

FRONTNIEUWS

The significant dangers of 5G technology

June 30, 2025

3



pixundfertig / Pixabay

When, during a conversation with acquaintances – and even with friends – one raises the subject of the dangers that 5G-technology harbours for our health because of the level of its radiation, chances are that someone would be skeptical, and raise objections such as reminding one that we have been using wireless (Wi-Fi) technology for decades, in the shape of, most abundantly, cell phones, and are none the worse for it. I beg to differ.

When we recently discovered that there were moves afoot to erect a 5G-wireless tower in the small town in a mountainous region of South Africa where we live, a number of concerned citizens decided to challenge this decision by systematically uncovering the hidden – and mostly ignored – risks of 5G. Just because it is invisible does not mean that the electromagnetic radiation 5G towers emit are

inconsequential; on the contrary, anyone who values her or his health should take it sufficiently seriously to do the required research and challenge the proximity of these towers to their habitat.

When I was a Research Fellow at the University of Wales, Cardiff, as early as in 1994, I recall listening to an interview with a physicist who was asked whether using cell phones – which had only been on the market for a relatively short time, since the early 1980s – posed a risk to human health. The physicist retorted, in no uncertain terms, that while there had been no extensive studies at the time, the fact that one's brain is exposed to electromagnetic radiation when you press the phone against your ear, would certainly pose such a risk.

He was critical of the cell phone industry for replacing the initial 'clunky' models, known for their characteristic antennae, with smaller phones minus such appendages, for what he dubbed 'cosmetic' reasons. Unlike the older phones, the antennae of which concentrated microwaves away from one's skull, the later, supposedly 'cute' instruments, lacked such a safety feature, which meant that the radiation in question was brought in close proximity to one's brain during a phone call. With contemporary smartphone transceivers one has the safer option of switching on the speaker and listening while holding the device away from one's ear.

These considerations, dating back thirty years, emphasise the importance of minimising the radiation emitted by one's smartphone, and for good reason, judging by currently available studies concerning the possible health effects of such radiation. One such recent [study](#) by, of all organisations, the WHO – which had previously denied that there was evidence of electromagnetic radiation causing illnesses such as cancer – has surprisingly revealed the opposite. The article linked above states:

There has been considerable evidence for some time that non-ionizing radiation from smart devices, Wi-Fi, mobile phones and cell towers has a negative effect on human and animal health. For example, Report24 recently reported on the effects of mobile phone radiation [on red blood cells](#). However, the World Health Organization has not seemed particularly concerned about this until now...

The latest review, '[Effects of Exposure to Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields on Cancer in Animal Studies](#)' (Mevissen et al.), published April 25, in a complete about-face, found that there was 'evidence that RF-EMF exposure increases the incidence of cancer in laboratory animals, with the [strength of evidence] being strongest for malignant cardiac schwannomas and gliomas' (brain tumors). There was also strong evidence of an increased risk of rare tumors of the adrenal glands and liver.

While it is difficult to infer a corresponding cancer risk for humans from animal studies, the same types of tumors have been found in human studies, so there are clear [links](#). The study authors made it clear that while there is no evidence of an increased risk for most cancers, there is evidence for some...

The fact that the WHO is now – based on its own studies – more or less forced to address the risks in question can at least be considered a milestone. But how long will it take before the limit values, which have remained unchanged since 1998 (!), are adjusted?

The question, above, is significant. Since 1998 technological developments are bound to have exacerbated the situation, not only regarding the very nature of 5G transmission compared to its predecessors, but

especially as far as the expansion of 5G networks are concerned. Although the development of 5G goes back to 2015, it was only at the end of 2018 that its mobile towers started operating, and according to this [article](#), became 'mainstream' in 2022. This means that it has spread worldwide by now, and therefore billions of people are exposed to its radiation effects.

