






Sign our Petition!

Support an Office of Research, Law, & Policy to Speak for Safer Tech!



Massachusetts

Safer Tech Petition Initiative

In MA, a law may be set on the ballot for voter approval *if* voter signatures in support are gathered in the required amount, *official* format, *and* time frame through a petition initiative (signature drive).



Petitioning Timeline

Fall 2026 is our signature drive test run, education, & start to build support.

Fall 2027 begins our full signature drive. Signatures drives run September to November & repeat the following spring if the legislature fails to act in support.

Paid for by Safer Tech at LastTreeLaws.com

Safer Tech Petition Initiative Massachusetts 2026

CONTENT

Correctly Signing Petitions

Petitioning is Tricky, Tough, & Getting Tougher

2026 Official Summary of Petition 26-01

Corrections & Details for Summary

FAQ / Questions & Answers

Necessity to Address Societal Impacts

Health Impacts

The Regulatory Gap

How can I Help?

Sign our petition in 2026 & in 2027. Check if there are local contacts listed in this packet, or offer to become a local contact. Look online at LastTreeLaws.com/Help-Win to contact us, learn other ways to help, or learn more.

Where is the full law?

To read the full law, visit <https://lasttreelaws.com/progress/> for a PDF link. Or, search online for ‘MA petition initiative attorney general 2028’ to find current initiatives. Select number 26-01 for the 2026 law. In fall of 2027, we will submit a revised law and get a different number.

How can I give suggestions or feedback?

Feedback on our educational materials and law is welcome. You can check this packet for a notepad to share ideas or respond via our website – look online at LastTreeLaws.com/Help-Win. You may be able to join review sessions. For detailed comments, mail to Safer Tech, c/o Kirstin Beatty, 149 Central Pk Dr, Holyoke, MA.

Who are you?

We a small group of concerned state residents, navigating laws which protect industry at public expense. We need your help.

Paid for by Safer Tech at LastTreeLaws.com

Paid for by: Safer Tech at LastTreeLaws.com

SIGN CORRECTLY!

Protect a petition's signatures from being thrown out.

LEAVE MISTAKES. Cross outs & extra marks void petitions.

1. ID TOWN/ CITY of VOTER. 3 boxes must list the same city or town.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
AN INITIATIVE PETITION FOR A LAW

Under Article XLVIII of the Amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth

SUMMARY

This proposed law would require companies that design, manufacture, install, or maintain digital, internet, or wireless technology or services to make technological and design choices that reduce electromagnetic radiation exposure. The proposed law contains specific design requirements that companies would be required to implement. The proposed requirements include specifications to reduce the duration and number of wireless signals, increase options for non-wireless and off-line modes, provide instructions to users on disabling or removing antennas for wireless equipment, and limit extraneous frequencies on electrical lines. These design requirements would apply to newly designed technology but would also be required in software updates or other updates to the extent possible. The law would create a more general requirement that companies make design and technological choices to limit harm from electromagnetic radiation above and beyond the specific requirements in the law. The law would create a new division within the Bureau of Climate and Environmental Health that would evaluate compliance, recommend electromagnetic radiation limiting practices and ensure reasonable timelines are set for all requirements to limit electromagnetic radiation. Employees of the newly created division would be required to meet certain conflict of interest standards, violation of which would be grounds for a civil suit and financial penalties.

The law would be enforced by the attorney general. The attorney general's office would be required to provide a mechanism for anonymous reporting of violations. The law would also create a private right of action and would afford protections to corporate whistleblowers. The law would require the attorney general to challenge any application of federal law which prevented the implementation of this law.

The law would be effective immediately upon passage. Compliance changes would be required to begin within a month. Software requirements which would require design modification would be required as soon as possible but no later than within two years of passage. Changes requiring manufacturing or hardware changes would be required as soon as possible but no later than within four years of passage. The newly created division would have the power to sue earlier deadlines.

