

## Biological Hazards of Wireless Radiation – Executive Summary

The FCC's standards for wireless radiation were established back in 1996, and have not been reviewed, updated or verified despite significant changes in the wireless technology in use today. The FCC's standards relate solely to wireless radiation's thermal impacts on a body (e.g. how the body reacts to being heated), and do not consider other known adverse biological impacts of non-thermal levels of RF radiation (such as damage to DNA or other changes to cells). The FCC's limits were established long before the existence of 2G, 3G, 4G, or 5G technology.

Congress eliminated the EPA's funding for electromagnetic research in 1996, knee capping the EPA from studying biological impacts of RF radiation for nearly 30 years. *At the very least, the FCC's standards should be reconsidered (FCC is under federal court order to do so, but has not) given current technology.*

**Wireless radiation, also referred to as radio frequency (RF) radiation, produces biological effects and evidence of its hazards are clear and convincing, yet the hazards are not generally publicized, and the hazards are unnecessary to reap the benefits of wireless technology.**

- **Industry Funded Research** – The wireless industry has funded studies that show adverse biological impacts. A 1990s \$28.5 million study found that RF radiation produces biological effects that are potentially hazardous to humans in ways that have nothing to do with heated tissue. A 2000 study for a major telecom carrier found RF radiation has links to cancer, neurological disorders and cognitive impairment. Insurance companies will not insure for personal injury from RF radiation, reflecting their concerns about the possible magnitude of their liability, e.g., that 5G is a high, “off the leash” risk.
- **Reports from Federal Agencies** – A 2018 \$30 million US National Toxicology Program (NTP) study found “clear evidence of cancer” in lab rats from wireless radiation. In 2019, the FCC admitted that RF radiation can have non-thermal impacts on humans, but it has conducted no studies to determine what those impacts might be or what changes should be made to its RF radiation emission limits. In 2021, the DC Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in *Environmental Health Trust, et al v. FCC* that the FCC's lack of action was arbitrary and capricious for failing to review its emission standards in light of new science and current technology and that it should consider non-cancer health impacts of wireless radiation. So far, the FCC has failed to comply with the Court order. As early as 1971, the US Naval Medical Research Academy concluded from 2300 studies that RF radiation, including millimeter (e.g. 5G), are linked to cardiac, neurological and other disorders.
- **Independent Studies** – Several major independent studies have concluded biological effects from RF radiation, including by the Int'l Agency on Research on Cancer (IARC) of the World Health Organization in 2011 (classifying wireless radiation as a Class 2B carcinogen), the Ramazzini Institute in 2018 (clear evidence of cancer in lab rats, corroborating the NTP's results) and the New Hampshire Commission in 2020 (all forms of wireless radiation are harmful). The American Academy of Pediatrics warns that children are disproportionately affected by cell phone radiation. Studies concluded increased risk for ADHD, delayed motor skills, diabetes and demyelination of fetuses' brain neurons.
- **Chronic Diseases and Clusters near Cell Towers** – Illnesses near cell towers, e.g., nausea, rashes, stroke, atrial fibrillation and a variety of cancers, have been documented near Duluth, MN (51 strokes), Pittsfield, MA (17 residents fell ill and many evacuated, one resident who remained died), Rippon, CA (4 children and 4 teachers developed cancer; one child died) and Eagle, ID (atrial fibrillations from 5G cell towers).

## BIOLOGICAL HAZARDS OF WIRELESS RADIATION -- SOME HIGHLIGHTS March 3, 2025

*“The evidence presented to the Board includes well over one thousand peer-reviewed scientific and medical studies which consistently find that pulsed and modulated RFR has bio-effects and can lead to short- and long-term adverse health effects in humans, either directly or by aggravating other existing medical conditions. Credible, independent peer-reviewed scientific and medical studies show profoundly deleterious effects on human health, including but not limited to: neurological and dermatological effects; increased risk of cancer and brain tumors; DNA damage; oxidative stress; immune dysfunction; cognitive processing effects; altered brain development, sleep and memory disturbances, ADHD, abnormal behavior, sperm dysfunction, and damage to the blood-brain barrier.”<sup>1</sup>*

~ Board of Health, Pittsfield, MA, Emergency Cease & Desist Order to remove cell tower that was sickening 17 residents simultaneously.

### What the Industry Knows About the Biological Hazards of RF Radiation:

1. **Industry Funded Research Finds Biological Effects.** A 1990s research program funded by the wireless industry at \$28.5 million under the independent non-profit, Wireless Technology Research, LLC (WTR), found that wireless radiation (i.e., non-thermal radiation) is **biologically active producing biological effects and potentially hazardous to human health.**<sup>2</sup> That means the radiation does not need to heat human tissue. (Note that the FCC limits only account for thermal, not non-thermal, adverse effects.)
  - a) The research was peer-reviewed with scientific oversight by both an independent Peer Review Board at the Harvard School of Public Health and a U.S. Government Interagency Working Group, chaired by the FDA, and including EPA, OSHA, NIOSH, CDC, FCC, and NIH.<sup>3</sup>
  - b) Abruptly after these findings, the EPA was defunded from doing any further research on the biological effects of wireless radiation.<sup>4</sup>
  
2. **Industry Commissioned Study Finds Biological Effects.** A study in 2000 commissioned by a major telecom carrier found links to cancer, leukemia, neurological disorders and cognitive impairment, with special caution for children and an acknowledgement of those already disabled from the radiation.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://ehtrust.org/cease-and-desist-order-against-verizon-cell-tower-by-board-of-health-pittsfield-ma/>, see below the fold for link to the Order at 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> “Whereas” clause, paragraph #1.

<sup>2</sup> Wireless Phones and Health II: State of the Science 2002 Edition, edited by George L. Carlo; Wireless Phones and Health: Scientific Progress, edited by George L. Carlo.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Overpowered, What Science Tells Us About the Dangers of Cell Phones and Other WiFi-Age Devices, Martin Blank, PhD, 2014 at 110-112.

<sup>5</sup> T-Mobil Deutsche Telekom commissioned study by the Ecolog-Institute, April 2000, “Mobile Telecommunications and Health Review of the Current Scientific Research in View of Precautionary Health Protection,” <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/ecolog2000.pdf>.

