

TRANSCRIPTS



5G SUMMIT

2020 WORLDWIDE CALL TO ACTION

HOSTED BY JOSH DEL SOL



The contents of this book are for informational purposes only and are not intended to be a substitute for professional medical advice, diagnosis, or treatment. These presentations do not provide medical advice, diagnosis, or treatment. Always seek the advice of your physician or other qualified health provider with any questions you may have regarding a medical condition.

PRESENTATION LINEUP

- 01 **Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.**
Dangers of 5G to Children's Health
5G satellite insanity
Industry lobbying and captured agencies
Violations of human rights and informed consent
- 13 **Martin Pall, PhD**
How Wireless Causes Harm (Part 1)
9 different areas of harm from wireless
Chemical process behind the harmful biological effects
Why 5G is more dangerous than its predecessors
- 32 **Magda Havas, PhD**
Extensive Biological Effects of EMFs and 5G
Rise of "electro-hypersensitivity"
Impact of EMFs on your health
Simple solutions to protect your home
- 51 **Devra Lee Davis, PhD MPH**
Science on 5G and Wireless Radiation
Science the industry doesn't want you to know
Impact of millimeter waves on your health
Exposing the industry playbook
- 70 **Jason Bawden-Smith, BAppSc, MSc**
Critical Disruption of Mitochondria by EMFs
Central role of quantum biophysics
What are the business benefits of 5G?
Healing at the root level
- 93 **Paul Heroux, PhD**
Harmful Effects of 5G and Wireless
Reactive oxygen species (ROS) and metabolic disturbances
Non-thermal effects from wireless radiation
Technical problems linked to the Internet of Things

PRESENTATION LINEUP

- 111 **Patrick Wood**
5G: The Agenda for Total Control
Connection between 5G and the “Technocracy”
Economy based on energy consumption and surveillance?
The “social credit” policy (and other dangerous agendas)
- 131 **James Corbett**
Implications of Surveillance Capitalism
5G, the IoT and total control of humanity
Chinese social crediting system in the West?
Freedom from socially-engineered propaganda
- 147 **David Greenfield, PhD**
Addicted Society: Tech Addiction and 5G
How to protect children from screens, VR and gaming
Coming to terms with tech addictions
Awareness of “addictive-by-design” technologies
- 166 **Sayer Ji**
5G and the War on Consciousness
Satellites and 5G: what are the facts?
Propaganda and censorship tactics
Threats to freedom of choice and natural medicine
- 185 **Max Igan**
5G and the Spiritual Crisis of Humanity
How geopolitical structures use fear to control
Legal steps to block and remove 4G/5G installations
Embracing the opportunity for awakening
- 205 **Paul Seils**
5G and Total Global Surveillance
Military and intelligence surveillance
Grassroots campaigns to apply criminal justice
How Australians and others are taking action

PRESENTATION LINEUP

- 223 **Dietrich Klinghardt, MD, PhD**
Best Protection From EMFs and 5G
Metals, mold, autism, Alzheimer's and autoimmunity
Strategies for overcoming EMF trauma
Clinical experiences of major recovery and healing
- 242 **Larry Gust, BBEC**
Safeguarding Your Home from 5G and EMF
Types and sources of EMF radiation
Best methods for protection
Building Biology Institute: EMF safety experts
- 267 **Terry Stotyn**
Eliminating Dirty Electricity in Your Home
Where does it come from?
How "dirty power" causes disease
3 benefits of filtering "dirty electricity"
- 285 **Wolfgang Jaksch**
PEMF Technologies for Healing
Identifying the different types of EMFs
Using pulsed electromagnetic field therapy (PEMF) for healing
Future of preventative and therapeutic medicine
- 301 **Dana Ashlie**
Solutions for a Toxic Agenda
Reducing EMF harm and detoxing heavy metals
Exploring deeper motives for using 5G
Emergence of spiritual refinement
- 324 **Jerry Day**
"Smart" Meters and Their Hidden Agenda
Link between 5G, "smart" meters and IoT
4 main concerns (you should know about!)
Powerful tips in the fight for our rights

PRESENTATION LINEUP

346

Theodora Scarato, MSW

Local Government and Community Actions

Science behind health effects from 5G and wireless
How federal government agencies have failed us
Local government pushback strategies

364

Sharon Goldberg, MD

Science About Wireless and 5G

EMFs, diabetes, mental illness and suicide
Refuting industry and government statements
Common misconceptions about EMFs

386

Kevin Mottus

Complete Regulatory Failure of 5G

Why isn't government protecting people?
How the FCC is a "captured agency"
Most effective actions you can take

404

Raphael Mahaim

Regional Governments Standing Against 5G

Why the Swiss are banning 5G
Industry response to government resolutions
Educating government officials

418

Timothy Schoechle, PhD (part 1)

Flaws of Driverless Cars, 5G and IoT (Part 2)

5G is not required for driverless cars
False expectations created by 5G marketing
Are 5G & IoT the next big bubble to burst?

440

Trevor Marshall, PhD

Debunking 7 Myths About 5G

Unacceptable risk from 5G transmitters
Difference between satellite and local 5G
Most important step to protect yourself and family

453

Ronald Melnick, PhD

"Clear Evidence of Cancer:" The \$30M NTP Study

Findings of the U.S. National Toxicology study
Cancer, tumors, heart problems and DNA damage
Why is government ignoring this landmark study?

PRESENTATION LINEUP

- 471 **Raymond Broomhall, LLB, GDLP**
How 5G Sites are Being Blocked and Removed (Part 1)
Step-by-step legal process
The “Achilles heel” of the telecom industry
Connecting with community and creating change
- 485 **Susan A. Manewich, MA**
Emergence of New Energy Technologies
Technologies to prevent centralization of control
How evolution of consciousness leads to change
Lifting the veil of repression
- 502 **Joe Martino**
Discerning / Dissolving “Social Engineering” Traps
Role of Trump, Q Anon, and other “narrative” storylines
How to bring people closer together
Empowering meta-shift that’s underway
- 521 **Olga Sheean**
5G vs. Your Inner Authority
4 stages of EMF awareness
Overcoming what separates you from your power
Processing fear and overwhelm
- 542 **Steven Whybrow**
The Inner Challenge of 5G
BulletWhat is the 5G “ultimate endgame?”
Using natural law to enhance your personal power
Embarking on a spiritual journey of self-discovery
- 559 **Debra Greene, PhD**
Changing the World with Inner Resources
Using “internal senses” for power and authority
Necessary and transformative role of fear
Embodying the courage to speak out about 5G

PRESENTATION LINEUP

578

Richard A. Lear

Root Cause of Chronic Disease Epidemics

What is the "P-FACTOR?"

7 biological factors behind the healthcare crisis

Pivotal roles of EMF and peroxynitrite

602

Martin Pall, PhD

5 Most Critical Areas of Harm (Part 2)

Most startling ways 5G damages your health

High urgency to solve this meta-problem

Possible role of EMFs in wildfire ignition

621

Tom O'Bryan, DC, CCN, DACBN

Wireless Radiation in Autoimmunity

Link between EMF and chronic disease

Impact on neurological health and immune system

Consequences of industry-controlled regulation

641

Beverly Rubik, PhD

Effects of Wireless on the Human Biofield

Understanding the human biofield

How to protect yourself from 5G?

EMF effects on live blood cells

657

Ty and Charlene Bollinger

Informed Consent: Who Owns Your Body?

Link between wireless radiation and cancer

How 5G and policies violate the Nuremberg Code

Rising above the strategies of "divide-and-conquer"

674

Tim Sandars

EMF and New-Paradigm Physics

Fundamental "flaws" in traditional physics

How EMF radiation causes harm

Quantum physics for protection and healing

PRESENTATION LINEUP

696

Raymond Broomhall, LLB, GDLP

The Legal Action Process (Part 2)

Templates to prevent 5G in your community
Step-by-step guide to Ray's legal action process
Organizing your community to fight

717

Timothy Schoechle, PhD

Communities Using Fiber Optics Instead of 5G

Pilot cities providing wired solutions
Educating elected officials
Benefits of local governments taking control
5G, driverless cars and IoT as the next bubble to burst?
Communities and local governments working together

738

Cece Doucette

Protecting Our Children

How to educate elected and school officials
Overcoming communication barriers and fears
Connecting with community members and leaders

762

Patrick Colbeck

Keys in the Fight for Justice

Why most elected officials are "tone deaf" to risks
Importance of discussing risks and benefits
Role of faith in the fight to protect life

783

Claire Edwards, BA Hons, MA

Unlocking Hidden Potential of the 5G Crisis

UN responses and other governing agencies
Propaganda programs (and how to counter them!)
5G as a community-catalyzing event in our world

798

Derrick Broze

Building Local Community to Resist 5G

Connecting to perform intentional actions
Educating elected officials
How industry has corrupted governing agencies

Dangers of 5G to Children's Health

Guest: Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.

Josh: Joining us today on the summit is Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. Mr. Kennedy, welcome and thank you so much for being here today.

Mr. Kennedy: Thanks for having me.

Josh: Your work and your background, Mr. Kennedy, you really need no introduction. Obviously, our audience is going to be familiar with you. You are a member of America's leading family and you are not afraid of rejection. You are not afraid to rock the boat, especially for children's health and their rights and you're willing to speak truth to power. Before we dive into your perspective on 5G, I wanted to first ask you, was there a turning point in your life or was it a gradual process or perhaps it was genetic, what led you to this role that you currently have of being a freedom fighter and willing just to take a bold stand for what you feel is right?

Mr. Kennedy: Well, I got involved in environmental issues when I was a very little kid. I loved the outdoors. I loved the rivers and streams and animals. I was very involved with wildlife from when I was little. I was conscious of pollution. This was back in the late 50s and early 60s. Washington DC had cement plants that were belching up smoke and the soot would come down and land on your clothes. At that time, there was a lot of air pollution where tens of thousands of people would die every year in our country. I was conscious that we were losing species.

In 1963, I was deeply involved in hawks, falcons, training hawks from when I was a little kid. A kind of iconic bird for me was the Eastern – or

Anatum – Peregrine falcon which was the eastern version of the most spectacular predatory bird in the world. It was a salmon pink and had beautiful white covert on the cere and there was a pair of them that used to nest on this old post on this building in Washington DC. And, whenever I would go visit my father who was the Attorney General or my uncle in the White House, I would look forward to those trips because I could look down Pennsylvania Avenue to the post office building and I could see these birds up there. They were the fastest birds in the world. They flew 240 miles per hour, and I could watch them come down Pennsylvania Avenue at these extraordinary speeds and pick pigeons out of the air right in front of the White House, 50 or 60 feet above the White House. For me, seeing a sight like that was more exciting than visiting my uncle in the White House. But that bird went extinct from DDT in 1963, the same year that my uncle was killed.

I couldn't swim in the Charles or the Potomac or the Hudson when I was growing up because of the pollution. I remember the Cuyahoga River burning in '69. I remember the Santa Barbara oil spill and I remember when Lake Erie, which was the biggest fishery – half the fish in the Great Lakes came out of Lake Erie – and, when it was declared dead, that drove 20 million Americans out into the street in 1970. I was 16 years old and went to New York City to demonstrate. I was involved with environment from when I was little. When I was 8 years old, I wrote my uncle, the President, a letter and asked him if I could come talk to him about pollution in the White House. He invited me there and I spent time with him in the Oval Office.