The proposed law provides that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would any in effect.

FILING DEADLINES. Initiative petitions must be submitted to local election officials for certification of signatures no later than 5 p.m. on **Wednesday, November 19, 2025**. Local election officials must complete their certification no later than December 1, 2025. Thereafter, initiative petitions containing certified signatures must be received by petitioners from the local election officials and then filed with the Election Division, Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth, One Ashburton Place, Boston 1795, Boston, MA, no later than 5 p.m. on **Wednesday, December 3, 2025**.

REGISTRAR USE ONLY:

REGISTRAR MAY WRITE IN THIS AREA

SPONSORS OF THIS PETITION MAY BE CONTACTED AT:

Petition 1
149 Central Park Drive
Holyoke, MA 01040
(413) 295-4044

INSTRUCTIONS TO CIRCULATORS AND SIGNERS

- DO NOT ALTER THIS INITIATIVE PETITION IN ANY WAY. ADDITIONAL MARKINGS ON THIS PETITION WILL DISQUALIFY ANY SIGNATURES ON THIS PETITION SHEET.
- For your signature to be valid, you must be a registered voter in the city or town named below and your signature should be written substantially as registered. DO NOT sign the same petition more than once.
- If you are prevented by physical disability from writing, you may authorize some person to write your name and residence in your presence.

REGISTRAR USE ONLY

I. SIGNATURE to be made in person with name substantially as registered (except in case of physical disability as stated above)

II. NOW REGISTERED AT (street, number and apartment number, if any) (city or town will be the same as stated above)

WARD **PREC.**

ONLY REGISTERED VOTERS OF **Holyoke** MAY SIGN THIS SHEET. (OVER)

FIND ▲ CITY

ATTENTION VOTERS: Before signing, read signer information on other side. CITY OR TOWN: **HOLYOKE**

REGISTRAR USE ONLY

I. SIGNATURE to be made in person with name substantially as registered (except in case of physical disability as stated on other side)

II. NOW REGISTERED AT (street, number and apartment number, if any) (city or town will be the same as stated above)

WARD **PREC.**

WARNING - criminal penalty for unlawfully signing, altering, defacing, mutilating, destroying, or suppressing this petition: fine of up to \$1,000 or imprisonment for up to one year.

INSTRUCTIONS TO REGISTRARS

- You must time-stamp or write in date and time these papers are received.
- Check this ☒ against the name of each qualified voter to be certified.
- For names not certified, use the code on the right. Draw a line through any blank spaces not containing signatures.
- Each sheet must be certified by at least three registrars. A facsimile stamp is acceptable.
- You must complete certification no later than December 1, 2025.

N - no such registered voter at that address, or address is illegible.
S - unable to identify signature as that of voter because of form of signature, or signature is illegible.
W - wrong community.
T - already signed papers for this question.

CERTIFICATION OF NAMES

We certify that _____ number of names (see numbers and words) _____

above signatures checked thus ☒ are the names of qualified voters from this city or town.

date

City or town

County

Registrars of Voters or Election Commissioners of

ONLY REGISTERED VOTERS OF **HOLYOKE** MAY SIGN THIS SHEET. I

▲ CITY

2. SIGN ▼ YOUR NAME. If messy, print last/ full name on right.

ATTENTION VOTERS: Before signing, read signer information on other side. CITY OR TOWN: **HOLYOKE**

REGISTRAR USE ONLY

I. SIGNATURE to be made in person with name substantially as registered (except in case of physical disability as stated on other side)

II. NOW REGISTERED AT (street, number and apartment number, if any) (city or town will be the same as stated above)

WARD **PREC.**

2 **Upton Sinclair** UPTON SINCLAIR 1 Walnut St. #1

3 **Fredrick Douglass** DOUGLASS 4 Sycamore St.