3. **Industry Patents Point to Health Risks.** Telecom and cell phone manufacturers have filed patents to reduce the level of wireless exposure tied directly to health risks such as neurological disorders and cancer.<sup>6</sup>
4. **Risk Warnings of Litigation.** Industry annual reports warn their shareholders of litigation risk from potential personal injury claims from RF radiation and potential financial losses.<sup>7</sup>
5. **RF Radiation is a Pollutant.** The telecom industry characterizes RF radiation as a pollutant in their device protection plans and disclaim insurance liability.<sup>8</sup>
6. **Insurance Companies Exclude Injury Coverage for RF Radiation.** Insurance companies such as Lloyd’s of London will not insure for personal injury from RF radiation because of the high risk of claims, with Swiss Re characterizing “5G” as “high,” “off-the-leash” risk.<sup>9</sup>
7. **No 5G Pre-Market Testing.** Telecom executives during a Feb. 2019 Senate hearing confirmed no industry pre-market testing of 5G for public health or safety. Sen. Blumenthal (CT) criticized the FCC and FDA for inadequate answers on questions of public health, and concluded, “We’re kind of flying blind here as far as health and safety is concerned.”<sup>10</sup>
8. **“Why Tech Leaders Don’t Let Their Kids Use Tech.”**<sup>11</sup> The article reports that technology executives restrict or forbid their children’s use of the very technology that they are providing to the public, including “the makers of smartphones and tablets, of social media channels and game boxes.” Technology “titans” such as former Apple’s Steve Jobs and Bill and Melinda Gates have admitted to placing restrictions on their children’s use of technology. Chris Anderson, former Wired magazine

---

<sup>6</sup> Swisscom patent, 2004 at <https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/nwdfklq7r7j2wwsipv7ws/SwissCom-Patent-application-2003-2004-WO2004075583A1-1-1.pdf?rlkey=liuy6175hamj24lbuszpe7vux&st=5p2oy0ji&dl=0>; “Manufacturers Own Patents to Cut Radiation,” RCR Wireless, June 4, 2001 at <https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/Orfwys743dgeqipfwu3ua/Manufacturer-own-patents-to-cut-radiation-RCR-Wireless-News.pdf?rlkey=e5hm46nyp9an6ugu4y005ldm3&st=xr7ocreh&dl=0>.

<sup>7</sup> AT&T, Inc., 2021 Annual Report, <https://investors.att.com/~media/Files/A/ATT-IR-V2/financial-reports/annual-reports/2021/complete-2021-annual-report.pdf> at 41.

Verizon’s 2021 U.S. SEC Form 10–K at 17, <https://www.verizon.com/about/sites/default/files/2020-Annual-Report-on-Form-10-K.PDF>.

<sup>8</sup> Exclusions of loss from electromagnetic radiation from insurance coverage:

- Verizon, Sec B “Exclusions,” Subsection 16 “Pollution,” <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/device-protection-brochure-nationwide.pdf>;
- AT&T, Sec II “Exclusions,” Subsection H. Loss from “Pollutants,” Sec IX.T. Definition of “Pollutants,” <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/ATT-Multi-Device-Protection-Pack-Insurance.pdf>;
- Sprint, Sec II “Exclusions,” Subsection H. Loss from “Pollutants,” Sec IX.P. Definition of “Pollutants,” <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Sprint-Insurance-Terms-and-Conditions-Downloaded-2019.pdf>.

<sup>9</sup> <https://ehtrust.org/key-issues/electromagnetic-field-insurance-policy-exclusions/>.

<sup>10</sup> <https://ehtrust.org/health-effects-of-5g-wireless-technology-confirmed-at-us-senate-hearing-after-senator-blumenthal-questions-industry/>; see also, <https://mdsafetech.org/2019/02/13/no-research-on-5g-safety-senator-blumenthal-question-answered/>.

<sup>11</sup> “Why Tech Leaders Don’t Let Their Kids Use Tech,” <https://kidzu.co/health-wellbeing/why-tech-leaders-dont-let-their-kids-use-tech/>.

editor and CEO of 3D Robotics, said that his kids “accuse me and my wife of being fascists and overly concerned about tech, and they say that none of their friends have the same rules. That’s because we have seen the dangers of technology firsthand. I’ve seen it in myself, I don’t want to see that happen to my kids.”<sup>12</sup>

## What Federal Agencies Know About the Biological Effects of Wireless Radiation and Have Disregarded:

1. **Food and Drug Administration (FDA).** The U.S. National Toxicology Program’s (NTP) 2018 report concluded **clear evidence of cancer** in lab rats from wireless radiation (similar to 2G and 3G cell phones).<sup>13</sup> NTP found malignant heart schwannomas and malignant brain gliomas.<sup>14</sup> NTP is one of the most prestigious toxicology institutions in the world. In 1999, the FDA had nominated the NTP to conduct a \$30 million study of RF radiation “with a high priority,” to conduct animal studies, stating that it was “not scientifically possible to guarantee that non-thermal levels of microwave radiation . . . will not cause long-term adverse health effects.”<sup>15</sup>
  - a) Dr. Linda Birnbaum, former NIH and NTP director, has stated: “Every agent known to cause cancer in humans will also produce it in animals when adequately tested.”<sup>16</sup> “Overall, the NTP findings demonstrate the potential for RFR **to cause cancer in humans.**”<sup>17</sup> [Emphasis added.]
2. **Federal Communications Commission (FCC).**
  - a) The FCC admitted in 2019 that at least some types of RF radiation can cause instantaneous non-thermal adverse effects with RF radiation frequencies ranging between 3 KHz and 10 MHz.<sup>18</sup> The FCC averages exposure levels over 30 minutes,<sup>19</sup> which completely obscures the

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> See letter of Dr. Birnbaum, former NIH and NTP Director, and hyperlinked amicus brief <https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/nc7l00p8zxc8tj0l2a1yr/Dr.-Linda-Birnbaum-cell-tower-letter.pdf?rlkey=vq1i363i74umg9ybydrrhmn5d&st=q9l49h88&dl=0> ; see also, <https://ehtrust.org/former-niehs-director-dr-linda-birnbaum-interviewed-about-cell-phone-radiation/>.

<sup>14</sup> <https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/whatwestudy/topics/cellphones#studies> *Environmental Health Trust, et al v. FCC*, Motion for Leave to File Brief of Amicus Curiae Joseph Sandri in Support of Petitioners Urging Reversal, Aug. 5, 2020, <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/20-1025-Amicus-Brief-Joe-Sandri.pdf>.

<sup>15</sup> Note that the following letter is no longer available at the below URL, although it was originally accessed from there. Letter from the Dept of Health and Human Services to the National Toxicology Program at the National Institute for Environmental Health Studies, May 19, 1999, [https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/sites/default/files/ntp/htdocs/chem\\_background/exsumpdf/wireless051999\\_508.pdf](https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/sites/default/files/ntp/htdocs/chem_background/exsumpdf/wireless051999_508.pdf).

<sup>16</sup> Dr. Birnbaum’s statement in Attorney Joe Sandri’s Amicus Brief filed 8-5-2020 in connection with *Environmental Health Trust, et al v. FCC*, <https://ehtrust.org/fcc-amicus-briefs/> (below the fold, right column) at 9.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, 11.

<sup>18</sup> Proposed Changes in the Commission’s Rule Regarding Human Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields, 34 FCC Rcd 11687, 11743-11745, ¶¶122- 124 & nn. 322-335 (2019).