While articles like the one linked above tend to focus exclusively on the technical advantages of 5G compared to 3G and 4G, and ignore its possible effects on people's health, it is imperative to scrutinise precisely those, given the pervasiveness of 5G networks in developed countries. Last year, when my partner and I were in Portugal, we were struck by the sheer number of 5G transmission towers everywhere we went. Why should this concern one?

In an important *Exposé* [article](#), Rhoda Wilson discusses the work of Frank Clegg, the CEO of [Canadians for Safe Technology](#), one of the people who has been outspoken about his concerns regarding the health-effects of 5G wireless technology – so much so that he has bravely [challenged telecom companies](#) promoting it to provide the required (but ignored) scientific proof of its safety.

Clegg's efforts to raise public awareness about the need to question the implications of Wi-Fi technology for human (and by implication all living beings') health, for example that of school pupils, have been relentless, and it is worth watching the educational video he released [in 2019](#), pertaining to the safety and health concerns of wireless technologies, particularly 5G. The most current research on wireless technologies at the time, as well as its consequences for human health feature in it, and it appeals to policymakers and the industry itself to investigate safer solutions that will nevertheless allow us to enjoy all the benefits of the technology. Clegg is especially worried about 5G, as Wilson indicates, quoting him as saying:

'I've seen the tremendous benefit that technology can provide; I've also seen the potential harm if technology is not implemented correctly ... I am especially concerned about our current implementation of 5G wireless technology and the more research I do and the more experts I talk to the more concerned I become'...

Furthermore:

'Over 230 scientists and researchers from 41 countries around the world have formally written to the United Nations, their member nations and the World Health Organisation expressing their concern over their planned rollout of 5G technology.'

'I am not aware of a single study that shows that 5G technology is safe,' he said.

He explained that all wireless technology, including 5G, gives off RF radiation which is absorbed into and accumulates in the human body. The proven health effects of wireless technology and wireless devices include:

- Insomnia.
- Headaches.
- Fatigue.

- Heart palpitations.
- Heart arrhythmia.
- Infertility.
- Tinnitus.
- Numbness or tingling in the extremities.
- Diabetes.
- Cancer.
- Permanent DNA damage.
- Mental health issues such as increased anxiety, depression, attention-deficit disorder (“ADD”) and attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (“ADHD”), autism, mood swings and emotional instability.

He said that hundreds of studies show proof of biological harm from wireless devices. Most recently, the National Institute of Health’s National Toxicology Programme released [a study in 2018](#) that showed evidence of cancer and DNA damage from wireless device use.

How could a product that has this much potential harm ever be released for public use?

Needless to emphasise, the obvious fact that the vaunted technical advantages of this undoubtedly dangerous technology outweigh its health hazards (as far as those in power are concerned), amounts to a cover-up, for the sake of the huge profits involved. For example, when one searches for admissions of its dangers on websites aimed at informing one of the nature of 5G technology, nothing of the kind is found. Yet, on websites like the Exposé’s, linked above, these risks are foregrounded. This is the case, too, on the [Propublica](#) website, where the question of such hidden threats is explicitly pursued:

...a growing body of research has found evidence of health risks even when people are exposed to radiation below the FCC limits. The array of possible harms ranges from [effects on fertility](#) and fetal development to [associations with cancer](#). Some [studies of people living near cell towers](#) have also confirmed an array of health complaints, including dizziness, nausea, headaches, tinnitus and insomnia, from people identified as having ‘electromagnetic hypersensitivity.’

The most sensational — and [hotly debated](#) — health fear about wireless radiation is cancer. In 2011, the International Agency for Research on Cancer, an arm of the World Health Organization, cited troubling but uncertain evidence in classifying wireless radiation as ‘[possibly carcinogenic to humans](#).’ In 2018, [a study by the federal government](#) that was nearly two decades in the making found ‘clear evidence’ that cellphone radiation caused cancer in lab animals. A [major study](#) in Italy produced similar results.