Then he arranged for me to meet with Rachel Carson who came to our house in Hickory Hill, who he was actually defending at that time from the attacks by Monsanto and by his own USDA, by the Department of Agriculture, and also his Secretary of the Interior. I was always involved in that. When I became an attorney, I went to work for fishermen on the Hudson suing polluters and helping build the Waterkeeper Alliance, which has now 350 waterkeepers in 44 countries with the biggest water protection group in the world.

I got dragged kicking and screaming into the vaccine issue. I was litigating at that time on behalf of various waterkeepers in the United States and Canada against about, I think, 38 coal-burning power plants and cement kilns across North America mainly for discharging mercury. That was what we were targeted on. The FDA had just done a survey that found that 100% of freshwater fish in the United States were contaminated with dangerous levels of mercury and most of that was coming from coal-burning power plants.

When I was suing, I was going around the country talking about those lawsuits and, wherever I went these women would sit in the front row and they would come up to me afterward – and they

were very presentable. They were professionals most of them. They were pharmacists and doctors and lawyers and one of them was a psychiatrist named Sarah Bridges, and they kept handing me scientific studies and saying, "If you are really sincere about your concern about mercury exposures to children, you should look at mercury in vaccines." I avoided doing it for a long time. One of them actually came to my house in Cape Cod. She was the mother of a child who had gotten autism from a vaccine and actually got an award from the vaccine court who recognized that his autism came from the vaccine and she said, "I am not going to leave here until you read these studies" and she handed me a whole pile of scientific studies.

And I'm accustomed to reading science. I wanted to be a scientist when I was a kid and that is one of the reasons I got into this racket. Virtually all of my lawsuits, I've had hundreds of lawsuits, and virtually all of them included some type of scientific controversy, so I am comfortable reading science. So, when I sat down and read it, I was immediately struck by the delta between what the scientific establishment, medical establishment, were saying about vaccines and mercury and what the science actually said. That kind of took me down a wormhole on this issue. That has ended up really kind of changing my career in many ways and taking me away from what I'd really like to be doing, which is to be suing water polluters and working on energy issues and environmental issues, and spending a lot more time working on children's health.

Josh: So, you founded the Children's Health Defense Organization because of your -- you were talking about how you became aware of vaccines and the harmful side of them that really had been covered up. How does 5G fit into your initiative?

Mr. Kennedy: Children's Health advocates on behalf of children's health and particularly against toxic exposures, including pesticides like glyphosate. We have been very instrumental and involved in the Roundup case and litigation. PFOAs and then other kinds of pesticides and fluoridation. And, so, 5G is something that really fits in with all of the other things we are doing. Our children today are walking around or swimming around in a toxic soup. There is a lot of inflammation and reaction that has synergistic effects from all kinds of different sources as it is and 5G may be an aggravating factor in all of those things. Electromagnetic waves, we know, impact children and they impact fetuses and children more than they do adults. We know they cause immune activation, they cause inflammation. The World Health Organization has said they are probable carcinogens. And this, we're talking existing cell phones with people, which are 2.4 GHz, much, much less potent in terms of their capacity to disrupt genes and to disrupt the electric currents of our body.

We're deeply concerned, particularly because you have a captured

agency, the FCC, which is kind of a posterchild of a captive agency. They are a very powerful industry, multi-trillion-dollar telecommunications. You have a military involvement which makes it a lot more difficult. There are immunity issues. It is hard to sue them. It is hard to bring them under the discipline of democracy. There is immunity from litigation for human health effects in certain contexts with this already. Big data today on everything. There are so many powerful interests within society that want to see this happen. The big tech people in Silicon Valley like Elon Musk and Amazon. They're putting all these satellites up. Big telecommunications companies, the Pentagon, the CIA, and all of the other stakeholders are building up our data and there's imperatives that include competing with the Chinese and the Russians and other people around the world. This is a system that could be weaponized. Military applications and, so, it is being pushed through without much thought.

A few months ago, the highest executives of telecommunications companies went before the Senate and they were asked, "Have you ever done any health studies on 5G?" And they said, "No." They were asked, "Have you allocated money to do a health study?" And they said, "No." And that seems kind of crazy because we know that there are literally, thousands and thousands of peer-reviewed publications and it shows a, not only 5G but 4G, detrimental effects on fetal and newborn development and detrimental effects on young children. Brain tumors and other cancers, DNA damage, altered gene expression, neurological effects, cognitive impairment, impaired sperm function and quality, altered metabolism, cardiovascular diseases, learning and memory deficits and many, many other. And not only 4G but also 5G has the capacity of altering the entire ecosystem. Nobody has studied it. Nobody knows what it is going to do and yet somehow – it has its own logic and it is pushing it through the political process without any kind of impediments or questioning. It is a huge nightmare, global experiment with human beings being used as some guinea pigs.

Josh: We even saw that the Belgium Minister of the Environment and Housing for Brussels said that exact thing, "I don't want my people to be as guinea pigs. You can't put 5G in." Let's talk about the environment a little bit more, the environmental effects of 5G. In other words, the pollinators, the animals, the soil. I know that there are some studies there. What can you tell us from your perspective as an environmental legal expert on this side of the 5G question?

Mr. Kennedy: On the scientists, I don't know enough I know there's a guy called Allan Shupe who is a famous architect and he is an environmental leader. He also has an apiary at his home in Millbrook, New York. He has a lot of hives there. About 10 years ago, I was at his house and he said, "I want to show you something" and then he took my cell phone. He put his cell phone on top of a beehive and called his cell

phone, which was on vibrate. When his phone rang, all the bees came out of the hive and even the queen came out. I was like, "Holy cow! I have never seen anything like that." I have seen a lot of bees in my life. I had never seen anything like that before. It takes a lot to get the queen to come out of the hive. I said to him, "Why is it doing that?" And he said, "I don't know." I don't know why. I don't know if anybody knows, but it is disturbing. You know the fact that something that has even that kind of observed empirical effect that I have seen. The fact that we are going to allow 20,000 satellites to feedback at all of us this... I was at Standing Rock during the demonstrations against the pipeline. I didn't get hit with that – they had an electronic wave weapon there and they had sound weapons which I was attacked with.

Josh: Wow!

Mr. Kennedy: And they had water. Other people there had been – they turned on the electromagnetic weapons, whatever they are, and they described them. They said it felt like their skin was burning up and they just wanted to run away. The other thing is, even at the low-level satellites, they are in the ionosphere. That is a very, very fragile part of the physiological ecosystem of the planet and we have no idea of what it will do if we disrupt the ionosphere in that way. There are so many unanswered questions and the experiment is so vast and so huge there is literally no part of the planet where anybody will be able to go to escape this. One of the good things is there are people, there are localities on the planet, as you pointed out, that are saying: "we are not going to allow the antennas here". Let's wait and see what happens. Let's see some science on them first. So, people are standing up and they are – a number of communities that stood up against them. They have won those battles. It is a very, very powerful industry and these are tiny pockets, at this time. They are going to be able to end run everybody, including in space, we're not going to have any choice.

Josh: So, you helped to lead the charge against Monsanto for that first big lawsuit. What, from your perspective, Bobby, on what you are seeing Monsanto and how they are very likely falling? First of all, do you think Monsanto is going down? And second of all, if you could relate it to what you see happening within big telecom, is that also on a long, sort of timeline for them to go down? How do you see this big picture happening, first with Monsanto and then with the big telecom and 5G?

Mr. Kennedy: I have been involved in all three Monsanto cases. I mean I suppose you can say it was analogous because it's a very powerful industry that has a captive Agency [the FDA] and that was able for 40 years to collaborate with regulators, with captive regulators inside of that agency, if they do any safety science on their pesticide, on their herbicide. We were actually able to get into the agency to look at the arguments. It became very clear that they had moles in the Agency that

were working for Monsanto and were not working for the American people. As a result of that, we had a best and most widely used pesticide in human history. Essentially it is now ubiquitous in most of our food, our water and our air, and it was a giant experiment on humanity around on the world. There is impact clearly on pollinators and other species. There is impact on microbiome, macrobiome and all our survival systems for humanity and they didn't care because they were making money. And they lied about the science. So, this an industry with billion dollars at stake with not just millions of dollars but trillions of dollars at stake. This is an industry that has friends at the highest level of the Republican party and with people of other parties all over the planet. This could be a very, very tough opponent to grapple with, because politically they're so powerful.

Josh: Now there is someone, a lawyer in Tasmania, Australia, that is part of this summit that I've interviewed: Raymond Broomhall. He's led the charge there in Australia and Tasmania and he's actually had the success and results of blocking 2,500 small cell 5G installations, so this is something that is very new. He blocked 1,600 from going in and actually... 900 of them, the carrier [has] uninstalled after he initiated, with the support of the community, a criminal action, a criminal assault-based action using doctors' medical opinions for their individual patients. Now, I know this is the first time that you might be hearing of this. What's your initial take on this development in terms of either the results or the legal process? Perhaps you and I, after his conversation, can keep the lines of communication going. I would love your input.

Mr. Kennedy: I think there are a lot of legal opportunities to challenge 5G on a local basis. My worry is... I think using US laws, like in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which is a law that requires environmental impact statements, and each state has an analogous active... and there's a lot of opportunities to, because there's so little science, they cannot give us a cost-benefit analysis because they have never done one and they don't have the science to do one; they are just trying to rush ahead and use political clout to force this; so, I think there are opportunities to challenge them and to create local pockets where they're not able to get in and do their business -- ...the problem is if they put them up in space: then there is nowhere and no way to escape from them!

Josh: There is a unique aspect of 5G and wireless infrastructure and devices because, from everything that we have uncovered, the big insurance companies do not insure electromagnetic radiation producing devices or technologies or cell towers. It seems that they are self-insured. I know Lloyd's of London has refused it. Swiss Re, the large underwriter, has issued a statement basically saying that 5G and electromagnetic radiation is in the highest risk long-term, their highest risk category. What are your thoughts on the insurance side of things?

Mr. Kennedy: The insurance industry is the ultimate arbiter of risk. These aren't hippies and tie-dyed – who are saying: “Oh this is a new technology that is too risky.” These are guys in suits from Wall Street and Fleet Street who are saying: “This technology, we’ve looked at it and, if there was a way for us to make money insuring it, we would figure out how to do it; but it is so risky, that any money we make, we can lose 10 to 20 times as much. We are not going to do it.” They did the same thing with the nuclear industry. The nuclear industry can't be insured, so the nuclear industry went to Congress and a sleazy legislative maneuver in the middle of the night passed the Price-Anderson Act which essentially relieves nuclear power plants of liability and the utilities that own them of liability for radiation damage if they have a leak or if they have an accident.

So, they are uninsured, but Congress gave them a way to get financing. I would agree, if you can sue them, unless they can figure out a way to do what the vaccine industry did, which is to get immunity from liability, I think they are going to get sued and they are going to have to pay a lot of money. We live in a scary world right now because they are big industries like “nuke” and like the vaccine industries that have been able to purchase Congress that gave them immunity from the injuries that they caused human beings. And we will have to see whether this industry is capable of doing that.