<sup>19</sup> 47 CFR 1.1307(b)(2): “Time-averaging period is a time period not to exceed 30 minutes for fixed RF sources or a time period inherent from device transmission characteristics not to exceed 30 minutes for mobile and portable RF sources,” [https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-47/chapter-I/subchapter-A/part-1/subpart-I/section-1.1307#p-1.1307\(b\)](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-47/chapter-I/subchapter-A/part-1/subpart-I/section-1.1307#p-1.1307(b)).

effects of the constant peaking and pulsations of RF radiation which causes adverse health effects, and does not account for 24/7 exposure by the population.<sup>20</sup>

- b) The FCC received in its docket, when requesting public comment on the adequacy of its 1996 RF radiation emission limits, 11,000 pages of peer-reviewed, scientific studies showing biological effects from RF radiation and a couple hundred personal submissions of injury. When the FCC closed the docket, it declined to update its limits. The FCC was sued and in 2021 the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled against the FCC and remanded the case back to the FCC because the FCC failed to provide a reasoned explanation for not updating its limits and ignoring the current science.<sup>21</sup> The FCC has not yet complied.

3. **A U.S. Naval Medical Academy Research** report from 1971 by Dr. Zory Glaser<sup>22</sup> linked 23 chronic diseases to RF radiation based on over 2300 studies.<sup>23</sup> A Feb 2025 report correlates Dr. Glaser's findings from 1971 of biological effects of RF radiation and millimeter wave (5G) technology to reported cases of chronic disease.<sup>24</sup> The 2025 report states that Dr. Glaser reported biological effects and diseases related to the central and autonomic nervous systems, genetic / chromosomal, vascular, blood, metabolic, endocrine and gastrointestinal disorders.<sup>25</sup> In 1976, Dr. Glaser updated the total bibliography to 3700 reports relating to the biological effects of RF radiation.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Human-made electromagnetic fields: Ion forced-oscillation and voltage-gated ion channel dysfunction, oxidative stress and DNA damage (Review) (2021) Pangopolous DJ, et al. International Journal of Oncology. August 23, 2021. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34617575/>.

Computational modeling investigation of pulsed high peak power microwaves and the potential for traumatic brain injury. Sci Adv. 2021 Oct; 7(44). <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8555891/>. "These studies reveal that the MAE threshold depends on the energy in a single pulse (not the average power density) for sufficiently short pulses [e.g., 32 μs in (46)], and peak power densities of 102 to 105 mW/cm<sup>2</sup> have been known to cause auditory effects in human participants (45)."

"Diplomats' Mystery Illness and Pulsed Radiofrequency/Microwave Radiation," Dr. Beatrice Golomb. Neural Comput. 2018 Nov; 30(11):2882-2985. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30183509/>; "Reported facts appear consistent with pulsed RF/MW as the source of injury in affected diplomats."

"5G: Great risk for EU, U.S. and International Health! Compelling Evidence for Eight Distinct Types of Great Harm Caused by Electromagnetic Field (EMF) Exposures and the Mechanism that Causes Them," Martin L. Pall, PhD, <https://peaceinspace.blogs.com/files/5g-emf-hazards--dr-martin-l.-pall--eu-emf2018-6-11us3.pdf>.

Belyaev, I., Dean, A., Eger, H. et al. "EUROPAEM EMF Guideline 2016 for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of EMF-related health problems and illnesses." Rev environ Health. 2016;31(3):363-397. Doi:10.1515/reveh-2016-0011.

B. W. G. (2012). "Bioinitiative Report 2012: A Rationale for Biologically-based Exposure Standards for Low-Intensity Electromagnetic Radiation."

<sup>21</sup> <https://media.cadc.uscourts.gov/opinions/docs/2021/08/20-1025-1910111.pdf>

<sup>22</sup> About Dr. Zory Glaser, <https://zoryglaser.com/>.

<sup>23</sup> [https://www.magdahavas.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/Navy\\_Radiowave\\_Brief.pdf](https://www.magdahavas.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/Navy_Radiowave_Brief.pdf).

<sup>24</sup> Report: "Safety of Wireless Radiation, a Scientific View, Feb 2025, Richard Lear and Camilla Rees, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388763046\\_Safety\\_of\\_Wireless\\_Technologies\\_The\\_Scientific\\_View](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388763046_Safety_of_Wireless_Technologies_The_Scientific_View) at 12-13.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid at 3.

<sup>26</sup> <https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/Naval-MRI-Glaser-Report-1976.pdf>.

4. **Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).** In 2012, the CIA declassified and approved for release a 1977 Russian study on the “Biological Effects of Millimeter Radiowaves” which found that while millimeter waves only penetrate the skin, they trigger a cascade of adverse biological effects within the body.<sup>27</sup>
  - a) The study coins the term “**radiowave disease**” to describe these effects.<sup>28</sup> Adverse effects on the skin included demyelination of sections of nerve fibers (damage or destruction to the insulation around nerve fibers which disrupts normal nerve impulse transmission), fragmented neural conductors, and deformation of sensory receptors, leading to neurological disorders.
  - b) The people observed working with millimeter radio wave generators had disturbances in their blood and immuno-biology.<sup>29</sup>
  - c) Exposure in lab animals caused many disorders including of the liver, spleen, heart and brain, inhibiting “oxygen consumption rate by the mitochondria of those organs.”<sup>30</sup>
  - d) The degree of adverse effects **increased with more exposure**;<sup>31</sup> the lab animals had been exposed for 15 minutes a day for 60 days. When exposure ceases, apparently disorders from low millimeter radio waves are reversible.<sup>32</sup> However, if adverse effects depend on duration of exposure, then Americans exposed continuously 24/7, 365 days a year, would suffer adverse biological effects, but without reprieve and without the ability to recover.
  
5. **Chronology of Federal Agencies** expressing since at least the 1990s that the FCC’s wireless limits address only thermal (heating of human tissue), not non-thermal exposure, of RF radiation,<sup>33</sup> despite the fact that non-thermal exposure produces biological effects and disease.

#### **Independent Research on Biological Effects of RF Radiation, Disregarded by Federal Agencies:**

1. **The World Health Organization’s (WHO) International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC)** classified wireless radiation (2G and 3G) as a **Class 2B possible human carcinogen** in 2011,<sup>34</sup> (similar to lead, diesel fuel and gasoline engine exhaust). This was based on “epidemiological observations in humans which exhibited higher risks for the glioma-type of malignant brain cancer and of benign vestibular schwannoma of the vestibulocochlear nerve among heavy or long-term subscribers of cell or mobile phones.”<sup>35</sup>
  - a. “[R]esults from animal experiments that the IARC was lacking were later provided by the U.S. National Toxicology Program (NTP) report of two types of cancers in laboratory rats that were

---

<sup>27</sup> <https://mdsafetech.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/biological-effects-of-millimeter-wavelengths.-zalyubovskaya-declassif-by-cia-1977-biol-eff-mm-waves.pdf>.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid at 57.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid at 60.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid at 59.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid at 59.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid at 58.