Small wonder that S.D. [Wells](#) counts 5G technology among the ‘Top 12 modern-day Weapons of Mass Destruction’ (WMDs). He describes it as follows: ‘Dirty energy – MSM and Big Tech call it the ‘5G Network,’ or 5th generation wireless network technology.’ If this seems as if it is an exaggeration, consider the fact that, as Lance D. [Johnson](#) points out,

For over 50 years, the U.S. government has [known about the potential health risks of wireless](#)

[radiation](#), yet regulatory agencies have consistently failed to act, leaving the public exposed to chronic conditions ranging from autism to diabetes. A new report, released on February 6 by researchers Richard Lear and Camilla Rees, reveals how a 1971 U.S. Naval Medical Research Institute study identified 132 biological effects and 23 chronic diseases linked to electromagnetic radiation (EMR)—findings that were ignored as wireless technology proliferated. [The report](#), shared at the American Academy of Environmental Medicine's annual conference in San Antonio, Texas, on February 14, highlights the staggering growth of these diseases and calls for urgent regulatory action.

What does it tell one about the 'authorities' in a country when a report dating back half a century, like the one mentioned above, is swept under the carpet? It appears that S.D. Wells was not using hyperbole when, in the quotation (above) he likened 5G to a WMD. After all, if electromagnetic radiation was linked to no fewer than 23 chronic diseases 50 years ago, I would bet the proverbial farm that, today, the number is much higher.

If there is one person who is wide awake regarding the threat posed to citizens' health by 5G, it is Robert F. [Kennedy](#) Jr., who states unapologetically: 'My concern about 5G is that the RF radiation from 5G is dangerous. It penetrates, it disrupts the blood-brain barrier. It also is associated with glioblastomas and other cancers. And it caused a lot of other dramatic health effects. And there are literally thousands and thousands of studies in that.'

In light of the plethora of studies related to this increasingly conspicuous phenomenon, it comes as no surprise that a [new name](#) has been coined to describe the variety of symptoms and disabilities which have been linked to electromagnetic radiation such as that caused by 5G. In the article referred to here, one reads:

Millions of people worldwide experience debilitating symptoms—ranging from headaches and insomnia to heart palpitations and cognitive impairments—when exposed to electromagnetic radiation (EMR) from everyday technologies like cellphones, Wi-Fi routers, and smart devices. Until now, this condition has been known by a patchwork of names, including electromagnetic sensitivity, electrohypersensitivity, and microwave syndrome, creating confusion and stigma for those affected. In a landmark effort to unify and destigmatize the condition, the OneName Project has introduced a new term: [Electromagnetic Radiation Syndrome, or EMR Syndrome...](#)

[EMR Syndrome is not a new phenomenon](#). Reports of adverse health effects from electromagnetic fields (EMF) date back to the 1970s, when U.S. military personnel working with radar equipment reported symptoms like headaches, fatigue, and cognitive issues. Today, the condition is increasingly linked to the proliferation of wireless technologies, including 5G networks.'

Is it at all superfluous, given all the evidence, listed above, of the adverse effects of being exposed to electromagnetic radiation, to state emphatically that one should hold the municipal or county authorities under whose jurisdiction 5G towers are erected, accountable for the consequences that would, in all probability, follow? Of course it is not – it is urgently necessary to do so. After all, what is more important? Our health, or the exorbitant profits of the telecommunication companies responsible for developing and establishing these wireless networks?

Moreover, it is arguably a symptom of the paradoxical capacity of '[self-extinction](#)' on the part of humans, that they blithely tolerate – and even claim to enjoy – the very phenomena that are promoting their suffering and early death. In this respect it is a moot question, whether we have really evolved beyond

those early members of our species who went out of their way to survive the many threats to their existence, such as lions, tigers, crocodiles and the like. If one no longer values life sufficiently to attend to the conditions that threaten its prolongation, it is an unmistakable sign of a lamentable, pervasive nihilism.

Bert Olivier.