Josh: Now you're talking about legal immunity. You mentioned near the start of our conversation that, the way that you mentioned it, Bobby, seemed to indicate there might be ways through that, even in the vaccine side of things so they are not as immune as people perhaps perceive them to be. And, also with the 1996 Telecommunications Act, Section 704, as you know, says that local governments can't refuse cell tower siting on the basis of environmental grounds. That also is now coming into light, like people realizing that, perhaps, isn't as ironclad of an immunity grant that we have been led to believe. What are your thoughts on either, if it's the vaccine side of things or the vaccine manufacturers or the 5G Telecom regulators and carrier providers?

Mr. Kennedy: I'm not sure what your question is?

Josh: My question is this, do they actually have full legal immunity or is it just the perception?

Mr. Kennedy: They certainly have limited immunity if a locality is trying to block them. A locality can't pass a law, like your local town cannot pass a law banning cell towers on account of the risk that they pose to human health. But I am not sure how much reach, beyond that, that that law has. Does that mean that you can't sue them under NEPA and force them to do an environmental impact statement that discloses their health impacts? I don't think so. I think they still have to do that. I think

we need to organize a resistance and we need to get the lawyers fully engaged. We need to start probing the fortress walls for weakness, for legal weaknesses, and do what we do -- with every wood -- use all the tools of advocacy, what Martin Luther King called the tools of advocacy, which is agitation, legislation and litigation, and I would add innovations. All of those things: we are going to have summon as a resistance, to build a resistance around those kinds of campaigns.

Josh: How important is it that we educate and inform and hold accountable our elected officials?

Mr. Kennedy: And the public!

Josh: Yes.

Mr. Kennedy: People have no idea that this is happening. People, I think, are completely unconscious of it, and I think the industry likes that because nobody's asking questions. The public needs, we need to do a lot more about educating the public and educating public officials and getting some really good allies in Congress who are asking the right questions, subpoenaing witnesses and having hearings so the public understands this.

Josh: When I was talking with former Michigan Senator, Patrick Colbeck, he was saying that he was giving a little bit of insight into elected officials, their mindsets and how you actually create change at that level. Something that he told me was that 20% of elected officials are on one side, locked in and their perspective is not changeable, 20% on the other side, 60% are more malleable. But pretty much everyone is subject to tremendous lobbying. Does that line up, first of all, with your perspective, or what can you tell us about how really to make inroads and get champions and have influence within the realm of elected officials across the country and around the world?

Mr. Kennedy: It is harder and harder because so much of it is money-driven. Telecommunications are like the oil industry and the pharmaceutical industry, they put a lot of money into lobbying on Capitol Hill. They already own a lot of Congress people. They own a lot of lobby shops. They have hundreds of lobbyists. There are no public organizations at this point with a presence on Capitol Hill, so they are zero lobbyists against this on Capitol Hill. And there of hundreds and hundreds of lobbyists for it. That is a deficit we are going to have to cure, that we are going to have to remedy.

The presence of people is the other thing Politics are driven by two things: the democracy, democratic politics.... One hand is money and the other is intensity. I think the intensity will come from our side. They have the money and they also have these very, very powerful allies that

exercise an unseen hand in this process. The intelligence apparatus and the military apparatus is looking at this as a national security issue and, of course, there is more and more focus on cyberwarfare and there is going to be an imperative that says that we don't want to lose this cyberwarfare battle to the Chinese: "And look at what they're doing; we know that they're doing this, and so, we need to stay ahead of them". I think all of those imperatives will have their ambassadors are whispering into ears on Capitol Hill and telling them not to listen to our side and not to listen to the human health aspects. And we are going to have to find our own champions.

Josh: Tell us about informed consent. The principle of it, why it is important for ourselves and our children, future generations going forward.

Mr. Kennedy: Informed consent, most of us agree that it is a fundamental right. Interventions that are going to impact our health. It really gained a lot of traction after World War II when human beings were subject, in concentration camps and elsewhere, to unwanted experimentation and medical interventions and essentially human experimentation. The Nuremberg Accords and the Helsinki Agreements and many, many other international, ethical treaties and proclamations, Syracuse Agreement which is sort of an ethical constitution of the United Nations and the primary human rights declarations all recognize that informed consent prior to interventions that might affect human health is an essential, fundamental human right. If you put all these things [the facts] in space with no information, without information you can't have the consent. Right now, nobody has this information. The people are putting it up in space. Admit that. They were specifically asked by the Senate, "Have you done any studies or tested this is safe?" There is no data that would indicate that it is safe. There is only propaganda. There is no data, there are no data. There are a lot of studies that indicate that it is not safe.

Video Excerpt:

Mr. Blumenthal: "I believe that Americans deserve to know what the health effects are, not to pre-judge what scientific studies may show, and they deserve also a commitment to do the research on outstanding questions. So, my question for you, particularly Mr. Gillen and Mr. Berry, how much money has the industry committed to supporting additional independent, I stress independent research? Is that independent research ongoing? Has any been completed? Where can consumers look for it? And we are talking about research on the biological effect of this new technology."

Mr. Gillen: There are no industry backed studies to my knowledge right now. Happy to visit with you as to what opportunities you think there

needs to be more studies and we are always for more science. We also rely on what the scientists tell us.

Mr. Blumenthal: So, essentially, the answer to my question how much money, zero.

Mr. Gillen: I can (he stutters) totally follow-up with you, Senator. To my knowledge there's no active studies being backed by industry today.

Mr. Blumenthal: Anybody else know of industry commitments to back research, fund it, support it, to ascertain, scientifically, to help that?

Mr. Berry: No. I am not aware of any—

Mr. Blumenthal: So, there really is no research ongoing. We're kind of flying blind here as far as health and safety is concerned. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

End of Video

Josh: With regard to whether it's 5G, deploying it without any safety studies, or whether it's vaccines being mandated in the face of a lot of obvious risks once you look into the science, how is it that these agendas continue against informed consent and, really, what are the implications of, if we don't draw a line now to protect ourselves and our children from these invasive technologies, what are the implications going forward? Who really owns our bodies? Who really owns the bodies of our children if we kind of allow this trend to continue?

Mr. Kennedy: All those questions are tied up in the essential question, which is, can we maintain the integrity of our democracy? Or is our democracy, because of all the money and politics now... are all of our rights going to be subverted and made secondary to corporate profit taking? That's what we are seeing today. We are seeing a domination of the political process on this kind of corporate kleptocracy. And all of human behavior is now subject to regulation in a way where the primary priority seems to be the profits of these corporations. All of us are subject to being commoditized. The landscapes are being commoditized. Our children are being commoditized.

It's a shocking evolution of American Democracy from it's highest ideals which are human dignity, independence, human freedom, the right to choose, and let's listen to what human beings say. We're dealing with a Congress now that is actively urging big tech companies to censor questions, or critical information about pharmaceutical products. Now there's 1,500 pharmaceutical lobbyists on Capital Hill. The other industries are going to do the same thing. They are going to censor "bad information". You know there was a law passed in Texas last month

that makes it illegal, makes it a felony to participate in a demonstration against pipeline projects.

We are reaching that point in our democracy where arguing with the corporation or criticizing a corporation is going to become a criminal act. And we are already there with vaccines. The vaccines are already a profit-making drug, a \$50 billion industry that are being mandated forcibly imposed with coercion on American citizens against their will. We have our political leaders who are telling these big tech companies... - everybody agrees they are far too powerful! -hat they should censor any criticism, they should censor photographs of children who have been injured by vaccines, hey should abolish vaccine injuries by *fiat* by simply declaring it doesn't exist and allowing nobody to talk about it! It is a very, very dangerous place that we are going into. It's Kafkaesque. But it paves the way for 5G. This is something that is bad of human beings, clearly. It is going to benefit the military industrial complex and it isn't going to benefit the average American and yet they are going to try to force it on us because so many people are going to be making profits from it.

Josh: About censorship, I wanted to ask your perspective on what we are seeing with censorships, particularly around vaccine choice, vaccine safety and rights. Are they doing this, taking books off Amazon and films off Amazon and now social media and you can't even have your say about simple facts – are they doing this because they are afraid of something – and when I say, I mean the corporate complex, the pharmaceutical industry – or are they just doing it because they can?

Mr. Kennedy: The pharmaceutical industry doesn't want to have a debate. I have been doing this for many years. The last time I was allowed to publish an editorial, and I'm not just talking about the mainstream papers like the New York Times, the LA Times, or the Chicago Sun Times or the San Francisco Chronicle or the Boston Globe, none of those have ever let me write an editorial, ever. but for a while Huffington Post was and some of the other liberal blogs, but the last time I was allowed to write an editorial in the Huffington Post was in 2009. That was a decade ago.

Even these so-called liberal blogs, which are supposed to be the antidote of corporate control of American society and democracy, have somehow been persuaded that they need to be part of this juggernaut of censorship and now you have the social medial, Facebook and Google. And they have their own partnerships with the vaccine industry. Google is now a vaccine company. It has a partnership with GSK, GlaxoSmithKline, like a \$600 million partnership. Not only are they making vaccines together, but they are also – GSK has a contract to mine data, for Google to locate your health information, your heart rate when you are holding your cell phone. And what Alexa or Siri can find

out about you as you are living in your home. To mine that data and to develop drugs and vaccines *etcetera*, and then directly market them to you.

It's a frightening world we're living in. These kinds of pharmaceutical companies control hospitals, they control the medical, they control the journals. And, now, they control the social media and, of course, they control the TV. Anybody who looks at the evening news, I think I read the other day that, the average evening news has 22 ads on it and 17 of those are pharmaceutical companies own. Out of those advertising purchasing dollars, \$9 billion in a year that they are putting into American media is purchasing content as well. That's a bad thing for democracy because democracy depends on an informed public.

Josh: You mentioned big data. You are talking about all these connections behind the scenes. How do you think children would be impacted by what 5G would bring in terms of constant surveillance and data harvesting?

Mr. Kennedy: Well, I have seven kids, I am very frightened to think about the world that they are going up in, because I think, everything they do, they are never going to be out of sight of some kind of surveillance system. It is scary. It is scary to think about how you can maintain a democracy under those conditions.

Josh: I have so much respect for you because you have taken the bull by the horns, so to speak, and you are fighting for what's right. Everybody watching this gets that. We are so grateful for you. What do we need to do to turn this thing around?

Mr. Kennedy: On a large level, I think we need to get money out of politics. We need to refer to the citizens united case and return to where we were before and restore the integrity of our democracy. On the smaller scale, everybody needs to become an advocate. Everybody needs to become involved. You can't afford to sit at home anymore and pretend this isn't happening because it is real now and the bad guys are winning, and we need to take back our democracy. Of course, I would suggest to people that they should join Children's Health Defense, follow me on Instagram, and get involved. And thank you.

Josh: Thank you. And I second that. Everybody watching this, there's a link on this page, click that and go to Children's Health Defense website, sign up for an e-mail, get involved. Mr. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., thank you so much for everything you are doing in the world and for the time that you have given us in coming on the summit today. On behalf of everyone watching, we really appreciate it.

