



The World Foundation for Natural Science
The New World Franciscan Scientific Endeavour of The New World Church
Restoring and Healing the World through Responsibility and Commitment in accord with Natural and Divine Law!
World Headquarters ♦ PO Drawer 16900 ♦ Washington, DC 20041, USA ☎ Tel: +1(703)681-1408 ✉ E-mail: WFNSHQ@NWC.global ♦ www.NATURALSCIENCE.org
Headquarters for Europe ♦ PO Box ♦ CH-6000 Lucerne 7, Switzerland ☎ Tel: +41(41)798-0398 ✉ E-mail: EU-HQ@NATURALSCIENCE.org

Thursday, October 17th, 2024

Mobile phone radiation: It is harmful after all!

In 2011 mobile phone radiation was classified as ‘possibly carcinogenic’ (level 2B) by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), part of the World Health Organization (WHO). This classification has since been a thorn in the side of the mobile phone industry, which is trying to eliminate it.

So when a report in early September 2024 spread like wildfire around the world¹⁾, it must have come as a huge relief to the industry. It stated that the largest meta-study ever conducted had now clearly proven that there was no link between mobile phone radiation and the development of cancer. In response, the American Council on Science and Health, for example, wrote: “So, feel free to call, text, or scroll – your brain’s not going anywhere. [...] As scientific evidence mounts, it’s clear that we can enjoy the convenience of our devices without fear of harm, setting aside outdated concerns about the impact on our physical health.”²⁾

So is this the good news we have all been waiting so long for? We can use all our wireless devices and technologies based on microwave technology, such as smartphones, tablets, Bluetooth, Wi-Fi, baby monitors, etc., without worry and fear about health consequences, and we can also entrust them to our children and young people completely without concern? Does this mean that the issue is finally settled and that no further research is needed? Does this mean that the IARC classification is outdated and needs to be revised?



The matter is not quite as clear-cut as portrayed by the media, and everything is not as it should be with the study cited as evidence, as we will show you below:

- **Media reports gave the impression that the study was a WHO study and that it naturally represented the opinion of the WHO. This is not correct.** After an unsuccessful attempt in 2012, the WHO launched a call in 2019 for studies in the form of so-called systematic reviews to be submitted for the re-evaluation of the risks of mobile phone radiation. On the basis of these studies, the WHO intends to carry out such a re-evaluation (probably in 2027 at the earliest). However, this call was not made publicly, but via a mailing list, whereby scientists critical of mobile communications were excluded right from the outset.
- By July 2024, seven out of ten studies had been submitted. Even at that time, scientists and organisations, such as the International Commission on the Biological Effects of Electromagnetic Fields (ICBE-EMF) pointed out **that these studies had major flaws and some even demanded that the studies be retracted.**³⁾
- Particular criticism was directed at the **close links between a large proportion of the scientists involved in the studies and the ICNIRP**, the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection. The ICNIRP is a non-governmental organisation based in Germany that is 75% financed by German taxpayers' money. The commission denies the existence of any non-thermal effects of microwave radiation despite overwhelming evidence⁴⁾ and primarily serves as a legitimisation body for the mobile phone industry. In 2019, investigative journalists from eight European countries working for major news outlets uncovered **the conflicts of interest of this 'ICNIRP cartel.'**⁵⁾ **Eleven of the 21 experts appointed by the WHO to the study groups are currently or have been members of the ICNIRP.** At least one ICNIRP-affiliated scientist was involved in each of the ten studies, and several of them were involved in different studies.³⁾ **By contrast, not a single one of the 250 scientists who signed the**

appeal to the United Nations for protection against exposure to non-ionising electromagnetic fields ⁶⁾ **was selected by the WHO for the task group.** The study on cancer cited by the media was conducted by the Australian Ken Karipidis, who is the deputy chair of ICNIRP. Co-authors include, among others, the Swiss Martin Rösli, who was a member of ICNIRP from 2016 to 2024, and the German Dan Baaken, Science Secretary at ICNIRP.