<sup>33</sup> <https://ehtrust.org/timeline-of-development-of-safety-limits-for-wireless-radiation-in-us/>.

<sup>34</sup> [https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208\\_E.pdf](https://www.iarc.who.int/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/pr208_E.pdf).

<sup>35</sup> J. C. Lin, "RF Health Safety Limits and Recommendations [Health Matters]," in IEEE Microwave Magazine, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 18-77, June 2023, doi: 10.1109/MMM.2023.3255659. keywords: {Radiation detectors;Human factors;Safety;Radiation effects;Cellular phones;Radio frequency}.

exposed, lifelong, to 2G and 3G cell phone RF radiation frequencies below 6 GHz . . . did not exceed 1°C,”<sup>36</sup> i.e., did not heat tissue.

- b. Since the WHO 2011 IARC cancer finding by independent scientists, other factions within the WHO have sought to produce industry-aligned pronouncements. For example, its website states a lack of causality of harm from wireless radiation<sup>37</sup>. However, over a decade later, a number of the IARC scientists are saying the opposite – that radiofrequency should be upgraded to a group 1 carcinogen (the highest level of evidence).<sup>38</sup> Dr. Miller, a former Senior Epidemiologist and Senior Scientist at the IARC has stated, “[t]here is sufficient evidence to now classify radiofrequency radiation as a human carcinogen.”<sup>39</sup>
- i. The WHO recently commissioned a study by Karpidis, et al, which concluded in 2024 no hazards from wireless radiation,<sup>40</sup> however, the study has been found to be severely flawed with no scientifically valid assessment,<sup>41</sup> and its conclusion contradicted scientific evidence and was drawn from data showing hazards.<sup>42</sup> Researchers have called for a retraction of the study.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> J. C. Lin, "RF Health Safety Limits and Recommendations [Health Matters]," in IEEE Microwave Magazine, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 18-77, June 2023, doi: 10.1109/MMM.2023.3255659. keywords: {Radiation detectors;Human factors;Safety;Radiation effects;Cellular phones;Radio frequency}.

<sup>37</sup> <https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/radiation-5g-mobile-networks-and-health>.

<sup>38</sup> Hardell, L., Carlberg, M."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 54, no. 1 (2019): 111-127. <https://doi.org/10.3892/ijo.2018.4606>

<sup>39</sup> Professor Miller, MD, FRCP, FRCP (C), FFPH, FACE, is an eminent physician and expert in preventative medicine, a scientific advisor to various scientific and health authorities, and a former Senior Epidemiologist and Senior Scientist at the World Health Organization's (WHO) International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), <https://phiremedical.org/2020-nir-consensus-statement-press-release/>; see Prof. Miller's statement at 00:15:06 at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S16QI6-w9I8>; see also Proceedings from a Symposium on the Impacts of Wireless Technology on Health, Prof. Miller at 8, [https://www.womenscollegehospital.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Symposium\\_Document\\_Final\\_Jan\\_12.pdf](https://www.womenscollegehospital.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Symposium_Document_Final_Jan_12.pdf).

<sup>40</sup> K. Karipidis, D. Baaken, T. Loney, M. Blettner, C. Brzozek, M. Elwood, C. Narh, N. Orsini, M. Rössli, M.S. Paulo, S. Lagorio, The effect of exposure to radiofrequency fields on cancer risk in the general and working population: A systematic review of human observational studies - Part I: Most researched outcomes Environ Int., 191 (2024), Article 108983, 10.1016/j.envint.2024.108983.

<sup>41</sup> John W. Frank, Joel M. Moskowitz, Ronald L. Melnick, Lennart Hardell, Alasdair Philips, Paul Héroux, Elizabeth Kelley, *The Systematic Review on RF-EMF Exposure and Cancer by Karipidis et al. (2024) has Serious Flaws that Undermine the Validity of the Study's Conclusions*, Environment International, Vol. 195, 2025, 109200, ISSN 0160-4120, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2024.109200>.

(<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160412024007876>)

<sup>42</sup> "WHO to build neglect of RF-EMF exposure hazards on flawed EHC reviews? Case study demonstrates how 'no hazards' conclusion is drawn from data showing hazards," 7/10/24, <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/reveh-2024-0089/html>;

"WHO's EMF Project's Systemic Reviews on the Association between RF Exposure and Health Effects Encounter Challenges," James Lin, IEEE Microwave Magazine, Jan 2025,

[https://www.dropbox.com/sc/fi/xq492i5ha6f2431vyxn3g/World\\_Health\\_Organizations\\_EMF\\_Projects\\_Systemic\\_Reviews\\_on\\_the\\_Association\\_Between\\_RF\\_Exposure\\_and\\_Health\\_Effects\\_Encounter\\_Challenges\\_Health\\_Matters.pdf?rlkey=o77i19den485rdo2k4ktdzhgi&st=842p0rbv&dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/sc/fi/xq492i5ha6f2431vyxn3g/World_Health_Organizations_EMF_Projects_Systemic_Reviews_on_the_Association_Between_RF_Exposure_and_Health_Effects_Encounter_Challenges_Health_Matters.pdf?rlkey=o77i19den485rdo2k4ktdzhgi&st=842p0rbv&dl=0).

<sup>43</sup> Lennart Hardell, Mona Nilsson. A Critical Analysis of the World Health Organization (WHO) Systematic Review 2024 on Radiofrequency Radiation Exposure and Cancer Risks. Journal of Cancer Science and Clinical Therapeutics. 9 (2025): 09-

- ii. Potential conflict of interest: note that the Karpidis study was done by the WHO's EMF Project, not by the IARC, the latter being an advisory group consisting of 29 scientists from 18 countries.<sup>44</sup>
  - iii. Another WHO study in 2024 on RF-induced oxidative stress identified 11,599 studies on oxidative stress within the 800-2450 MHz range, but discarded more than 99% of those studies.<sup>45</sup> Researchers have called for a retraction of the study.<sup>46</sup>
2. **The Ramazzini Institute** in Italy in 2018 found increased malignant heart schwannomas and malignant brain gliomas in lab animals from cell tower base stations, similar to what the NTP found from 2G/3G.<sup>47</sup>

**Note:** "Since the IARC evaluation in 2011, the evidence on human cancer risks from RF radiation has been strengthened based on human cancer epidemiology reports [IARC Class 2B designation for RF radiation], animal carcinogenicity studies [NTP study finding clear evidence of cancer] and experimental findings on oxidative mechanisms [associated with increased DNA damage]<sup>48</sup> and genotoxicity [associated with increased DNA damage]<sup>49</sup>. Therefore, the IARC Category should be upgraded from Group 2B to Group 1, a human carcinogen<sup>50</sup>."<sup>51</sup> [Some internal footnotes omitted]

3. **International Commission on the Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields (ICBE-EMF).** "Scientific evidence invalidates health assumptions underlying the FCC and ICNIRP exposure limit determinations for radiofrequency radiation: implications for 5G."<sup>52</sup>
- a. The FCC wireless radiation limits for human exposure are based **largely** on 1980s experiments "involving 40-60 minute exposures in 5 monkeys and 8 rats, and then applying arbitrary safety factors to an apparent threshold specific absorption rate (SAR) of 4 W/kg . . . Adverse effects observed at exposures below the assumed threshold SAR include non-thermal

---

26., <https://cdn.fortunejournals.com/articles/a-critical-analysis-of-the-world-health-organization-who-systematic-review.pdf>.