Mr. Kennedy: Thank you so much. It has been really a pleasure.

How Wireless Causes Harm, Part 1

Guest: Dr. Martin Pall

Josh: With us today on the summit is Dr. Martin Pall. Martin, thank you so much for being with us.

Dr. Pall: My pleasure.

Josh: This is an interview that I've been looking forward to for a long time. I think I contacted you around a year ago, and we've been trying to set it up. And so now that we're doing the summit, I'm just very pleased to be able to talk with you and to be able to help your vast knowledge and information get compiled and released to the people, to the viewers. It's very important at this time. So I'd like to just read your bio, and then we'll dive right in.

Dr. Pall: Okay.

Josh: So, Martin Pall is a Professor Emeritus of biochemistry in basic medical sciences, at Washington State University. He earned his PhD in biochemical genetics from Caltech, and was on the faculty of WSU for many years before; "retiring" in 2008. But you haven't really retired, have you? You just continue to do a lot of work in this area. Since then, he has published numerous papers on wireless radiation effects. Dr. Pall's research has focused most on nine different categories of the effects of wireless radiation, including neurological and neuropsychiatric effects, cellular and DNA, cell death, endocrine effects, cancer, cardiac effects, very early onset Alzheimer's, and other dementias.

One of the most valuable contributions Dr. Pall has made, is describing in detail, the main mechanism by which these effects are produced. So, Dr. Pall, let's dive right in. So talking about these so called government safety standards, governments and their agencies are telling us that

5G, just like other wireless sources, is going to be safe because it comes below the threshold; below their stated threshold of supposed safety. What can you tell us about these government standards and why we should or should not look to them as defining what is and isn't safe?

Dr. Pall: Well, with any theory, and basically, the safety guidelines are a theory that predicts what things are safe and what things are not safe, you need to test the theory to see whether it makes accurate predictions. And so what I've done recently is to go through each of eight different types of repeated studies, which tell us whether the safety guidelines in fact, predict biological effects and therefore are safe or not. In every single one of these, these safety guidelines fail and in most cases, fail massively, to make accurate predictions. And it's very interesting to see the way in which they fail because the way in which they fail tells you a lot about what the problems are with the safety guidelines.

So I guess what I'd like to do is to go through those eight with you. So we can discuss what's going on and why these safety guidelines really don't tell us anything about safety. Okay, so the first thing is that there are these different effects that you discussed in your introduction. There are large numbers of reviews on nine different effects that have been published, that clearly show that each of them occur at levels well below safety guidelines. And therefore the safety guidelines do not predict safety. And by the way, they range from nine to 38 different reviews on each of these things. So there's a lot of evidence on every single one of them.

So let's talk about them. First of all, you have reproductive effects. So, the reproductive effects... EMS, well below safety guidelines, have effects on the structure of the testes, and the structure of the ovaries. Both of those have been done in animals. They produce a lower sperm count, lowered sperm motility; other measures of lowered sperm quality. So all those things are very important for male fertility. They produce lower number of eggs in females and lowered fertility, in human studies. They produce increases in spontaneous abortion, and humans and in animals. They produce lower levels of each of the three kinds of sex hormones; estrogen, progesterone, and testosterone, and lower libido.

So everything that you can think of that might impact reproduction is being impacted here, and this is extraordinarily serious; at levels well below our safety guidelines. And in many cases, orders of magnitude below the safety guidelines, like 1,000 times lower or 100 times lower. So that's a big deal. Now, there are all these other things, there are widespread neurological, neuropsychiatric effects. And we'll talk about those in some detail, I think, in the second interview. And they are already far along in our societies. And we'll talk about that also, in the second interview.

There are other effects. The mechanism of action goes through excessive intracellular calcium, which produces everything else, and so

that's one of the things it's produced. These are intracellular calcium levels go up, following EMF exposures. Oxidative stress, and free radical damage goes up following EMF exposures. What's called apoptosis, sometimes pronounced apoptosis; programmed cell death, goes up, following EMF exposures. Again, all of these well within our safety guidelines.

Josh: Just to jump in, you're talking about peer reviewed published science that is vetted and within the scientific community, right?

Dr. Pall: Yes.

Josh: But which the safety standards and the governments are not taking into account?

Dr. Pall: That's correct. So the apoptosis is very important, both for the reproductive effects that we already talked about, and also neurodegenerative effects and so that's important. And you also have attacks on the cellular DNA, of three different types. You get single stranded breaks, you get double stranded breaks, and you get oxidized bases, they all produce important mutations that can be involved in both cancer causation and in reproductive... producing mutations in young babies that were just born. So that's a big issue.

And then cancer, which of course is caused to some extent by the DNA effects we just talked about. There are 38 different reviews arguing that EMFs, well below our safety guidelines, cause cancer. And I think it's absolutely stunning that we're still discussing this issue. The only reason we're discussing it is because the industry puts out so much propaganda, that it's getting covered all the time. But there is extraordinary evidence that cancer, in fact, is caused by EMF exposures. And that the DNA effects we talked about before are an important part of that, but not the only mechanism. There are other things that are going on as well.

There are also hormonal effects of various sorts. Almost every hormone system or perhaps every hormone system in the body is impacted. And then there are also the cardiac effects, which we haven't said anything about. So the EMFs cause immediate tachycardia, rapid heartbeat. They, over longer time periods, produce bradycardia, slow heartbeat, and they all produce arrhythmias. Arrhythmia is associated with bradycardia, and are highly associated with sudden cardiac death. And we have a big epidemic of increases in sudden cardiac death, including among apparently healthy athletes, dying in the middle of an athletic competition.

Josh: Yeah, sorry to jump in there, Martin. We saw a Canadian longtime career journalist, exposing what was happening in, I believe the Simcoe County School District in Ontario, in a talk to, I think the board there, the school board. And he was telling how since the Wi-Fi was installed several years ago, in a short period of time, there was two sudden deaths from students and two others, cardiac arrest that were

resuscitated. All around the time from the Wi-Fi being installed. And in many of these districts, and most regions aren't correlating that possible link between when Wi-Fi transmitters and all these Wi-Fi devices go live; and effects like that. I mean, so that one thing alone is potentially, like, huge, in terms of the risk of what we're talking about here with 5G and beyond.

Dr. Pall: Yah, it is. I mean, there are many, many risks, and we'll talk about five of them that are, I believe, clear, existential threats to our survival. And I won't even be talking about the cardiac effects at that point.

Josh: We'll dive into those in the second half, in part two. If you're watching this, we'll go into those five specific areas. What we're going to do now is just more of an overview to expand the science and the mechanism really. So yeah, please continue, Martin.

Dr. Pall: Okay. So we have all these things. By the way, there's a total of 197 bodies of evidence, each of which shows that one of these things is occurring at levels well below our safety guidelines. So there should be no question about any of them. And yet the reason, of course, we're still talking about it is because of all the industry propaganda, which has no connection with reality. And by the way, there are a whole series of types of radiation that we are exposed to all the time that have major effects on us.

So we're talking about cell phone radiation. We're talking about cordless phone radiation. We're talking about cell phone towers, you know, people who live near cell phone towers. We're talking about Wi-Fi. We're talking about smart meters. All of these have major effects on us, based on all the available evidence we have. So it's really outrageous that people don't have a feeling for what they're facing. And the main reason is because of all this industry propaganda, and the lack of coverage in the media, on all these things. And again, we're talking about peer reviewed studies, in the scientific literature, that show all these things. I mean, we're in a weird situation. Okay, so let's go on with regard to the eight. That's just one of the eight that we just talked about. That 197 bodies of evidence. That's just one of the eight. Okay, let's go on to two.

Josh: One of the areas in which...?

Dr. Pall: Areas where you have extensive, repeated evidence that the safety guidelines do not predict biological effects and therefore do not predict safety.

Josh: Okay, thank you.

Dr. Pall: Second one, we have 13 different reviews that each show that pulsed EMFs, EMFs that pulse up and down rapidly, are in most cases much more biologically active. And therefore much more dangerous than our non-pulsed EMFs. And part of the reason this is important, is that every single wireless communication device communicates at least in part, via pulsations. So, these are things we are exposed to all the

time. And even radar has as its own sort of pulsation because it uses something called phase arrays, which exposes us to pulsations.

So, almost everything we're exposed to is highly pulsed, and the smarter the device, the more the pulsations. And potentially, and I believe actually, the more dangerous it is. So we're going down this road towards smarter and smarter devices, with the whole issue of pulsations being key, and this is totally ignored. The whole role of pulsation, totally ignored in the safety guidelines and totally ignored by the regulatory agencies. Even though we've known about these things. I mean, the first review on pulsations was published back in 1965. Believe it or not, and so it's bizarre where we are. Okay, so that's the second area and it's very important, and especially important with regard to 5G, because 5G is terribly highly pulsed.

The third area has to do with what the main mechanism is, by which non-thermal effects are produced. And this is my own work, not based on my own experimental studies, but based on studies that were in the literature before I ever got involved in this. So what we know is that there are, I believe, 28 different published studies that have shown that EMF effects, these non-thermal effects, can be blocked or greatly lowered by using calcium channel blockers.

And there are five different classes of these that have been used for these studies. And they're all thought to be highly specific in what they do. So this argues that those calcium channels, and they're called voltage gated calcium channels, which are blocked by these drugs, these calcium channel blockers; that what the EMFs are doing is activating those voltage gated calcium channels. Therefore, you can block or greatly lower the effects by essentially blocking these channels.

Josh: Do you want to dive into that more now? And we will be able to show some visuals on the screen as you talk about this. But is what you're saying, EMFs disrupt the ability for calcium ions to go in and out of the cell through the membrane? Is that correct?

Dr. Pall: No. What the EMFs do is they actually greatly increase the influx of calcium ions through these voltage gated calcium channels. The voltage gated calcium channels, I abbreviate as VGCC, is just so you don't have to keep repeating all that stuff. So what happens is that the VGCCs get activated by the EMFs and we know now why they get activated. And this is very important. The VGCCs have a structure called a voltage sensor, in which the normal physiology, it detects the electrical charge across the plasma membrane.

So, these are channels in the plasma membrane, the membrane that surrounds all of our cells. And as far as I can tell, they occur in every single cell type, not necessarily at the same levels, not necessarily the same types; there are actually 10 different types of these things. But they occur in all of cells. And when the channels open up, they allow large amounts of calcium to flow into the cell. And most if not all,

biological effects are produced by excessive intracellular calcium. And intracellular calcium is designated Ca^{2+}_i , which I think is on some of my figures that you may be showing.

Josh: So that's a huge point right there. In the fact that there was an existing body of science before, like, you've looked at these studies, you've expanded this awareness about the primacy of the role of VGCCs. And you've added to this body of knowledge, and you're bringing it forward; because for years, that's been kind of a distracted question by the industry, is, "What then is the mechanism?"

So now you've essentially answered that and there's others who have different parts of the puzzle, such as Paul Héroux, who is part of the summit, and other researchers. But this, I just want to focus in on that, for people to realize this mechanism, this aspect of the mechanism and the science of how these molecules work together, and these VGCCs. That's absolute prime knowledge and information that everyone needs to be aware of. Would you agree?