- The articles published worldwide suggest that the study by Karipidis et al. has finally proven that mobile phone radiation is not dangerous. **However, as is clear from the study itself, there is no conclusive evidence.** For example, with regard to the risks of holding a mobile phone to the ear, the study states that there is ‘moderate certainty of evidence’ that this ‘likely does not’ increase the risk of tumours. The cancer risk associated with using cordless or mobile phones is said to be ‘supported by evidence of low certainty’. The same applies to the risks of occupational exposure. With regard to the risk of cancer in children exposed to radiation from transmitters, the study states that there is ‘moderate certainty that it is not likely to increase the risk of leukaemia in children and low certainty that it will not increase the risk of paediatric brain tumours’. When it comes to the risks for adults exposed to radiation from mobile phone masts, the authors even write that there are no meaningful studies at all!⁷⁾ **Statements such as ‘with moderate/low certainty’, ‘not likely’ or even ‘no studies available’ are anything but clear-cut evidence that microwave radiation is harmless!**
- The study by Karipidis et al. claims that electromagnetic fields, due to their low energy, could fundamentally not cause any cell changes and therefore not cause cancer. This is known as the ‘thermal dogma’. **This approach is unscientific and denies all damage beyond tissue heating, such as DNA strand breaks, chromosome aberrations, impairment of the blood-brain barrier⁸⁾, damage to sperm and fertility⁹⁾ and, in particular, oxidative cell stress¹⁰⁾, although these effects are well documented.¹¹⁾**
- Karipidis et al. **only evaluate epidemiological studies** (e.g. case-control studies, surveys, evaluation of medical records, etc.), but no medical-biological studies. It is well known in science that epidemiological studies are often distorted. For a thorough risk assessment, therefore, epidemiological studies, cell studies in the laboratory (in vitro) and animal and human studies (in vivo) must be taken into account and the results combined.

- The authors of the study have **rejected or not taken into account landmark studies recognised among scientists** on the subject, such as Balmori (2022)¹²⁾, Ramazzini (2018)¹³⁾ or the US NTP study (2016).¹⁴⁾ On the other hand, heavily criticised studies such as the industry-funded COSMOS study or studies with false data interpretation such as the Danish Cohort Study, which even the WHO accused of ‘misclassification in the evaluation’, were highly praised.
- Dr Joel M. Moskowitz of the University of California in Berkley points out further weaknesses in the study by Karipidis et al.¹⁵⁾ **For example, the definition used for ‘regular mobile phone use’ is anything but realistic**, as it means at least one weekly mobile phone call in the last six months. In view of the fact that there are already more mobile phones than people on the planet and that most people hardly ever put their phones down, such a definition is simply ridiculous. Most human research focuses on mobile phones or cell towers and excludes other sources of exposure (e.g. use of cordless phones, Wi-Fi or other personal wireless devices), leading to **incorrect classification of the overall exposure** of people. Furthermore, most of the case studies ended their data collection in the early 2000s. **They therefore show the effects of 2G technology, but not of the three subsequent generations of mobile phone technology, let alone 5G, which uses different carrier frequencies and functions.** With the introduction of the smartphone in 2007 mobile phone technology has also changed significantly. The external mobile phone antenna on the top of the phone has now been replaced by several different antennas built into the device, **exposing not only the temporal and frontal lobes of the brain,¹⁶⁾ but also the lower head and neck to strong radiation.** This could further increase the risk of thyroid and salivary gland tumours.
- Completely ignored in this whole discussion are **the serious effects of mobile phones on the human brain, which are also reflected in our (social) behaviour.** Brain researchers warn that constantly looking at your mobile phone can, among other things, reduce the **ability to concentrate, speed of work and cognitive performance.** The result of incessant multitasking is that we make more mistakes and have a poorer memory. The effects on children and young people are particularly serious. Because the brain changes with prolonged mobile phone use, **the ability to learn language and**





to empathise suffers. Thus, young people not only lose the ability to communicate with their fellow human beings, but also find it increasingly difficult to put themselves in their shoes and show understanding for them. There is also a certain **potential for addiction, plus depression and anxiety disorders** may be a result of mobile phone use.¹⁷⁾