4 **Eleanor Roosevelt** ELEANOR ROOSEVELT 11 Acorn Lane #1

5 **Bruce Lee** Lee 1 Dogwood Ave #12

6 **GABRIEL GARCIA MARQUEZ** 3 Acorn Lane

▲ Leave BLANK
ward & precinct.

3. ▲ GIVE STREET # & STREET NAME
(& apartment number, if any).

Why Petitioning is **TRICKY & TOUGH** in Massachusetts

SIGNATURE REQUIREMENTS ARE HIGH for State-Wide Petitions
≥ **87,000 voter signatures needed in 2026** (which is 3.5 % of the votes for governor in last election) with **only 25% from any county**.

INACTIVE VOTERS Require More Signatures

Only active Massachusetts voter signatures count. Half of ‘voters’ may be inactive for:
(a) failing to respond to the annual town confirmation of address, or (b) moving to a new address without re-registering. Check locally or online at <https://www.sec.state.ma.us/OVR/>

DISQUALIFIED Petitions Require More Signatures

MISPRINTING copies or using the wrong paper voids a petitions and all its’ signatures.

EXTRA PETITION MARKS lead to the petition’s signatures being thrown out, e.g.:

cross outs coffee stains underlining scribbles/ squiggles highlighting

TIMELINES BRIEF for Signature Drive

FALL: c. **60 days** for the first 3% of signatures (to get about 75,000 signatures in 2026)

SPRING: c. **60 days** for 0.5% of signatures (c. 12,500 in 2026)

PETITION DELIVERY is Costly & Demanding

Signed petitions, sorted by municipality, **must be delivered by set deadlines to each municipal clerk**, collected 12 days later and **delivered by 5 PM 14 days later in Boston**.

REPORTING PENALTIES Hurt Small, Grassroots Ballot Committees

A ballot committee & bank account is required whether or not funds exist. **State & federal penalties apply to advertising, donor reporting, and tax filings** for late filings or errors. **Treasurers are personally liable**. State late fees are \$25 a day and waivers are given only for medically-proven incapacitation. Treasurers **cannot be ‘public employees’** which removes a large pool of potentially qualified, volunteer treasurers such as teachers. In contrast, **wealthy, industry-funded campaigns can hire large political compliance firms**.

LOBBYING & OVERSIGHT of Public Officials is Necessary

Legislators can adopt, change, or overturn a citizen-initiated law, so public lobbying and attention is crucial. **Distressingly**, legislators are considering adding new requirements for greater geographical signature gathering requirements & bi-weekly or monthly reports tracking all contributions ≥ \$50, with accompanying daily fines (up to \$5K per report).

Paid for by Safer Tech at LastTreeLaws.com

**Initiative Petition for a Law Relative to
Safer Technology per Non-Ionizing Radiation
2026 Summary by Attorney General's Office**

SUMMARY OF NO. 26-01

This proposed law would create a new, independent state agency called the **Office of Research and Technology Optimization (ORTO)**, which would be established on November 15, 2029, subject to appropriation. The agency would track, **study the impact of, and make policy recommendations about non-ionizing radiation**, which is the invisible energy emitted by everyday equipment and infrastructure such as power lines, cell towers, wireless networks, and digital devices. ORTO's recommendations about non-ionizing radiation would be based on an "As Safe as Reasonable and Achievable" standard.

ORTO's leadership would include an executive director, legal chief, head scientist, and a financial manager. Its leaders would be appointed by different state officials and vetted by a panel of non-profit experts. Additional staff would include a scientific editor, legal and policy editor, and a chief engineer who could measure non-ionizing radiation.

ORTO would be tasked with providing data and transparency across several main areas, including:

1. **Researching** how non-ionizing radiation may affect the public, including but not limited to **employment, public health, personal property, energy usage, and civil liberties**.
2. Developing technology **recommendations and best practices** to help individuals and entities lower exposure to non-ionizing radiation and address the impacts of non-ionizing radiation.
3. Managing a free, **open-access, independent journal** that publishes policy analysis, legal analysis, and peer-reviewed research on non-ionizing radiation.
4. Collecting field data to build an open-access **public digital map showing non-ionizing radiation levels** across the state, side by side with anonymous **health statistics**.
5. Offering fee-based **non-ionizing radiation testing** to municipalities wishing to evaluate radiation emissions from local cell towers, power lines, and buildings.