Dr. Pall: Yeah, well obviously I will agree. Of course, I have a little bias in this but let me just say; the first paper that I published on this that I published in 2013, has now been cited 219 times in the scientific literature, according to the Google Scholar database. So that's very important because what it means is, is that this has been widely recognized. And this is unusual, usually in science, when you come up with a new paradigm of what's going on, it takes quite a while before people accept it. But this is already widely accepted. That doesn't mean everybody accepts it. But it means that there has been a stunning amount of acceptance of this view, in a short time period. So that's important.

Now, there are a couple of other very important things here that I want to mention. And one is that, all the EMFs, all the way down from millimeter waves, through microwaves, through radio frequency, through intermediate frequency, through extremely low frequency from our power wiring, 50 or 60 hertz, depending on what part of the world you happen to be in; all the way down to static electrical fields, and amazingly, static magnetic fields, they all can work via VGCC activation. And this is absolutely stunning because it's a big surprise.

So then the question is, why is it that the VGCCs are so sensitive to low intensity EMFs? And I think the reason basically comes out of the structure of the voltage sensor, the thing that actually regulates the opening of the channel. So the structure has been known for a while, from a number of important scientists who've worked on this thing. And what's true is that the voltage sensor occurs on four different alpha helices that are within the structure of the VGCCs, and that occur within the lipid part of the lipid bilayer. So they're in the fatty part of the lipid bilayer of the plasma membrane.

That turns out to be very, very important for two distinct reasons.

And one is that there's something called Coulomb's Law, it's the law of physics; it was first enunciated back in 1784 by August Coulomb, a French physicist. And Coulomb's Law says that the forces on electrically charged groups are inversely proportional to the dielectric constant of the medium in which they occur.

Josh: Translation?

Dr. Pall: Well, so the dielectric constant of the fatty part of the membrane is about 120th of the dielectric constant of the aqueous parts of our cells and bodies.

Josh: What is dielectric?

Dr. Pall: Well, it's a measure of the electrical properties, basically, of that part on a charger. The point is that the forces on those charges are about 120 times stronger, because of the dielectric constant. Okay, so that's important. The other thing that's even more important is that the plasma membrane has a very high electrical resistance. And for that reason, things are highly amplified. The electrical gradient, highly amplified across the plasma membrane, and that's about a 3,000 fold.

Now, when you put all this together, it turns out there are 20 charges in the voltage sensor and so you've got 20 times 120, which is the dielectric constant, times 3,000. So if you're comparing the forces on the voltage sensor, with the forces on singly electrically charged groups, and the aqueous parts of our cells and bodies, the force is about 7.2 million times stronger. That's absolutely stunning. And the safety guidelines are based on heating, on the thermal effects.

Josh: Yeah. The safety guidelines throw out all of that science and all of the science period, and just look at how much something heats up over a period of time.

Dr. Pall: Right. So the thermal effects are produced mainly by the forces of these electric charges on singly electrically charged groups and the aqueous parts of our cells and bodies. That's how it gets produced. So that argues alone that our... and we'll talk about other things that come into this... but it argues alone that the safety guidelines are allowing us to be exposed to levels that are something like 7.2 million times too strong.

Now, one of the things that we'll say later is that those response curves on this are nonlinear. So that doesn't mean the effects are 7.2 million times higher than they would be at the safety guidelines, as opposed to at the very low levels the safety guidelines should be. But still in all, this is a huge, huge thing, and it's really gigantic.

Josh: Can I just ask about the plasma membrane? I want to understand and kind of visualize this mechanism, and hopefully some of the slides we can add in, will help. So you mentioned the plasma membrane of the cell. Does that have anything to do with what I think Gerald Pollack and Paul Lemay, science and tech writers, journalists, were talking about like

this fourth phase of water? Do you want to say anything about that or is that going into left field?

Dr. Pall: I mean, it doesn't have a direct relationship to it. That's all I can say.

Josh: So plasma membrane is essentially just the cellular membrane that regulates the influx of calcium ions and other ions.

Dr. Pall: Yes, it regulates the influx and efflux of all kinds of things into the cells. Yeah, that's right. So, the plasma membrane is very, very important. One thing about this is that normally, under normal conditions, where you're not trying to regulate anything, the calcium levels inside cells are about one 10 000th to the calcium levels outside the cell. And so there's a big concentration gradient driving calcium into the cell.

There are also electrical forces driving calcium into the cell. So all of this means there's powerful forces driving calcium in. And obviously, the fact that the cells keep the calcium levels very low, means that that's a very important thing to do. And so what happens when you activate these VGCCs when they shouldn't be activated, and you keep activating them, you get all kinds of really stunning effects that occur.

Now, there's one other thing I want to mention here, and that is that you can see the physics here tells us why these VGCCs are so sensitive. And let me just say, there are also other voltage gated ion channels that are activated, but the calcium channels seem to be the really important ones, probably because calcium itself is so important in the cell. So basically, the biology is telling us that the VGCCs are the main mechanism of action of the EMFs, and the physics is telling us why. So here, the biology and physics are clearly telling us that the same thing is going on here. So this is a very, very important finding here.

Josh: You mentioned earlier that there are specific medications for reducing the influx of calcium ions. Can you say a little bit more about them? And are you talking like, are they pharmaceuticals, or are they natural? What effects have been observed so far?

Dr. Pall: A lot of these studies have been done in cell cultures. So, people have been looking at the kinds of things you can look at in cell culture. Which include calcium influx, which include the hormone release, for instance, which include apoptosis, and which include oxidative stress. So a lot of this stuff has been looked at, at the cellular level, which is, of course is what... in general, in biology, if you've got something occurring at the cellular level, it's best studied at the cellular level. So this is the best way to study it. So, those things are all terribly important here.

Josh: I just want to dive into that a little bit more. Are there specific medications or remedies available for reducing the influx of calcium ions?

Dr. Pall: I think there are some things that help and in fact, for a long time, people have been saying, "Well, these calcium channel blockers don't really help clinically." Now there are starting to be reports where apparently they do. At low concentrations, you can actually get something. I don't know that it's that clear. The problem, of course, is that these VGCCs are important. I mean, they're there for important reasons. So you can't completely block them. If you do, you're just blocking not only the whole nervous system, but all kinds of other things like your heart, and so forth.

So, there are limitations to what you can do. I think there are a number of things that could be useful, including magnesium, which is probably useful as well. But let me just say, I'm a PhD, not an MD. Nothing I say should be viewed as medical advice. So, should we go on to some of these others? We've gone through three of these things and each of them shows that the safety guidelines don't predict biological effects and therefore don't predict safety. There are several others and I want to talk now about a couple of other types of studies, which involve this whole area of pulsation. The reason why I want to talk about it, you know, pulsation is terribly important with regard to understanding 5G. So it's very important to understand these things, to understand 5G.

Okay, so there have been at least 100 different studies on what are called nanosecond pulse studies. So nanosecond pulse is defined as a pulse that's between one nanosecond and one microsecond. So there's a big range here, but they're all very short. And what's true, is we have a lot of studies that show the nanosecond pulses, and some of these occur in cell culture and some of these occur in whole organism studies; produce effects, very similar to the effects that are seen from other kinds of EMFs. And that it's been shown that these effects also go through VGCC activation.

So, the next two actually are very important, with regard to the pulsation issues, and which are very relevant to 5G. So those are things we need to focus on, to understand 5G. Okay, so the first of them has to do with single nanosecond pulses. So these are pulses that last somewhere between one nanosecond and one microseconds. They go up and down quickly, and they produce effects. But the safety guidelines... which we really haven't talked about their structure, the safety guidelines use average intensities, over a period of six minutes or 30 minutes, to predict whether there will be biological effects or not. Okay, so six minutes, think about that.

So if you take, let's say, a typical nanosecond pulse, let's say one that's 40 nanoseconds long. And you average that intensity over a period of six minutes, you're averaging the intensity over a period that's 10 to the 10th times longer; 10 billion times longer. Now, obviously, what that does is it lowers the average intensity by a factor of 10 billion. So what the safety guidelines do is they predict, "Oh, there shouldn't be any effects," but there are. There are effects over and over, and over again,

and safety guidelines say, "No, there can't be any effects."

Josh: It's almost insane, when you break it down. The fact that this has been allowed to occur, to define our standards of safety for the general entire population for so long. I mean, it's insane. But please continue.

Dr. Pall: Yeah, I mean, it really is insane. So, what is the rationale for taking something that will work in, let's say, 40 nanoseconds to produce an effect, and averaging it over 10 billion times longer? It makes absolutely no sense to do this. I discussed something, which would be a sort of a parallel failure in logic, in the document that I wrote up on this. Let's say you're concerned about being shot by a high powered rifle bullet that goes over 2,000 feet per second. And that rifle bullet then takes about 50 microseconds to destroy your body. And you go to a regulatory agency, and you say, "Well, I'm concerned about this," and they say, "Oh, don't worry about it. If you average the intensity over 10 billion times longer," which turns out to be about 75 days, "the average intensity is so low. You don't have to worry about it."

Josh: Right.

Dr. Pall: I mean, that's exactly the kind of logic that's being used here, by the safety guidelines in the regulatory agencies, with regard to EMFs. So it is, as you said before, totally insane; and yet, that's what we're doing. So those nanosecond pulses are very important because 5G is going to have huge numbers of nanosecond pulses. It's also true that there are also studies on pairs of nanosecond pulses; and those are also important, and they're also highly relevant to 5G.

So there are studies that have been done where you have pairs of nanosecond pulses that are within a few microseconds of each other. And what you find is, if they have the same polarity, and we'll tell you why the polarity is important a little bit, they produce super additive effects. So, the safety guidelines are based on only having additive effects on anything. So here you have super additive effects of two nanosecond pulses within a few microseconds of each other.

You're going to have billions and billions of these pairs of nanosecond pulses in any kind of full-fledged 5G system. So these are highly relevant to the kinds of exposures that we'll have, whenever 5G, if it ever happens, that we get something like the final system that they want us to get, which I certainly hope we never will, it's going to be absolutely stunning what the biological effects are going to be.

Josh: So, by super additive, you mean, kind of synergistic on the negative side. Where more than one adds up to be greater than the sum of its parts.

Dr. Pall: Much bigger effects than the two summed together, yeah.

Josh: Okay. And then I also just wanted to say, for our viewing audience, that as part of this summit going to make that standards document that you wrote, we're going to make that available as part of this summit. So

look for that, if you're watching this, either on this page or look for it in your email, but that's an important document, Martin, and we want to help to get it out.

Dr. Pall: Great, thank you. So there are also studies that have been done where the second pulse has the opposite polarity of the first pulse; and when that happens, it actually lowers the effect of the first pulse. So you get much less effect than you get with the first pulse alone. So this has been called cancellation or partial cancellation. So the second one, if it has opposite polarity, you get a major lowering in the effect. Now, that's not predicted by the safety guidelines either, because the safety guidelines assume that everything's additive.