<sup>44</sup> Health risks from radiofrequency radiation, including 5G, should be assessed by experts with no conflicts of interest, Lennart Hardell, Michael Carlberg. *Oncol Lett.* 2020 Jul 15;20(4):15. doi: 10.3892/ol.2020.11876.

<sup>45</sup> Frank, John W., Melnick, Ronald L. and Moskowitz, Joel M.. "A critical appraisal of the WHO 2024 systematic review of the effects of RF-EMF exposure on tinnitus, migraine/headache, and non-specific symptoms" *Reviews on Environmental Health*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1515/reveh-2024-0069>; "Another WHO RF Review Challenged, More than 99% of Studies on Oxidative Stress Discarded," *Microwave News*, 8/21/24, <https://www.microwavenews.com/short-takes-archive/another-who-rf-systematic-review-challenged>.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>47</sup> <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29530389/>; see also J. C. Lin, "RF Health Safety Limits and Recommendations [Health Matters]," in *IEEE Microwave Magazine*, vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 18-77, June 2023, doi: 10.1109/MMM.2023.3255659. keywords: {Radiation detectors;Human factors;Safety;Radiation effects;Cellular phones;Radio frequency}.

<sup>48</sup> Yakymenko I, Tsybulin O, Sidarik E, Henshel D, Kyrylenko O, Kyrylenko S. Oxidative mechanisms of biological activity of low-intensity radiofrequency radiation. *Electromagn Biol Med.* 2016;35:186–202. doi: 10.3109/15368378.2015.1043557.

<sup>49</sup> Smith-Roe SL, Wyde ME, Stout MD, Winters JW, Hobbs CA, Shepard KG, Green AS, Kissling GE, Shockley KR, Tice RR, et al. Evaluation of the genotoxicity of cell phone radiofrequency radiation in male and female rats and mice following subchronic exposure. *Environ Mol Mutagen.* 2020;61:276–290. doi: 10.1002/em.22343.

<sup>50</sup> Carlberg M, Hardell L. Evaluation of mobile phone and cordless phone use and glioma risk using the Bradford Hill viewpoints from 1965 on association or causation. *BioMed Res Int.* 2017;2017:9218486. doi: 10.1155/2017/9218486.

<sup>51</sup> Health risks from radiofrequency radiation, including 5G, should be assessed by experts with no conflicts of interest, LHardell, MCarlberg, *Oncol Lett.* 2020 Jul 15;20(4):15. doi: 10.3892/ol.2020.11876.

<sup>52</sup> *EnvironHealth* 21, 92 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12940-022-00900-9>.



induction of reactive oxygen species, DNA damage, cardiomyopathy, carcinogenicity, sperm damage, and neurological effects . . . ”<sup>53</sup>

4. **New Hampshire Commission** studied the biological effects of wireless radiation and issued a report Nov. 2020<sup>54</sup> with former commissioner Dr. Kent Chamberlain explaining a “key finding being that exposure to wireless communication radiation is harmful to the health of humans and the environment. Those findings apply to all forms of wireless radiation, which include all generations of cellphone radiation.” (see Appendix A, Dr. Chamberlain’s letter explaining their findings).
5. **Thousands of scientific and medical studies** show neurological disorders; increased risk of cancer and brain tumors; DNA damage; oxidative stress; immune dysfunction; cognitive processing effects; altered brain development, sleep and memory disturbances, ADHD, abnormal behavior, sperm dysfunction, and damage to the blood-brain barrier.<sup>55</sup>
6. **Eight case studies** since Jan 2023 in Sweden show adverse health impacts from exposure to 5G towers. Previously healthy individuals developed typical “microwave syndrome” symptoms shortly after the towers were installed: headaches, abnormal fatigue, heart arrhythmia, burning skin, trouble concentrating.<sup>56</sup> The significance of these reports is that non-ionizing radiation<sup>57</sup> from 5G — well below levels allowed by authorities — can cause health problems in individuals who had no prior history of electromagnetic sensitivity.<sup>58</sup> Dr. Lennart Hardell, lead author of the reports and world-renowned scientist on cancer risks from radiation, affirms these reports as “groundbreaking” because they serve as the “first warning of a health hazard.”<sup>59</sup>
7. **One-third of Americans suffer from symptoms from RF radiation**, based on a 2019 Bevington study which analyzed the prevalence of symptoms from RF radiation within any given population.<sup>60</sup> Based

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> <http://www.gencourt.state.nh.us/statstudcomm/committees/1474/reports/5G%20final%20report.pdf>.

<sup>55</sup> A Rationale for Biologically-based Exposure Standards for Low-Intensity Electromagnetic Radiation, 2022, <https://bioinitiative.org/conclusions/>; see also, Adverse health effects of 5G mobile networking technology under real-life conditions, May 1, 2020, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31991167/>; Wireless Radiation (RFR) – Is U.S. Government Ignoring Its Own Evidence for Risk? March, 28, 2019, <https://electromagnetichealth.org/electromagnetic-health-blog/u-s-gov-ignoring-own-evidence/>; Oxidative Mechanisms of Biological Activity of Low-Intensity Radiofrequency Radiation, *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine*, 35(2), 186-202, Yakymenko, I., Tsybulin, O., Sidorik, E., Henshel, D., Kyrlyenko, O., & Kyrlyenko, S. (2016), <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26151230/>.

<sup>56</sup> <https://mdsafetech.org/2023/11/20/5g-health-effects-5-case-reports-of-health-symptoms-after-5g-cell-towers-placed-in-sweden/>; e.g., Jan 2023 study of 63 year old man and 62 year old woman where 5G antennas were installed on the rooftop of their home, [https://www.gavinpublishers.com/assets/articles\\_pdf/Case-Report-The-Microwave-Syndrome-after-Installation-of-5G-Emphasizes-the-Need-for-Protection-from-Radiofrequency-Radiation.pdf](https://www.gavinpublishers.com/assets/articles_pdf/Case-Report-The-Microwave-Syndrome-after-Installation-of-5G-Emphasizes-the-Need-for-Protection-from-Radiofrequency-Radiation.pdf) and <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/5g-radiation-microwave-syndrome-symptoms/>; Feb 2023 study of two previously healthy men where 5G antennas were installed on the rooftop of their business, <https://www.anncaserep.com/open-access/development-of-the-microwave-syndrome-in-two-men-shortly-after-9589.pdf>; April 2023 study of 52 year old woman whose apartment was 60 meters from a 5G base station, <https://acmcasereport.com/pdf/ACMCR-v10-1926.pdf?fbclid=IwAR2J-mE3XeBxqaXPQdFxsIf9Q23bMCer9vgUBHnCvJXBrgBv-w7YdRUDwF0>; see also, “The microwave syndrome or electrohypersensitivity: historical background,” <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26556835/>.