The latest press releases that try to make us believe that our mobile phone technology and our constant use of mobile phones are harmless and not detrimental to our health are

misleading, flawed and ignore important aspects of the subject. So there can be no talk of an all-clear and of a clear-cut data situation. Nor can we sit back comfortably and carelessly on the sofa with our mobile phones in our hands, scrolling through the latest social media posts!

References

- 1 Washington Post (2024): Do cellphones cause brain cancer? A WHO review of 63 studies finds no link. Rachel Pannett, 03.09.2024. -<https://www.washingtonpost.com/wellness/2024/09/03/cellphones-cancer-risk-radiation/>
The Guardian (2024): Mobile phones not linked to brain cancer, biggest study to date finds. Natasha May, 03.09.2024. <https://www.theguardian.com/science/article/2024/sep/04/mobile-phones-not-linked-to-brain-cancer-biggest-study-to-date-finds>
Blick (2024): Handys nicht schuld an Hirntumoren. Thomas Benkö, 04.09.2024. <https://www.blick.ch/digital/who-studie-gibt-entwarnung-handys-nicht-schuld-an-hirntumoren-id20105194.html>
Süddeutsche Zeitung (2024): Studie: Handynutzung erhöht das Krebsrisiko nicht. Deutsche Presse Agentur, 06.09.2024. <https://www.sueddeutsche.de/wissen/gesundheit-studie-handynutzung-erhoeht-das-krebsrisiko-nicht-dpa.urn-newsml-dpa-com-20090101-240905-930-224010>
- 2 American Council on Science and Health (2024): More Evidence Cell Phones Don't Cause Cancer. Susan Goldhaber, 13.09.2024. <https://www.acsh.org/news/2024/09/13/more-evidence-cell-phones-dont-cause-cancer-48991>
- 3 Electromagnetic Radiation Safety (2024): ICBE-EMF finds serious problems with WHO-Commissioned review of human observational studies on the effects of exposure to radio-frequency EMFs. 15.07.2024. <https://www.saferemr.com/2021/09/who-radiofrequency-emf-health-risk.html>
- 4 Vgl. z. B. www.emf-portal.org; www.bioinitiative.org; www.emfdata.org
- 5 Electromagnetic Radiation Safety (2023): ICNIRP's wireless radiation exposure limits are based on smoke and mirrors. 25.07.2022 <https://www.saferemr.com/2018/07/icnirps-exposure-guidelines-for-radio.html>
Diagnose-funk (2019): Europa ignoriert mögliches Krebsrisiko von 5G - Tagespiegel recherchiert zu 5G / Mobilfunkstudienlage. 14.01.2019 <https://www.diagnose-funk.org/aktuelles/artikel-archiv/detail?newsid=1335>
Diagnose-funk (2024): Alter Wein in neuen Schläuchen! Entschlüsselung der neuen ICNIRP-Krebsstudie - Spiel vorbei? Wahrscheinlich nicht! Louis Slesin, 12.09.2024. <https://www.diagnose-funk.org/aktuelles/artikel-archiv/detail&newsid=2125>
Microwavenews (2024): Old Wine in New Bottles. Decoding New WHO-ICNIRP Cancer Review - Game Over? Likely Not. 11.09.2024 <https://www.microwavenews.com/news-center/old-wine-new-bottles>
- 6 International Appeal: Scientists call for protection from non-ionizing electromagnetic field exposure. Eur J Oncol. 2015 Dec. 20;20(3/4):180-2. <https://emfscientist.org/index.php/emf-scientist-appeal>
- 7 Karipidis, K., Baaken, D., Loney, T., Blettner, M., Brzozek, C., Elwood, M., ... & Lagorio, S. (2024). 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. Environment International, 108983
Diagnose-funk (2024): Einseitige ICNIRP-Studie behauptet, Handynutzung erhöhe Krebsrisiko nicht. Ist das so? 14.09.2024. <https://www.diagnose-funk.org/aktuelles/artikel-archiv/detail?newsid=2127>
- 8 Salford LG, Brun AE, Eberhardt JL, Malmgren L, Persson BR. Environ Health Perspect (2003): Nerve cell damage in mammalian brain after exposure to microwaves from GSM mobile phones. med./bio.
- 9 Cordelli E, Ardoino L, Benassi B, Consales C, Eleuteri P, Marino C, Sciortino M, Villani P, Brinkworth MH, Chen G, McNamee JP, Wood AW, Belackova L, Verbeek J, Pacchierotti F (2024): Effects of radiofrequency electromagnetic field (RF-EMF) exposure on male fertility: A systematic review of experimental studies on non-human mammals and human sperm in vitro. Environment International, 185, 108509