Now, this actually tells you several very important things about the EMFs and the safety guidelines. First of all, the safety guidelines are based on the assumption that EMFs have scalar properties; that is they have intensity, but they don't have any directionality. And that's what allows the safety guidelines to just average these things. They just look at average intensities; that's all they look at. But what this clearly shows is that's not true, and in fact, it's been known for about 200 years that EMFs are vectors, not scalars. They have a directionality, and that the angle at which the magnetic and electrical fields kind of stick out from the direction of the vector, can vary.

So you can get different angles, and that's where the polarity comes in. So the polarity is very, very important here, as you can see, because you have one polarity and a relative polarity. And you get super additive effects, you get the opposite one; and the second one greatly lowers the effect of the first one. So there are major issues and all of that shows that the basic structure of the safety guidelines is completely bogus. They're assuming that EMFs are scalars, not vectors, and not vectors with polarity; and we know that assumption is false.

So the physics is false here, again. Okay, we talked about the physics of the VGCCs as being very important and being a very important example where the physics is false, with regard to the safety guidelines. Here's the second one. So the people who taught the safety guidelines say, "Oh, the physics is wonderful." Well, the physics in fact, is not wonderful, and it doesn't work. The physics they've got in the safety guidelines is deeply, deeply flawed. So that's important.

Okay, now let's talk about two other things that are important here and that is that there are a whole series, I think there are nine different reviews that have been published. Where you have what are called intensity windows. Where the intensity of a particular kind of EMF, within a certain range of intensities, not a very tight range, but a fairly tight range of intensities, give you maximum effects within that intensity. But when you go lower or higher, they drop way down.

Josh: Interesting. So it's not always a higher intensity equals a higher effect and a lower intensity equals a lower effect. There's something else

happening here.

Dr. Pall: That's right. That's right. So what that tells you; that tells you something else that's very important about the safety guidelines. So the safety guidelines, as I said before, are based on everything being additive. You can only have additive effects if you have linear dose response curves.

Josh: What is a linear dose response curve?

Dr. Pall: It means if you double the intensity, you're going to double the effect. If you go up the intensity tenfold, you're going to get tenfold the effect, and so forth. So it's directly proportional, the effects are directly proportional to the intensity. So it makes no sense whatsoever to simply add these things, and we already said they didn't add them right anyway. But it makes no sense to add these things if you have nonlinear dose response curves, and these dose response curves are not only nonlinear, they're what's called non monotone. That is, they don't always go up with increasing exposure, and they don't always go down with decreasing exposure.

So again, the whole structure of the safety guidelines is bogus. It's not just that it doesn't make good predictions, the whole structure of it is just ridiculous. Okay, so that's another thing that's very, very important. So, the other one is that there have been a whole series of studies where specific research groups, using the same methodologies, have studied different cell types in culture. So you look at different cell types. And what they find is that the effects produced are highly dependent on what kind of cell you're looking at.

That's not surprising at all, when you've got a biological target. But that's not what you expect if all you're looking at is heating, you know, the thermal effects, and a biological target, which differs from one cell type to another. At least in terms of how much is there and what kind of susceptibility they have. So, what that tells you, in fact, is you cannot ignore the biology. That's clear. And in fact, every other example that we talked about also says you cannot ignore the biology; because all of these things, where you look at the biology, you find the safety guidelines don't work.

So, the fact that the industry and the regulatory agencies have been ignoring the biology throughout this whole thing is just another outrage in this whole process. So what we have here is a multi-trillion dollar set of industries, all of whose claims of safety are based on fraud, really. Because the safety guidelines are fraudulent, and therefore anything based on those are fraudulent.

The last thing of these eight is that there are also, what are called frequency windows, and these are very specific frequency ranges. So you're talking about a very, very tight range, where specific frequencies give extraordinarily strong effects, even in extremely low intensities. So, intensities many orders of magnitude below what some nearby

frequency would require to see an effect; you can see extremely large effects.

And these are thought to be due to resonance with a target, and I think that's right. I would predict the targets are the voltage sensors of these VGCCs, but we don't know that; we have no evidence on that. The interesting thing is, the only place where we do have evidence on what the target is from these resonance things, are some studies that were published by Igor Belyaev, on *Escherichia coli* bacteria. And in that case, the direct target is actually the DNA.

Josh: Can you define the direct target? Are you talking about the specific target mechanism?

Dr. Pall: Well, I mean, so we talked about the fact that the voltage sensor is the direct target, but there could be other direct targets. And in this case, from Belyaev's study in *E. coli*, the bacterium, *E. coli*, the target of these frequency windows is the DNA of the cell. And I won't try to tell you what the evidence for that is, but I think it's very compelling evidence. So that's interesting and that's surprising. So it raises another question about, is the DNA also a target in the animal and plants? And I think there are effects on the DNA in animals and plants, but so far, we don't have any evidence that they're important for anything. So I don't know. I don't know the answer to that. But we shouldn't be too dogmatic about things. That's a possibility that may still be out there.

Josh: It seems like the insurance companies know about this, at least to some extent, right? Like Lloyds of London doesn't ensure wireless products. And I mentioned in a couple of the other talks, like Swiss Re and some other major insurance companies are identifying the high level of risk of the wireless industry. It seems like there's some level of awareness of this behind the scenes and probably throughout a considerable amount of industry. But they're just looking at the short term and making as much money as they can, and getting as much control as they can, I would argue.

Dr. Pall: Interestingly, the Swiss Re insurance company put out a press release, expressing a great concern about 5G; specifically about 5G. And that's, I think, very important. It was in German, and I actually translated it into English and put an English version up.

Josh: So, we know of the bio initiative report on bioinitiative.org, there's roughly 1,800 studies, I believe. As early as 1972, Zora Glaser and the US Naval Medical Department, compiled something like 2,300 studies, all showing a biological effect. And all these studies are just not taken into account, as we've discussed, by regulatory agencies. How many studies would you estimate, Martin, are there that show a biological effect from EMF?

Dr. Pall: At levels well below safety guidelines?

Josh: Yeah.

Dr. Pall: I think there are probably at least 14,000.

Josh: Wow.

Dr. Pall: And I can sort of give you a rough idea. Let me just say, there are also therapeutic effects of EMFs, and that's something I recognized from the very first paper that I wrote on it. Which, interestingly, are not recognized by the industry. They're more concerned about maintaining their propaganda claim that nothing's going on, than they are in trying to take credit where they might actually have a little bit of credit. In that there are actually therapeutic effects of these EMFs.

Josh: Interesting.

Dr. Pall: Yeah. So there's something like 4,000 papers on the therapeutic effects and there are at least 10,000 on the pathophysiological effects. And then of course, it's the pathophysiological effects that we're concerned about.

Josh: So, diving into 5G, what is it specifically about 5G, from your perspective, that makes it potentially more harmful than 4G and other technologies? We know that 5G is a higher frequency band, or it includes a higher frequency band, and it actually includes low and mid-range as well. And you mentioned the nanopulses. So maybe talk a little bit about, how is 5G different, with regards to your concerns?

Dr. Pall: Well, let me just say, I'm also very concerned about 4G. That's not a trivial point; but I think that the thing about 5G is the extraordinary level of pulsations. So the whole idea behind 5G is to use high frequencies, which allow you then to have extraordinarily high levels of pulsation, in order to carry extremely large amounts of information per second, or whatever time period you're interested in. So this, again, emphasizes the importance of pulsation in this whole story. And so you're having extraordinary amounts of pulsation in a 5G system.

And if we ever get to the point where 5G antennae are interacting with what they call the Internet of Things, with thousands and thousands of devices, the amount of pulsation undoubtedly is going to be absolutely extraordinary. So, this is an absolutely gigantic issue, the pulsation issue. And let me just say, some industry sources now are saying, "Well, we're really not going to use millimeter waves," so I can't say about that. They may have found out that millimeter waves are way too dangerous, and they've decided maybe they're not going to use them.

But the millimeter waves are absorbed by materials, building materials, materials of our bodies; the electrical parts of the millimeter waves are absorbed. Now, what that tells you basically, is that the electrical parts of the millimeter waves are going to interact with electrically charged groups, including the electrically charged groups in the voltage sensor. So I think what that tells you is that their ability to activate this target is going to be extraordinary, because of this absorption.

Now, one of the things that the industry claims is, "Well, it's absorbed so

much in our body and therefore can't penetrate, except maybe about a millimeter or so into the body, and therefore you don't need to worry about effects deeper in the body." And they've made that argument. I've made a counter argument, and I can tell you what it is, but what's also true is now we have evidence from published studies on millimeter waves that in fact, millimeter wave effects go at least 20 times deeper than what the industry claims. And I suspect it goes much deeper than that.

So how then do you get deep effects? And this is relevant both for microwaves and for millimeter waves. I think the way you get deep effects is that while the electrical parts of the EMFs are absorbed at some level, but the magnetic parts are extremely highly penetrated. That's the first thing. But now you say, "Well, okay, but it's the electrical parts that interacts with the voltage sensor. So why should you even think about the magnetic parts?" It turns out, and I mentioned this before, the magnetic fields can activate the VGCCs as well.

And I think the way they work is that, for instance, when you have a magnetic part of 5G radiation, it goes very deeply in the body, when it interacts with electrically charged groups, this is your dissolved ions in the aqueous parts of our bodies, what does it do? It puts forces on them, and when you put forces on those, you're going to regenerate the electrical parts deep within our bodies. The same frequency, same kind of pulsation, just much lower intensity.

But when you have the voltage sensor so exquisitely sensitive to these EMFs, you can get effects very deep in the body. And this is based on millimeter waves that are not pulsed, so they don't have all the problems with pulsation that 5G does. They can produce effects on the heart, they can produce effects on other internal organs in the body, many internal organs in rodents. They can in humans, produce EEG effects, produce changes in the electrical activity of the brain, in humans. And so in order to do that, what do they have to do?

They have to penetrate through the hair, through the skin, through the skull, and through the meninges that surround all the neural tissue in the brain. And so what that means is, they have to go at least 20 times deeper than the industry claims as possible, in order to do this. And if they can go that deep, they go any kind of deep, because basically, the magnetic parts could go right through your body. So I think this is another situation where the industry makes all kinds of claims. But if you look at the data, it's just wrong.

Josh: So, Deborah Davis, who is the President and leader of the Environmental Health Trust, in this summit, is going to talk about the effects of millimeter wave radiation, according to the independent science. We know that the industry is not doing any science on 5G. They don't want to find out what they probably know that they will, if they were to actually do some studies, that's been admitted, as we talked about before. But one of those studies, I think it's an Israeli study that

looks at sweat ducts. Have you heard about this one, Martin? I think it was a study from last year, the sweat ducts, how they act as Helios antennas of some type, to transmit the energy from the millimeter wave pulsations, more deeply into the body.

Dr. Pall: No, I haven't heard of it. Let me just say, in science, you always have to distinguish between the results and the interpretation. So the fact that you're seeing these effects, doesn't necessarily tell you that the interpretation that's been proposed is the correct interpretation.

Josh: Well, the bottom line, we know that the effects happen more deeply into the body, with millimeter waves, especially with pulsed millimeter wave radiation, and the science is very clear on that. Alright, so just wrapping up this first part, Martin, of this interview, what are your predictions in terms of what 5G, the implications of 5G, would have on humans and the environment?