<sup>57</sup> <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/emr/emf-key-terms-descriptions/>.

<sup>58</sup> <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/emr/emf-wireless-health-impacts/>.

<sup>59</sup> <https://www.stralskyddsstiftelsen.se/two-studies-show-that-5g-caused-the-microwave-syndrome-in-healthy-persons/>.


<sup>60</sup> “The Prevalence of People with Restricted Access to Work in Manmade Electromagnetic Environments,” *Journal of Environment and Health Science*, <https://mdsafetech.files.wordpress.com/2019/10/2018-prevalence-of-electromagnetic-sensitivity.pdf>.

on a population of 332.4 million people in the U.S.,<sup>61</sup> 120 million have symptoms, 2% of which (7 million) have severe symptoms or can't work.

8. **Children absorb more RF radiation and are at greater risk than adults.**<sup>62</sup>

a. **From cell phones:**<sup>63</sup>

## Children are more vulnerable to RF microwave radiation.



Depth of absorption of cell phone radiation in a 5-year old child, a 10-year old child, and in an adult from GSM cell phone radiation at 900 MHz. Color scale on right shows the SAR in Watts per kilogram. Source: [Exposure limits: the underestimation of absorbed cell phone radiation, especially in children](#)

b. **American Academy of Pediatrics:** children are disproportionately affected by cell phone radiation due to their lower bone density and amount of fluid in the brain allowing for absorption of greater quantities of RF radiation than in adults.<sup>64</sup>

c. **Greater risk for fetuses:** risk of “degeneration of the protective myelin sheath that surrounds brain neurons.”<sup>65</sup>

<sup>61</sup> <https://www.commerce.gov/news/blog/2022/01/us-population-estimated-332403650-jan-1-2022#:~:text=As%20our%20nation%20prepares%20to,since%20New%20Year's%20Day%202021>.

<sup>62</sup> Wireless technologies, non-ionizing electromagnetic fields and children: Identifying and reducing health risks,” Devra Davis PhD, MPH, Linda Birnbaum PhD, Paul Ben-Ishai PhD, Hugh Taylor MD, Meg Sears MEng, PhD, Tom Butler PhD, MSc, Theodora Scarato MSW, bCurr Probl Pediatr Adolesc Health Care, 2023 Feb;53(2):101374 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cppeds.2023.101374>; see also, *Children and Wireless Radiation*, <https://ehtrust.org/educate-yourself/children-and-wireless-faqs/>.

<sup>63</sup> Exposure limits: the underestimation of absorbed cell phone radiation, especially in children, Gandhi, Morgan, Augusto de Salles, Han, Heberman, Davis, October 14, 2011, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21999884/>.

<sup>64</sup> *Key Scientific Evidence and Public Health Policy Recommendations*, Supplement 2012, at 21, David O. Carpenter, MD, Director, Institute for Health and the Environment University at Albany, Cindy Sage, MA, Sage Associates, [https://bioinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/sec24\\_2012\\_Key\\_Scientific\\_Studies.pdf](https://bioinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/sec24_2012_Key_Scientific_Studies.pdf).<https://bioinitiative.org/>.

<sup>65</sup> *Why children absorb more microwave radiation than adults: The consequences*, Morgan, Kesar and Davis, Journal of Microscopy and Ultrastructure, Vol. 2, Issue 4, December 2014, 197-204, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2213879X14000583>.

- d. **School-age children:** risk of “[d]igital dementia.”<sup>66</sup>
  - e. **Childhood leukemia,** increased risk.<sup>67</sup>
  - f. **Potential dangers of cell towers near schools.**<sup>68</sup>
    - i. **Elementary school children** exposed to high RF radiation from mobile phone base stations 200 meters from their schools “had a significantly higher risk of type 2 diabetes mellitus” than those exposed to lower RF radiation.<sup>69</sup>
    - ii. **Adolescent school children** exposed to high RF radiation from mobile phone base stations within 200 meters from their schools had “delayed fine and gross motor skills, spatial working memory and attention” than those exposed to lower RF radiation.<sup>70</sup>
    - iii. **A ten-year old child** testified of his cardiac condition being caused by exposure to RF radiation from a router in the library where he was being tutored.<sup>71</sup>
9. **Neurobehavioral Symptoms Near Cell Towers.** The following chart shows a worsening of symptoms when closer to a cell tower but a lessening of symptoms when farther away from a cell tower.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> *Why children absorb more microwave radiation than adults: The consequences*, Morgan, Kesar and Davis, *Journal of Microscopy and Ultrastructure*, Vol. 2, Issue 4, December 2014, 197-204, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2213879X14000583>.

<sup>67</sup> *Key Scientific Evidence and Public Health Policy Recommendations*, 2007, at 19, David O. Carpenter, MD, Director, Institute for Health and the Environment University at Albany, Cindy Sage, MA, Sage Associates, [https://bioinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/sec24\\_2007\\_Key\\_Scientific\\_Studies.pdf](https://bioinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/sec24_2007_Key_Scientific_Studies.pdf).


<sup>68</sup> Dr. Magda Havas: WiFi in Schools is Safe. True or False? <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6v75sKAUFdc>.

<sup>69</sup> *Association of Exposure to Radio-Frequency Electromagnetic Field Radiation (RF-EMFR) Generated by Mobile Phone Base Stations (MPBS) with Glycated Hemoglobin (HbA1c) and Risk of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus*, Sultan Ayoub Meo et al, *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 2015; [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283726472\\_Association\\_of\\_Exposure\\_to\\_Radio-Frequency\\_Electromagnetic\\_Field\\_Radiation\\_RF-EMFR\\_Generated\\_by\\_Mobile\\_Phone\\_Base\\_Stations\\_with\\_Glycated\\_Hemoglobin\\_HbA1c\\_and\\_Risk\\_of\\_Type\\_2\\_Diabetes\\_Mellitus](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283726472_Association_of_Exposure_to_Radio-Frequency_Electromagnetic_Field_Radiation_RF-EMFR_Generated_by_Mobile_Phone_Base_Stations_with_Glycated_Hemoglobin_HbA1c_and_Risk_of_Type_2_Diabetes_Mellitus).

<sup>70</sup> Meo, S. A., Almahmoud, M., Alsultan, Q., Alotaibi, N., Alnajashi, I., & Hajjar, W. M. (2018). *Mobile Phone Base Station Tower Settings Adjacent to School Buildings: Impact on Students' Cognitive Health*, *American Journal of Men's Health*; <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30526242/>.

