

1. **Expertise in Relevant Fields:**
  - The field of non-ionizing radiation, particularly as it pertains to RF emissions from cell phones, requires specialized knowledge and research focus. Experts in electromagnetic fields and RF technology might offer more directly relevant insights into the potential biological effects of cell phone radiation.
  -
2. **Revisiting the Non-Ionizing Radiation Safety:**
  - While Prof. Woloschak's assertion that cell phone radiation is not hazardous might align with her expertise in radiology, emerging research in the field of non-ionizing radiation suggests a need for a more nuanced approach. Studies indicating potential non-thermal effects of RF radiation, including DNA damage, call for a reevaluation of these assertions.
  -
3. **Understanding Biological Effects of RF Radiation:**
  - As Prof. Caffrey discusses the use of energy waves in cell phone communication, it's important to acknowledge the advancements in RF radiation research that show biological interactions beyond thermal effects, as demonstrated in treatments like TheraBionic.
  -
4. **Reassessing Cancer Risk Assessments:**
  - The differentiation between ionizing and non-ionizing radiation by Dr. Fine, while grounded in established medical practice, may not fully encompass the complexities of RF radiation effects as suggested by various studies and the IARC's classification of RF fields as possibly carcinogenic.
  -
5. **Advocating for Comprehensive Expertise and Updated Guidelines:**
  - This scenario underscores the necessity of involving interdisciplinary expertise in discussions about cell phone radiation. Experts in fields directly studying non-ionizing RF radiation are better positioned to provide comprehensive assessments. Furthermore, it highlights the need for updated public health guidelines that integrate the latest findings in RF radiation research.

While the contributions of Professors Woloschak and Caffrey, and Dr. Fine are acknowledged, their expertise in radiology and medicine predominantly related to ionizing radiation do not fully address the complexities of non-ionizing RF radiation from cell phones. A more inclusive approach, incorporating insights from a broader range of experts, is essential for a well-rounded understanding of the potential health risks associated with cell phone radiation.

## **RF Safe**

Be RF Safe