Dr. Pall: My prediction is that everything that we know that microwaves do, 5G will do vastly stronger, because of the incredible pulsation. And again, we know that the individual nanosecond pulses work by VGCC activation; same mechanism. And, I think there will be absolutely extraordinary effects, because of the pulsation, and also because of the frequency that's being used. And I think there may be specific effects that may be particularly severe, where you have large aqueous regions in the body. Where basically, this conversion from the magnetic to the electrical part may be very highly efficient.

So, there are a lot of those, where there are major concerns. For instance, the cardiac effects we talked about before. You've got a lot of water in the blood and the heart. So there could be very high effects there, and the cardiac effects. There are effects on the whole vascular system, and there are impacts of microwaves, for instance, on the vascular system. So, that's an issue. Kidneys have a lot of water. We may have huge epidemics of kidney failure. The eyes have the aqueous and vitreous humors; we may have gigantic epidemics of blindness, because of the impact on the eyes. I mean, so there are a lot of different things are extraordinarily concerning.

Let me just say that, I expect that obviously, you're going to have a lot of effects on the skin, because there are surface effects, and those surface effects are much, much higher. And among those things that I think will be occurring as a surface effect, we'll probably have giant... and I hate to use that term all the time, but I believe it's true, giant epidemics of melanomas, because of cancer. And there is evidence, in fact that melanomas can be produced by EMFs. And if you have these huge, huge exposures, I think we're going to have huge, huge epidemics of melanomas.

The other thing is that the blood circulates towards the surface, so anything that's in the blood can be heavily impacted. And so what kind of things are we going to see? Well, the erythrocytes, it turns out,

are highly sensitive to the EMFs, surprisingly sensitive to microwave frequency EMFs. And you get things like what are called Rouleaux figures where the erythrocytes sort of stick together into long chains; that kind of clogs up the circulation of the blood.

You also get changes in the structure, you know, erythrocytes kind of look like a nice smooth, more or less donut shape. And those are really good for the erythrocytes to go through, in blood circulation. But when you have EMFs, you get little spiky things coming off of there, which kind of gum things up. You also get a lot of hemolysis, you've got a lot of cells that just lyse and release a lot of hemoglobin into the blood. You can get anemia from that. So I think there are going to be massive effects, from that standpoint.

I think that there will also be effects on the cells of the immune system, including high levels of allergy, because of the impact on mast cells; and also high levels of autoimmune diseases. And by the way, there is a report now on autoimmune diseases being elevated from millimeter wave exposures; and there's a whole series of reports that microwaves elevate autoimmune diseases. The way these elevations work, at least from the microwave studies, is that you get changes in the T cell signaling that controls the autoimmune response. And these are our calcium signaling changes in the T cells that control it. So I think we're going to have huge epidemics of autoimmune diseases, as a consequence of 5G.

Josh: And we already are, right? I mean, there's 1 in 6 people apparently, in the United States that has an autoimmune condition and it's all been increasing exponentially, in just this generation, since the proliferation of wireless.

Dr. Pall: Right. So it's amazing that we've got all these things going on, and we at least we have substantial literature, which says EMFs cause autoimmune diseases, and nobody's paying any attention to it.

Josh: Yeah. We know the chemicals, I mean, the various industries that produce chemicals. Dr. Tom O'Bryan talks about this in the summit, how that contributes, and wireless exposures contribute to an overall toxic load in the body that once it's reached, is when people start exhibiting symptoms. And everyone has a different level of threshold. Would you agree with that, just that overall toxic load perspective on it, at what point people exhibit health problems?

Dr. Pall: I'm skeptical about that. I mean, the reason I'm skeptical about it is from some other work that I've done in the past, and that has to do with the fact that chemicals, and I believe EMFs and other stressors, such as physical trauma, such as infections, etc., etc., can initiate a vicious cycle mechanism. And once the cycle mechanism gets going, it can propagate itself over time. And then it doesn't make any difference what the initial causation was; this thing will go on regardless.

So I think that in fact, in things like multiple chemical sensitivity, when

people are studying what kind of chemicals they have in their bodies, often they're not high. That's in part, of course that people avoid chemical exposures. But it doesn't help them get rid of the disease, it helps prevent it from getting worse, which is useful.

So I think that... let me just say, there are chemicals.... and this is another thing that I've worked on in the past... that act through increases in the NMDA receptor activities, those also produce increases in intracellular calcium. So the effects of the chemicals, and the effects of the EMFs can be very similar, because they can both work often via increases in intracellular calcium. So I think, to my mind, that's a better perspective to use, to understand the connections between the chemicals and the EMFs.

Josh: Is peroxy nitrate part of the overall mechanism that involves VGCCs?

Dr. Pall: Yes. There are two main pathways of action by which the EMFs produce pathophysiological effects. One is through excessive calcium signaling, and we already talked about that. The other one is that from the increases in intracellular calcium, you get increases in both nitric oxide and superoxide. Those are two free radicals actually that are relatively non-reactive. But when they react with each other, which they do very readily, they form peroxy nitrate, which is a potent antioxidant.

Peroxy nitrate is not a free radical, but it breaks down to form highly reactive free radicals, including hydroxyl radical, which is probably the most reactive of all of them. So, you then get free radical effects and in fact, that's how the DNA effects are produced. The DNA effects that you get are produced through the free radical attacks on the DNA. And those then can produce single strand and double strand breaks in the cellular DNA, and they also produce oxidized bases. And those are the three types of things that we see in the DNA effects, they can all be produced in that way.

So, the free radicals and oxidative stress are very important parts of this whole story. You also get increased inflammation as a consequence to them. And that goes through increases in a transcription factor known as NF Kappa b. So we know a lot about how these things occur. And that's, I think, very important. I mean, the industry tries to claim, "We don't know anything," and it's just complete crap.

Josh: Well, Dr. Martin Pall, thank you so much. This has been a blockbuster talk here, this part one of two. And just such valuable information that lay people, parents, the industry, and our elected officials need to know; this is the root fundamental science, showing causation, showing how all this is working at the cellular level. I really appreciate your time.

In part two, we're going to go into the big picture, Dr. Pall's big picture perspective. We're going to go into five main areas. We're going to dive deeper into the science of those five main areas of symptomatology.

We're going to talk about how we solve this problem and get Dr. Pall's thoughts on that. So, Dr. Pall, thank you so much for your time today. And we'll look forward to talking with you again in part two.

Dr. Pall: Great. Thank you.

Extensive Biological Effects of EMFs and 5G

Guest: Dr. Magda Havas

Josh: Joining us on the summit today is Dr. Magda Havas, who has been a leader in electromagnetic health research for many years. Dr. Havas, thank you so much for joining us today.

Dr. Havas: My pleasure.

Josh: Now, I will dive into your history and the key information on the science and what we can do on solutions that you are bringing to this conversation. I'm really looking forward to dive in with you. And this is actually our first conversation even though I've been following your work for many years, so very good again to connect with you. But first I want just want to share with our viewers your bio, your background.

So Dr. Magda Havas is a professor emeritus at the Trent School of the Environment and Center for Health Studies at Trent University in Peterborough, Canada. She does research on the biological effects of electromagnetic pollution and on the beneficial effects of electro therapies. She is co-author of Public Health SOS, *The Shadow Side of the Wireless Revolution*. Dr. Havas is internationally recognized both for her previous work on acid rain and metal pollution, and for her current research in the area of electromagnetic pollution and electromagnetic therapy.

So just diving in, how did you get involved in this area of research?

Dr. Havas: Well, I was doing research on acid rain and metal pollution. That was my original background as a PhD student, and the first type

of research I did after I graduated from the University of Toronto. And I got involved in that about 1975. And by the mid 1990s, we have clean air legislation, which was what we were ultimately aiming for. That's why a lot of the scientists were doing research was to ultimately change policy so that the lakes would stop becoming acidic and people's health would improve. So once we had clean air legislation, I actually lost interest in continuing the research on acid rain. We studied for a few years how lakes were recovering. So the Clean Air actually made a very big difference in the environment. The environment was responding a lot more quickly than scientists believed it would, which was very promising.

But I realized at that stage that I enjoyed doing research in an area that was controversial scientifically. Now the reason for that is it means basically that scientists are disagreeing, so you know, one side is going to be right and the other side's going to be wrong. And when there's so much controversy, you never know which way it's going to end up. So I like things that are unknown in science, obviously.

I also wanted to do something that had really major impact on the environment and on human health. And I was teaching a course at the time called pollution ecology where we dealt with lots of different types of environmental contaminants, mostly chemical, but not entirely. And I thought I wanted to contribute to my lectures by introducing electro smog and how it affects children with increase the leukemia, for example, which was one of the early areas of research. And so I really got into it out of an area of curiosity and wanting to teach about it. And it took me about three years of reading the literature before I had my own personal opinion about it. It was a relatively new area for me, I was mostly into chemical toxicants rather than electromagnetic toxicants. And so I had a lot of learning to do. And when I read the literature, it was all over the place back then. And so there were people saying, you know, children who live near power lines have a greater risk of developing leukemia and other people saying, those studies are not very well conducted and it's not really true.

And after three years, I became convinced that not only was there a link to childhood leukemia, but people who were occupationally exposed also had a greater risk of having various types of cancers. And then I moved away from just looking at extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields that relate to electricity and moving to something called dirty electricity and ultimately moving to higher frequencies, radio frequency and microwave radiation. So I basically covered in my research the entire gamut of -- from extremely low frequency all the way up to microwaves.

Josh: Excellent. So just looking at -- you said you got involved in acid rain research and that whole conversation in the mid70s, and it was in

mid 90s until there was legislation passed. And so there was a 20 years latency period. Where are we at in the wireless conversation? How far along or is that applicable even that same ballpark for when this conversation reaches the tipping point and you know, we mandate and enforce safe technologies?

Dr. Havas: Well, with respect to acid rain, I got involved in it fairly early on when it was just beginning to become internationally recognized. And with respect to the electromagnetic pollution, it really depends on where your starting line is. So if we go back to some of the historical literature on microwave radiation, for example, it goes back to the 40s and 50s. So it goes back a lot longer period. And my involvement began in 2000. That was the first year I actually published on it. I started about 1995. It took me about five years before I felt I knew enough to publish in this area. So I've been at this for about 20 years already, but it started well before I got involved. So we're running slightly behind acid rain. And I think the reason for that is acid rain is relatively simple compared to this.

When it comes to electromagnetic pollution, there's a lot more sources, it's a lot more complex. There's a lot more reaction, in the sense of we're not trying to reduce smokestacks. And you know, that kind of a mission we're actually asking people to reduce their use of some of this technology in a wireless fashion. And people love their gadgets. So there's a lot of resistance to this. So we're not just asking the industry to make changes, which is basically what we were doing with acid rain. We're actually encouraging people to make changes in the way they live and what they do in their homes to minimize the exposure and protect themselves, and that's harder to do.

Josh: Yeah, well said. What are the different types of electromagnetic pollution and what effects do they have?