The proposed law would not ban or require any specific technology. ORTO would provide facts, advice, and policy guidance for **individuals and entities to make their own technology procurement decisions**. The proposed law states that if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

Paid for by Safer Tech at LastTreeLaws.com

Initiative Petition for a Law Relative to Safer Technology per Non-Ionizing Radiation

Corrections & Extra Details for 2026-01 Summary

by the ballot committee 'Safer Tech at LastTreeLaws.com'

- (a) **Definition Correction.** Not all non-ionizing radiation is invisible. **Light** is a visible form of non-ionizing radiation.
- (b) **Independence & Conflicts of Interest.** To help the agency remain independent, leaders are appointed by different state officials and are vetted by a special panel of non-profit experts without conflicts of interest. Leaders and staff must not only comply with state conflict of interest rules, but also submit more detailed conflict of interest reports and may not accept any money during employment from relevant industries, take jobs two years post-work from relevant industries, and appointed leadership may not have worked for or received money from relevant industries in the past five years.
- (c) **Additional Details.**
- (1) **Relevant Technologies.** Non-ionizing radiation technologies include but are not limited to remote connections for robotics, drones, and artificial intelligence, as well as technologies such as tasers, self-driving cars, and surveillance cameras.
 - (2) **Public Education.** The agency may develop educational materials within its' purview.
 - (3) **Legal Support.** Analyze, educate, and advise on relevant law. Provide free model municipal ordinances, while offering a separate, paid municipal service with site-specific drafting recommendations.
 - (4) **Legal Testimony.** Provide relevant legal education and in court provide evidence & testimony, such as field measurements of cell towers or other equipment.
 - (5) **Outside Funding.** In addition to standard state appropriations, the agency's operations may be funded by federal research grants, commercial patent licensing fees, service fees, donations, and court costs recovered from providing evidence in successful technology lawsuits.
 - (6) **Trust Fund.** Any collected funds enter a trust fund to support tools & equipment needs, additional expertise, honorariums, & grants, but may never be used for salary increases or bonuses.
 - (7) **Non-Use.** Recommendations may include non-use of technology, if deemed best or ASARAA, the "As Safe as Reasonable and Achievable" standard.
 - (8) **Health Impacts.** Public and environmental impacts of the non-ionizing radiation itself may be examined.
- (d) **Possible 2027 Revisions.** In 2027 this will be improved and *may also include* ionizing radiation, adding medical imaging and nuclear as relevant technologies. That decision is pending. Feedback on this or other suggestions is welcome to strengthen the law.

Paid for by Massachusetts ballot committee Safer Tech at LastTreeLaws.com

Q. & A. on Massachusetts 2026 Safer Tech Petition

Paid for by the ballot committee Safer Tech at [LastTreeLaws.com](https://www.lasttreelaws.com) ~ Page 1 of 2

Q. How can it become law? More than 120,000 Massachusetts voter signatures are needed on official petitions, without extra markings, to let voters vote on the law. Public lobbying & support is needed, too, so the legislature supports the law as well. **Fall 2026 is our trial run.** September 2027 begins our *full* signature drive. Please register to vote now or check your voter registration online at: <https://www.sec.state.ma.us/OVR/>

Q. Does this petition ban cell phones, Wi-Fi, or smart devices? No. You may keep your personal and work technology. The law only provides *advice* on safer tech.

Q. What tech is examined to support safety? *Non-ionizing* radiation technology is analyzed. Depending on whether legally possible, ionizing radiation *may be* added.