<sup>71</sup> Child With Heart Problems From Wireless: 5G Health Risks California SB 649 Hearing, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OgNLR9fQOX4&list=PLT6DbkXhTGoDakSq1i\\_7milpwGx4xMFq](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OgNLR9fQOX4&list=PLT6DbkXhTGoDakSq1i_7milpwGx4xMFq).

<sup>72</sup> *Cell Tower Health Effects*, Physicians for Safe Technology, <https://mdsafetech.org/cell-tower-health-effects/>.



Symptoms experienced by people near cellular phone base stations; RF radiation affects the blood, heart and autonomic nervous system.<sup>73</sup> Source: Santini, et al (France): *Pathol Biol.* 2002;50:S369-73; Dr. Magda Havas, PhD.

10. **RF Radiation Effects.** A group of toxicology researchers from multiple universities concluded that overall, high frequency RF radiation even below the FCC limits “can result in: carcinogenicity (brain tumors/glioma, breast cancer, acoustic neuromas, leukemia, parotid gland tumors), genotoxicity (DNA damage, DNA repair inhibition, chromatin structure), mutagenicity, teratogenicity, neurodegenerative diseases (Alzheimer’s Disease, Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis), neurobehavioral problems, autism, reproductive problems, pregnancy outcomes, excessive reactive oxygen species/oxidative stress, inflammation, apoptosis, blood-brain barrier disruption, pineal gland/melatonin production, sleep disturbance, headache, irritability, fatigue, concentration difficulties, depression, dizziness, tinnitus, burning and flushed skin, digestive disturbance, tremor, cardiac irregularities, adverse impacts on the neural, circulatory, immune, endocrine, and skeletal systems” and “from this perspective, **RF is a highly pervasive cause of disease.**”<sup>74</sup>

11. **5G’s Biological Effects.** Contrary to claims that 5G’s higher frequencies (millimeter waves) simply “bounce” off the skin, researchers have documented that the coiled portion of the skin’s sweat duct can be regarded as a helical antenna in the sub-THz band and the skin, our largest organ, can intensely absorb the higher 5G frequencies.<sup>75</sup> The millimeter wave technology of 5G will not only directly and adversely affect the skin and eyes [e.g., skin cancer, cataracts], but will, in turn, cascade into systemic signaling effects within the body, “on the nervous system, heart and immune system.”<sup>76</sup> The free


<sup>73</sup> Dr. Magda Havas, [https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Symptoms-experienced-by-people-near-cellular-phone-base-stations-based-on-the-work-of\\_fig2\\_258313941](https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Symptoms-experienced-by-people-near-cellular-phone-base-stations-based-on-the-work-of_fig2_258313941).

<sup>74</sup> Ronald N. Kostoff, Paul Heroux, Michael Aschner, Aristides Tsatsakis, “Adverse health effects of 5G mobile networking technology under real-life conditions,” *Toxicology Letters*, Vol 323, 2020, pp. 35-40, ISSN 0378-4274, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.toxlet.2020.01.020>.

<sup>75</sup> N. Betzalel, Y. Feldman and P. B. Ishai, “The Modeling of the Absorbance of Sub-THz Radiation by Human Skin,” in *IEEE Transactions on Terahertz Science and Technology*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 521-528, Sept. 2017, doi: 10.1109/THZ.2017.2736345, <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8016593>.

<sup>76</sup> Ronald N. Kostoff, Paul Heroux, Michael Aschner, Aristides Tsatsakis, “Adverse health effects of 5G mobile networking technology under real-life conditions,” *Toxicology Letters*, Vol 323, 2020, pp. 35-40, ISSN 0378-4274,

radicals accumulating on the skin from 5G (see figure below) cause oxidative stress which can lead to DNA strand breaks, cancer and atherosclerosis.<sup>77</sup>



12. **Clumping of blood cells.** A Feb 2025 study found that when an otherwise healthy person is in close proximity to a cell phone red blood cells clumped together (rouleaux formation), which leads to blood abnormality, less oxygen transport, and potentially blockages, stroke and heart problems.<sup>78</sup>
13. **“The 5G Appeal”** to the United Nations to halt the proliferation of 5G, warning of potential biological effects, was signed by 252 scientists and professionals from 43 countries, 40 scientists of which are from 15 U.S. states, including scientists and medical professionals from Columbia and Harvard.<sup>79</sup> Other scientists have joined in consensus statements.<sup>80</sup>
14. **International Association of Fire Fighters** passed a resolution in 2004 that disapproved of cell towers on or near fire stations until safety can be proven.<sup>81</sup>
15. **Increases in brain cancer** in the U.S. have been reported, with scientists attributing a high probability on RF radiation from cell phone use.<sup>82</sup>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.toxlet.2020.01.020>; J J B, A R M, S M J M. A New Look at Three Potential Mechanisms Proposed for the Carcinogenesis of 5G Radiation. J Biomed Phys Eng. 2020 Dec 1;10(6):675-678. doi: 10.31661/jbpe.v0i0.2008-1157. PMID: 33364204; PMCID: PMC7753259, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7753259/#ref7>.

<sup>77</sup> J J B, A R M, S M J M. A New Look at Three Potential Mechanisms Proposed for the Carcinogenesis of 5G Radiation. J Biomed Phys Eng. 2020 Dec 1;10(6):675-678. doi: 10.31661/jbpe.v0i0.2008-1157. PMID: 33364204; PMCID: PMC7753259, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7753259/#ref7>; Russell C L. 5 G wireless telecommunications expansion: Public health and environmental implications. EnvironMental Research. 2018;165:484–95. doi: 10.1016/j.envres.2018.01.016.

<sup>78</sup> “Hypothesis: ultrasonography can document dynamic in vivo rouleaux formation due to mobile phone exposure,” Robert R. Brown, Barbara Biebrich, Front. Cardiovasc. Med. , 10 February 2025 Sec. Atherosclerosis and Vascular Medicine, Volume 12 - 2025 | <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcvm.2025.1499499>; see also, <https://ehtrust.org/cellphones-and-your-blood-what-you-need-to-know/>.

<sup>79</sup> <http://www.5gappeal.eu/the-5g-appeal/>; see also, Dr. Martin Blank, PhD, Dept of Physiology and Cellular Biophysics, Columbia University, announcing the appeal early on and warning on wireless radiation, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HgECRrabuZQ>; see also, <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/5g-rollout-harm-regulation-profit/>.

<sup>80</sup> <https://phiremedical.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/2020-Non-Ionising-Radiation-Consensus-Statement.pdf>.

<sup>81</sup> <https://www.iaff.org/cell-tower-radiation/>.

<sup>82</sup> See, e.g., [Brain Tumor Rates Are Rising in the US: The Role of Cellphone & Cordless Phone Use](#); [The Incidence of Meningioma, a Non-Malignant Brain Tumor, is Increasing in the U.S.](#); [New review study finds that heavier cell phone use increases tumor risk](#); [Expert report by former U.S. govt. official: High probability RF radiation causes brain tumors](#); [Cell phone and cordless phone use causes brain cancer: New review](#); and <https://ehtrust.org/scientific-documentation-cell-phone-radiation-associated-brain-tumor-rates-rising/>.