- 10 Pall (2018): 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, Written and Compiled by Martin L. Pall, PhD Yakymenko, I., Tsybulin, O., Sidorik, E., Henshel, D., Kyrylenko, O., & Kyrylenko, S. (2016). Oxidative mechanisms of biological activity of low-intensity radiofrequency radiation. *Electromagnetic biology and medicine*, 35(2), 186-202.
- 11 An overview of non-thermal effects can be found here, for example: Diagnose-funk (2024): ÜBERBLICK für den Durchblick – Stand der Forschung Mobilfunkstrahlung. 29.08.2024 <https://www.diagnose-funk.org/aktuelles/artikel-archiv/detail&newsid=2090>Kompetenzinitiative (2024): ATHEM-3: Indikatoren für Gesundheitsrisiken in Bezug auf stationäre Mobilfunk-Sender <https://kompetenzinitiative.com/athem-3-indikatoren-fuer-gesundheitsrisiken-in-bezug-auf-stationaere-mobilfunk-sender/>
- 12 Balmori, A. (2022). Evidence for a health risk by RF on humans living around mobile phone base stations: From radiofrequency sickness to cancer. *Environmental Research*, 214, 113851.
- 13 Falcioni, L., Bua, L., Tibaldi, E., Lauriola, M., De Angelis, L., Gnudi, F., ... & Belpoggi, F. (2018). Report of final results regarding brain and heart tumors in Sprague-Dawley rats exposed from prenatal life until natural death to mobile phone radiofrequency field representative of a 1.8 GHz GSM base station environmental emission. *Environmental research*, 165, 496-503.
- 14 National Toxicology Program (2024): Cell Phone Radio Frequency Radiation – Research Overview. US Department of Health and Human Services. <https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/whatwestudy/topics/cellphones>
- 15 Electromagnetic Radiation Safety (2024): Health Hazards of Wireless Technologies: What do we know now? A webinar by Dr. Joel Moskowitz, 25.09.2024. <https://www.saferemr.com/2024/>
- 16 Philips, A., Henshaw, D. L., Lamburn, G., & O'Carroll, M. J. (2018). Brain tumours: rise in glioblastoma multiforme incidence in England 1995–2015 suggests an adverse environmental or lifestyle factor. *Journal of environmental and public health*, 2018(1), 7910754
- 17 GEO (2024): Welche gravierenden Auswirkungen Smartphones auf das menschliche Gehirn haben. 12.04.2024. <https://www.geo.de/wissen/gesundheit/gravierende-auswirkungen-so-veraendert-das-smartphone-unser-gehirn-34598530.html>

Published Thursday, October 17th, 2024 in the categories Effects and Harm, Microwaves & Mobile communications

<https://www.naturalscience.org/news/2024/10/mobile-phone-radiation-it-is-harmful-after-all/>