Q. What is *non-ionizing* radiation (NIR) technology? This is any technology that emits non-ionizing radiation (NIR). NIR is an electric and magnetic field surrounding electricity, transmitted by antennas, or visible as light. NIR from technology includes wireless transmissions, power line fields, and computer screen light.

Q. What is *ionizing* radiation (IR) tech? We may *or* may not resubmit this petition to add ionizing technology safety, which includes medical imaging and nuclear reactors.

Q. How does the law support safer tech? The law creates an advisory research office.

Q. What does the Office of Research & Technology Optimization (ORTO) do? ORTO conducts/ funds public research, including of state radiation exposures alongside health statistics. ORTO prepares advisory public reports & establishes a state-sponsored scientific journal (bypassing academic censorship) on how technology impacts our lives, whether privacy, health, or other topics. ORTO also prepares model ordinances, provides educational materials, examines relevant law, and may file legal evidence & briefs.

Q. Does this address privacy, AI, & more? Yes, in relation to NIR functions (e.g., remote surveillance)—see <https://lasttreelaws.com/radiating-tech> for more examples.

Q. How will ORTO remain independent? Leadership of ORTO is vetted for qualifications and conflicts of interest by a select group of non-profit organizations that must be free of conflicts of interests too. Leadership and staff must comply with state conflict of interest rules, plus: are prohibited from investment or employment in relevant industries; may not have worked for a prohibited industry within 5 years; and must file annual disclosures of any other potential conflicts. Only if necessary expertise cannot be found can ORTO leaders reduce the 5-year industry prohibition, but guard rails remain.

Q. How will safer technology be implemented without a mandate, since ORTO is an advisory office? By describing how to make technology safer, ORTO will provides an opportunity for change through consumer purchasing, government purchasing, education, & vendor or manufacturer choices. Also, ORTO may provide legal briefs and scientific information to support safer technology in court cases or for state regulations.

Q. What court assistance is available? When a legal decision would help influence technology safety, ORTO specialists are authorized and have the choice to file legal briefs and provide scientific or technical information as evidence.

Q. Why can't ORTO set mandates, such as stop 5G non-ionizing radiation? The Massachusetts Supreme Court has stated that only the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) can regulate wireless transmissions as part of federal preemption. A MA petition initiative is prohibited from overturning rulings by our state Supreme Court.

Q. Can states set limits on safer technology? States can set limits on many factors, whether related to AI or cell tower placement. As far as the right of states to regulate wireless for the benefit of public and environmental health, law & legal opinions could change or vary by state or jurisdiction, or be overturned by state and federal legislatures.

Q. Can ORTO set safety limits for exposures from electricity or wireless? ORTO cannot mandate limits, but can recommend limits be adopted based on a standard that is 'ASARAA' or 'As Safe as Reasonable and Achievable.'

Q. What will this cost taxpayers? Because the "Office of Research and Technology Optimization" (ORTO) operates remotely with few staff, the cost should be less than 2 million. The ORTO trust fund can also be used to support research & equipment costs.

Q. Can ORTO charge fees? Yes, ORTO is allowed to set reasonable rates for some specialized services, such as radiofrequency (RF) testing. ORTO is allowed to petition the judicial system for cost recovery of certain scientific and technical services provided in a winning case. These funds enter a trust fund to support ORTO's mission, such as to fund research. The trust fund can never be used to increase salaries set by the state.

Q. What cost-based services are provided for municipalities? If ORTO has time available, municipalities can pay for direct assistance implementing model ordinances into their codes or for radiofrequency (RF) testing of cell towers & EMF equipment.

Q. Will ORTO save money? Cost savings can occur if recommendations for safer technology are adopted—such as by reducing hacking damage or environmental harm.

Q. How do we know costs will stay low for municipalities and the state? Municipalities and individuals have zero required costs. Choosing safer equipment and practices is optional for everyone. Public schools and towns can choose to adopt ORTO's recommendations incrementally as part of standard maintenance budgets. It costs zero extra dollars to use already budgeted funds to replace old equipment.