16. **Comprehensive overview** of the adverse biological effects on people and the environment is provided at [https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/EHT-5G-Health-and-Environment-Open-Letter-3\\_2021-3.pdf](https://ehtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/EHT-5G-Health-and-Environment-Open-Letter-3_2021-3.pdf).

### Chronic Disease and Clusters Near Cell Towers

1. **Near Duluth, MN**, a woman suffered 51 strokes after a nearby cell tower was “upgraded,” in addition to experiencing nausea, blind spots in her vision, orientation and balance difficulties.<sup>83</sup>
2. **Clusters of sickness near cell towers (not exhaustive).**
  - a. **The Board of Health of Pittsfield, MA** issued an emergency cease and desist order in April 2022 to turn off a 4G cell tower that injured 17 residents, most of whom evacuated their homes.<sup>84</sup> One of those who remained has since died of cancer. The order cited residents having reported “headaches, ringing in the ears, dizziness, heart palpitations, nausea, and skin rashes,” and, e.g., a child who had “to sleep with a bucket next to her bed in case she needs to throw up.”<sup>85</sup> Because the telecom carrier threatened to sue, the Board of Health was compelled to rescind the order. The residents filed suit against the city but lost on federal preemption, i.e., no legal recourse for health claims.
  - b. **In Rippon, CA** when a cell tower was placed near an elementary school, 4 children (ages 6-11) got cancer (brain, liver, kidney) and 4 teachers got breast cancer.<sup>86</sup> One of the children who contracted brain cancer (glioblastoma) when he was 10 years died in Aug 2024.<sup>87</sup> Since the tower was removed, it was reported that there were no more instances of cancer at the school.<sup>88</sup>
  - c. **In an Idaho town** after 5G cell towers were installed, it was reported that a cluster of residents developed atrial fibrillation (a-fib). One of those residents who had undergone surgery for a-fib is a plaintiff in a lawsuit against the telecom carrier which refuses to provide accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/marcia-haller-cell-tower-rf-radiation-sickness/>.

<sup>84</sup> <https://ehtrust.org/cease-and-desist-order-against-verizon-cell-tower-by-board-of-health-pittsfield-ma/>, see below the fold for link to the Order, p.12.

<sup>85</sup> <https://ehtrust.org/family-injured-by-cell-tower-radiation-in-pittsfield-massachusetts/>.

<sup>86</sup> See beginning of video at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-9TMTexPb\\_0&t=128s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-9TMTexPb_0&t=128s) .

<sup>87</sup> See the lists of treatments and surgeries that this child endured before he died, <https://www.gofundme.com/f/support-the-ferrulli-family-in-memory-of-mason>.

<sup>88</sup> See beginning of video at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-9TMTexPb\\_0&t=128s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-9TMTexPb_0&t=128s) .

<sup>89</sup> <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/press-release/chd-files-in-series-of-lawsuits-seeking-disability-accommodation-for-people-injured-by-rf-radiation-from-cell-towers/> and <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/henry-hank-allen-chd-verizon-lawsuit-radiofrequency-radiation-cell-towers/>.

## APPENDIX A



**College of Engineering and Physical Sciences**  
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Kingsbury Hall  
33 Academic Way  
Durham, NH 03824-2619

V: 603.862.1357  
F: 603.862.1832  
TTY: 7.1.1 (Relay NH)

[www.ceps.unh.edu/ece](http://www.ceps.unh.edu/ece)      [ece.dept@unh.edu](mailto:ece.dept@unh.edu)

February 13, 2023

Queens Community Board No. 12  
Hon. Rene Hill, Chair of the Transportation Committee  
Ms. Yvonne Reddick, District Manager  
90-28 161<sup>st</sup> Street  
Jamaica, New York 11432

Dear Community Board Members:

I am writing you as a former member of the New Hampshire State Commission that was tasked with exploring the Environmental and Health Effects of Evolving Wireless and 5G Technology. This Commission was formed through [bipartisan legislation](#) and was supported by the governor. The Commission was comprised of unbiased experts in fields relating to health and radiation and were highly qualified to evaluate the issue in a fair and in-depth manner. The Commission submitted its [final report](#) in November 2020, with a key finding being that exposure to wireless communication radiation is harmful to the health of humans and the environment. Those findings apply to all forms of wireless radiation, which include all generations of cellphone radiation.

My purpose in writing is to alert you to the dangers of siting a cell tower near to where people, particularly young people, live, work or recreate. I provide relevant details about the New Hampshire Commission's findings on this issue in a [presentation](#) I gave to the Lenox, MA Board of Health. Please know that the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF) in 2004 adopted a [position statement](#) still in effect today forbidding wireless communication facilities on or near fire stations as firefighters were being injured by the radiation. Many of the firefighters exposed to the wireless radiation could not remember where they were going during emergencies, nor how to administer CPR. As Dr. Gunnar Heuser indicates at the [EMF Medical Conference](#), functional MRIs showed damage to the gray matter of their brains from the radiofrequency radiation exposure.

Scientists, physicians, environmental and public health physicians, epidemiologists, pediatricians along with engineers such as myself have been calling for state and local governments to be proactive in protecting your citizens against radiation exposure. I realize that providing such protection may seem challenging. However, initiatives such as the New Hampshire Commission and the [successful lawsuit](#) brought about by the Environmental Health Trust and others are exposing the dubious claims by the FCC that wireless radiation is harmless. Given the mounting evidence regarding the clear harm of radiation, it is only a matter of time before meaningful protective regulations are put in place.

While telecom companies currently have the upper hand in that they seem to be able to force communities to accept whatever tower sites they mandate, there are actions that those communities can take to delay or stop installations where people will be excessively exposed. For example, citizens in York, Maine have delayed the installation of antennas positioned close to a neighborhood. The Board of Health in Pittsfield, Massachusetts issued a [cease-and-desist order](#) against Verizon regarding a cell tower that was causing illness in a surrounding neighborhood. There are many other examples where citizens and administrators have worked together to protect people against cell tower radiation. Those examples can be used to strengthen your ordinances to help protect against inappropriate cell tower siting.

I am currently working with my state legislators to pass legislation that would provide protections against excessive radiation exposure. The original legislation called for a 1,640-foot setback for all new cell towers; this setback is one of the recommendations made by the New Hampshire Commission, and the rationale for picking that distance is explained [here](#). The legislation is currently being revised so that it can be acted on in the next legislative session.

Wireless radiation dangers are real, and they can be significant in their impact on human health and the environment. I encourage you to do whatever is within your power to protect your constituents against it.

Sincerely,



Kent Chamberlin, PhD  
Professor & Chair Emeritus  
Fulbright Distinguished Chair