Q. Where can I find more information? Please see the website lasttreelaws.com for the full petition, progress, blogs and handouts, like our handout *Why (Wireless) Federal Protections Froze in 1996*, or see progress at: <https://lasttreelaws.com/progress/>

Q. Can I help? Yes, please join online at lasttreelaws.com, in person, and donate! We need your support. Visit our website to learn more or sign up, & please share widely.

WE NEED TO KNOW ALL ABOUT TECH SAFETY

Paid for by ballot committee Safer Tech at LastTreeLaws.com

Need for Ethics & Means of Enforcement: An Example

Medical Mind Read: Technology now allows patients paralyzed in body and speech to use a **brain-computer interface (BCI)** to control a computer & prosthetic device using brainwaves by recording & decoding thoughts (wireless mind reading) expressed by brain waves, with no consent or movement required. BCIs may be (a) surgically implanted (brain or veins); (b) non-invasive (headband or cap); or be (c) [injected](#) as '[dust](#)' (future).

Work BCIs: Corporations can now audit employee mood or attention with coarse BCIs that could gather extra data (e.g., '[Smartcap](#)'). The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) is seeking soldier integration with BCIs that monitor & stimulate the brain with a [million](#) electrodes stimulating 100K neurons (e.g., to speed & automate weapon discharge). **AI is quickly advancing BCI abilities & ethical concerns.**

Elephant in the Room: BCIs & related devices present risks of error, physical harm, wireless eavesdropping, precise lie detectors, exact profiling, manipulation, & control.

Control: BCIs used by authoritarian governments could identify rebellion, target opposition, manipulate, surveil, and exert remote control. BCIs & brain stimulation have successfully controlled insects, dogs (as early as 1960s for CIA), [rodents](#), cats, & other animals. As early as the 1960s, scientist José Manuel Rodríguez Delgado used wireless implants to halt a bull's charge with the press of a button, subdue a monkey's personality, and in humans to stimulate euphoria, lust, love, & anger (e.g., see 3/21/2016 *Discover*).

Mental Protections: As Duke University Professor Nita Farahany warns, we need a new right to mental liberty *with a means of enforcement* to address neurotech advances. The Neurorights Foundation, co-founded by tech investor Jamie Daves, agrees.

OTC BCIs: Non-surgical BCI's are on the market to 'enhance' focus and mood. Critically, standard consumer hardware can function without user consent as a hidden BCI. VR headsets serve as the best full platform for reading and writing, followed by smart caps, headbands, and smart earbuds, & to a lesser extent by smart glasses and smartwatches.

BCI Plans for Whom? Based on litigation records from the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, rushed experiments for Elon Musk's *Neuralink*'s high-density deep brain connections led to painful deaths, with self harm, of over 1,500 test animals (e.g., monkeys). As one of the world's wealthiest & most powerful, Musk has leverage to push this into the mainstream. Despite having enrolled only 21 human participants worldwide in its early clinical trials, developers are rapidly scaling for mass industrial manufacturing. The company wants human- AI integration for everyone now, despite the impossibility of long-term physical safety studies or definitive protections for privacy & mental liberty.

2025 Federal AI Policy Framework

Under Executive Order 14365, the federal government moved to preempt and legally challenge state-level artificial intelligence (AI) regulations.

Concurrently, implementation began for the Rural Health Transformation Program via federal health infrastructure legislation. This initiative directs federal funding toward tech-driven healthcare, explicitly prioritizing consumer wearables, remote monitoring, robotics, and AI.

Energy & Resource Attention

- 4G technologies consume **23 times** more energy than a wired connection.
- 5G base stations consume 3 times as much power as 4G & need more antennas for the same area: using up to **69 times** more energy than wired.

>90% of the network cloud's energy consumption is driven by wireless usage, while driving raw mineral extraction & pollution in mining communities.

Need for Reliable & Safe Infrastructure

The fragile wireless grid introduces massive points of failure. 1 error or hack can shut down cellphone towers, erase 911 access, cut internet, & freeze retail debit and credit card machines (*e.g., Rogers Outage 6/1/2022*) or cut power, transit, & water (*e.g. July 2026 water in 12 states hacked*). Remote control of wireless utility meters & appliances allows utilities to cut one's power illegally or for hackers to start an oven fire.

Legacy copper phone lines that work during a power blackout with better connectivity are being dismantled, with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) permission, so telecom companies can sell copper for an estimated \$7 billion & require wireless service.

Catastrophic overheating, electrical arcing, and explosions are tied to wireless digital utility meters (*e.g., Palo Alto, 2011, 80 caught fire at once*). Utility poles heavy from cell tower antennas are prone to fall or catch fire (*e.g., 2007 Malibu Canyon fire*). Advancing federal bills allow the FCC to preempt or overrule state safety regulations for antennas.

Protecting Local Finances & Lives

Personal & local sovereignty suffers when health & finances do. Local economies are impoverished by tech's monopolies (*e.g., Amazon*), copyright theft, required tech purchases, wage docking, and AI-enabled job losses.

DID YOU KNOW? The Distributed AI Research Institute in 2025 reported invasive surveillance sensors, AI systems, cameras, & phone apps flagged Amazon delivery drivers for normal behavior (*e.g., braking/ toilet*), docking pay or causing termination.

The FCC has failed to respect a 2021 court order by the DC Court of Appeals to base wireless exposure guidelines on docket filings of science & harm such as fatigue, memory loss, headaches, and mental distress.

Meanwhile, electric lines exceeding 500 milligauss (mG) are being set under public sidewalks when decades of data show childhood leukemia risks double from chronic exposures of 3-4 mG. Home values drop to 44% near transmission lines, on the rise to serve IT. Values drop near utility pole antennas, too.

Suppression is possible as the boundary between corporate and government data & surveillance dissolves & leverages artificial intelligence to enforce tight control. Local dependence on technology lacking guardrails fosters government and corporate misuse.

Support our Petition Initiative for Safer Choices

Our initiative petition creates an independent office to research clear, legal & scientific paths for safer technologies as related to non-ionizing radiation like electricity & wireless and, where needed, to identify alternatives. We need your help in order to succeed.

Paid for by ballot committee Safer Tech at LastTreeLaws.com

The Biological Effects of Non-Thermal, Non-Ionizing Radiation

What the Peer-Reviewed Science Reveals About Long-Term Exposure

The Hidden Military Archive & Halted Federal Research

The public remains largely unaware of non-ionizing radiation risks due to the immense financial power of industry and a historic legacy of military concealment. Declassified U.S. defense and intelligence documents list extensive findings of harm. The National Toxicology Program (NTP) eventually completed a landmark, \$30 million study in 2018—the first comprehensive federal public investigation in decades—which found **"clear evidence" of cancer and DNA damage** in laboratory models to reflect cellphone exposures. Despite these alarming results, the agency abruptly announced it would halt all further research.

Carcinogenicity (Long-Term Cancer Risks)

Decades of epidemiological research consistently link wireless radiation and specific electromagnetic fields to increased cancer risks, particularly tumors and leukemia. This assessment is explicitly backed by senior, newly retired federal scientists from the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) and NTP—including **Dr. Christopher Portier, Dr. Linda Birnbaum, and Dr. Ronald Melnick**—as clear and undeniable.

Reproductive Health & Prenatal Development

A substantial body of peer-reviewed studies demonstrate severe reproductive impacts, including direct sperm DNA fragmentation, structural deformities, and elevated miscarriage rates. Multi-generational studies indicate progressive declines in ovarian function. Furthermore, prenatal exposure is linked to long-term developmental issues in children, including attention deficits, reduced socialization, increased asthma rates, and metabolic weight gain. Articles on this science & history can be searched at **Microwave News** (.com).

Neurological Disruptions & Chronic Illness

Since the widespread deployment of cellular infrastructure, continuous exposure has been repeatedly tied to neurological and systemic symptoms. Documented effects include chronic headaches, cognitive and short-term memory impairment, sleep fragmentation, cardiac arrhythmias, and severe hormonal and metabolic disruptions. In his landmark book *Dirty Electricity*, epidemiologist **Dr. Samuel Milham** tracks how the historical introduction of electrification directly correlated with the rise of modern diseases, identifying specific high-frequency voltage transients as the primary driver of these illnesses.

Environmental Degradation & Wildlife Collapse

The rapid expansion of the tech infrastructure inflicts massive environmental damage through staggering energy grid demands and destructive mineral and water consumption. Biologically, non-ionizing radiation acts as an environmental stressor. Joint studies published by researchers **B. Blake Levitt, Dr. Henry Lai, and Dr. Albert Manville** document severe impacts on plants, soil microbiology, and wildlife, detailing chronic cellular stress, disorientation, reduced fertility, and unprecedented behavioral disruptions in birds, bees, and mammals. ~ Paid for by the Safer Tech at LastTreeLaws.com ballot committee

The Radiation Regulatory Gap ~ *Why Federal Protections Froze in 1996*

The 1996 Political Miscalculation

Regulatory non-ionizing radiation gaps in oversight trace back to the *Telecommunications Act of 1996*, authored by then Rep. Ed Markey. To accelerate infrastructure deployment, **Section 704** of the Act stripped local zoning boards of the right to block cell towers based on health concerns while transferring safety guidelines from the EPA to the FCC. A separate bill that year defunded the EPA's radiation research branch, halting public safety research.

The Death of Competition and Mainstream Journalism

The Telecommunication Act of 1996 lifting of ownership caps also allowed a handful of conglomerates to buy up local media to intertwine with telecom companies & corporations. Without independent media as a public watchdog, propaganda becomes press.

The Push for Costly Tech and Surveillance

Today, federal legislators push private wireless over more secure fiber and the more reliable, better regulated, publicly-owned copper landlines. Forcing daily tech dependence while funding unregulated expansion with our taxpayer dollars enables dual misuse for surveillance, propaganda, data manipulation, fabricated biometrics, and remote hacking (of grids, appliances, devices, etc.). This high-power electric data infrastructure provides the exact energy footprint required to host and deploy electromagnetic or directed energy weapon systems and remote AI operations, concentrating decisive power in technical hands.

A Systemic Crisis from Shrinking Resources

In a high-stakes race to control shrinking global resources, liberty, public and environmental health are treated as a secondary concern. This short-sighted prioritization of technological control over natural stability creates profound systemic risks, ignoring the inevitable reality of technological failures and the foundational value of the Earth and its people.

The Hubris of the Technocratic Ideology

This detachment from biological reality reflects dangerous ideological hubris. A faction of wealthy technologists actively pushes a future of tech-created food, designer babies, brain chip implants, lunar colonization, and more—falsely assuming engineering can replace nature, while dismissing safeguards as obsolete barriers rather than essential.

The Federal Court Ruling

By maintaining an engineering-focused FCC that legally froze safety standards in 1996, the federal government ensures powerful interests face zero public health barriers. This systemic failure was exposed in August 2021 when the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled in **Environmental Health Trust et al v. FCC** that the FCC had acted "arbitrarily and capriciously" by completely ignoring decades of science finding harm from non-thermal, non-ionizing radiation exposure.

Paid for by Safer Tech at [LastTreeLaws.com](https://lasttree.com) Ballot Committee ~ All RF science sourced from Levitt et al., declassified federal archives, & the 2021 U.S. Court of Appeals ruling.