Dr. Havas: Well, if we're talking about non ionizing radiation, in my mind, they fall into four categories. One is extremely low frequency, and that includes both electric and magnetic fields. The second is something called dirty electricity or poor power quality. And that's in the kilohertz range. So it's thousands of cycles per second. It's a radio frequency, but it's a radio frequency that travels along the wire and then radiates from the wire. We also have something called ground current, which is a combination of low frequency and radio frequency, the flow is along the ground so it interacts with people in a very different way. Then there's obviously microwave radiation at much higher frequencies that still within the radio frequency band. We can go up to infrared and visible light, they're still part of the non ionizing part of the electromagnetic spectrum. And I do research with light, mostly from a therapeutic perspective of how it helps you heal as opposed to how it harms you.

Josh: Okay. Light including the red light, infrared therapies that we had

talked about before the call?

Dr. Havas: Correct. And blue light as well. Blue light is very good for any kind of skin problems that people have, psoriasis, for example. Including ultraviolet. Ultraviolet has been given a bad name, but there's some really good therapeutic aspects of UV if you use it sparingly. So I do research within all of those areas.

Josh: Okay. And in your research and in the body of science, what are the key biological effects from electromagnetic pollution or EMF or wireless radiation, and these terms obviously synonymous.

Dr. Havas: I kind of call it electro smog to cover everything. You know, electro smog is all forms of non-ionizing radiation. That's how I use it. The health effects fall into three categories, one is cancer, obviously. The other are reproductive problems, particularly as it affects sperm. We have a lot of information on that. But there's also contributions to miscarriages to problems with offspring, if they're exposed in utero to electromagnetic radiation. There's a greater degree of them having neurological disorders, learning disabilities, that sort of thing. And to me, that's all part of the reproductive issue. And then there's a third area that's rather large and morphed, it doesn't really have a good shape to it. And that's dealing with mostly neurological but also hormonal problems and we tend to clump them together as electro hypersensitivity, is a catch all phrase for all of these other things. So the three areas cancer, reproduction and electro hypersensitivity are the key biological responses to electro smog.

Josh: I'd love to dive into some of the specific research that you've done in this area. I remember seeing a number of different videos and different angles and topics that you're exposing, and one of them was with electro hypersensitive patients or those who can feel it and/or exhibit symptoms when a wireless electro smog source is turned on. Can you tell us about the work that you've done specifically?

Dr. Havas: Yes. Primary area of my research is how do we diagnose someone who has electro hypersensitivity using objective technology, objective methods. So we can ask someone how severe their headache is, or some other thing that they're experiencing. And that's a subjective reaction which has real value obviously, especially to the person. But in science, it's lower down on the totem pole kind of thing on being reliable because people will have -- you know, the amount of pain you experience, the amount of pain I experience might be very different. And so you might be an excruciating pain and to you it's minimal, whereas the same amount of pain might knock me out completely. And so there's not this consistency. And you could be you know, exacerbating your pain doing other things. Or you might even assume a lot of it is in your head as opposed to something being really physiological.

And so the question is, what physiological reactions are people displaying that we can measure? And how do we get that information to the healthcare community? So those are my key areas of research right now. And so we've worked with people who are diabetic. So if you're diabetic, and you're also electrically hypersensitive, chances are that when you're exposed to the electro smog in your environment, it's going to affect your blood sugar. Blood Sugar regulation is one of the weak links to someone who's diabetic.

And it turns out that it affects both type one and type two diabetics. So you can be type one diabetic and be electrically hypersensitive or type two diabetic can be electrically hypersensitive, or be one of those without the electro hypersensitivity. And so we began to work with people because we measuring blood sugar is an objective method. It's totally reliable, quite accurate. And so we began by working with people who were diabetic under different circumstances, and either exposing them to more electro smog or reducing their exposure, and then documenting changes in blood sugar.

And I'll just give you one example of that research because I think it's something that has relevance to a very large population. We worked with a woman in New York who was a type two diabetic. She wasn't taking any medication at all. And she controls her blood sugar by the diet she ate, and in the event that she might take in more carbs and sugar than her body liked, she would go for a 20-minute walk. And during that 20 minutes exercise, her blood sugar would be consumed and it would come back down to normal. And she would do this on a number of different days and it came right back down 20 minutes, very reliable. Some days, she didn't want to go outside for a walk because it was raining or it was too dark or whatever. And so she would work out on the treadmill that she had in her home. And she would measure her blood sugar before she got on the treadmill and measure her blood sugar after 20 minute walk on the treadmill. And every single time she went on the treadmill, her blood sugar went up, not down. And if you mentioned this to doctors, initially they don't believe you because you're actually using sugar. So how can the sugar levels go up in your body, but it's very reliable.

And one of the things that we found that might explain this is that someone who is electrically hypersensitive when they're exposed to electro smog, their body goes into a stress response very often. You know, heightened sympathetic stress response just like a fight or flight. And if your body goes into that fight or flight response, it's going to release sugar into your body, so that you can consume that sugar in order to do whatever, you know, run away from the saber toothed tiger.

And so the stress response increases blood sugar and in diabetics who don't have the right amount of insulin, or who are compromised in

certain way, that blood sugar won't go down. And so exposed someone who's diabetic to electromagnetic pollution that they're sensitive to, and chances are, their blood sugar will go up and it'll go up within a matter of 10 to 20 minutes. So it's a very fast response. Put them into an electromagnetically clean environment and their blood sugar goes down. So it's almost like very predictable.

We actually call this a different type of diabetes, we called it a type three instead of one, two. We call it type three diabetes, or something that is triggered by the environment. And that's something that's really important for doctors to know. Because when they tell their patients to just exercise, and doesn't matter if you go on a bike or a treadmill or any kind of electronic equipment. Well, that's not the case, if you're also electrically sensitive. So we have to let doctors know that is not an appropriate way for electrically sensitive people to exercise.

Josh: Interesting. Well, thanks for that. The term electro sensitivity or electro hypersensitivity, I've kind of personally and I know some other people have kind of struggled with that because it almost seems like there's something anomalous or strange or weird about that hyper sensitive person, like the idea that, "Oh, you're just hyper sensitive, everything bothers you."

But really this could it be also called microwave sickness or even, you know, it's exceeding the toxic load of the environmental stressors and toxins. I mean, another way it could be described perhaps is electromagnetically aware, you're just more aware, you're more interactive with your environment. So can you just talk about that term if we could and help us to kind of reframe and even for the audience that are very sensitive to these fields, just to help them perhaps contextualize that it isn't something perhaps that they are victimized for the rest of their life, that they are things that have power, and there's ways that they can see this and things that they can do to come back.

Dr. Havas: Well, I agree with you. You know, the concept of why electro hypersensitivity, why not just electro sensitive. And I discussed this with Olio Hansen many, many years ago, and he said the reason that hypersensitivity is being used because we're all electrically sensitive. You know, we're actually beings of light. And if anything, one of the more profound lessons I've learned in doing this research is moving away from the chemical paradigm of how the body works and moving more to an energy paradigm on how the body works.

And I think once you move into that way of thinking, a lot of things fall into place, and they begin to make sense. Whereas otherwise, you're still scratching your head because it doesn't get. It's like the Copernicus model of the universe and the solar system, and the earth being the center versus the sun being the center. And so now,

if you think of us as electromagnetic beings, and simply every cell in our body has electromagnetic potential charge on the membrane. All of our neurological activity, all of the chemical reactions are also electromagnetic reactions.

So once we start looking at the human body like that, we're all electro sensitive, which means we're going to respond to a certain degree to anything in our environment that has a charge, that's moving in some way. And so if you're electro hypersensitive, it simply means that the levels of exposure are now causing changes in your body that are often negative. So they're not things that you want to happen. The rest of us are probably in homeostasis, we're using energy to maintain that homeostasis.

So we don't necessarily change, we don't necessarily get that headache, but it took a heck of a lot of energy to prevent that headache from happening. And then you pass a certain threshold where your body can no longer maintain that homeostasis, and that's when you start developing symptoms. And the types of symptoms you have depends on your weakest link in your body. So I mentioned you know, if you're diabetic, it will be blood sugar, if you have multiple sclerosis -- and we've worked with people who have MS as well. It'll be a neurological disorder.

Now you said can we call it microwave sickness, and it used to be called microwave sickness. That was the name that they gave to it during the Second World War, which is the first time microwaves were used. Artificial microwaves, you know, manmade microwaves were actually used in the environment. And prior to that, it was called neurasthenia. And that goes back to the turn of the century, early 1900s. And here the term was used for women who worked on Telegraphs and telephone. You know, in the past you had to plug things in for a telephone call and they were getting shocks. They were exposed to fairly high levels of electromagnetic fields, and their nervous system just basically gave up. They started having fatigue, excessive fatigue, chronic pain, sometimes they collapse. They just pass out. And neurasthenia is a weakening of the nervous system. That's basically what it means. So that was the original diagnosis.

It then moved to microwave or radio wave sickness during the use of video display terminals, when a lot of the women secretaries were typing on their computer in front of a big computer screen. Then it was called screen dermatitis, so people who reacted the name was screen dermatitis. And Dr. Johansen in Sweden reported on this and showed that there was a histological reaction to the radiation, and now we just call it electro hypersensitivity. I actually call it rapid aging syndrome, because the cells in your body are aging and you're having the symptoms of aging.

So things like poor sleep, chronic fatigue, chronic pain difficulty in concentrating. These are all symptoms that we have as we age. And many of the people I talked to who have these symptoms say, "Well, I'm just getting older and this is perfectly natural." But when you put them into a clean environment, electromagnetically clean environment, a lot of their symptoms go away. So that's not real aging. That's, in my mind, a rapid aging that happens that can be reversed, which is the really good news for people who are suffering from this illness.

Josh: Interesting. Other talks on the summit I mentioned, Dr. Martin Paul talks about causation and the role of voltage, calcium channels and proxy nitrate and other factors in this mechanism. And Richard Lear is a researcher who actually has done some epidemiological work and actually put together a new model of understanding that builds on the proxy nitrate and that functionality includes like oxidative stress, nitrate stress, mitochondrial dysfunction, and about four other factors to really help try to identify this new model, which can perhaps for the first time in this amount of clarity, identify what's behind this rapid increase in journalists chronic diseases this past generation. There's 36 or more journalists chronic diseases that according to the stats are all vastly increasing. What's your take on this, Magda? How significant of a factor is electro smog in these autoimmune neurodegenerative and other degenerative chronic diseases that we're seeing increases?

Dr. Havas: Well, there are now literally hundreds of papers with multiple species showing oxidative stress. And so what the research is showing is that the various enzymes that we have that deal with oxidative stress, their antioxidants are being turned off by electro smog. And so if you have a buildup of free radicals in your body, they're going to do a heck of a lot of damage. And basically, all of the symptoms that were documented can be due to oxidative stress.

So I think that's absolutely fundamental in what's going on. In mitochondria, as you well know, and probably many of your viewers know this, that mitochondria produce the energy in your cell. And so if you're not going to have active mitochondria, you're not going to have cellular energy, the cell will be able to do its job, ultimately it will die. And so part of this is recharging, the way to recover is to recharge yourself so that the battery in each cell doesn't run down to a point where it can't function anymore.

This I think is absolutely central in the cancers, central in the sperm damage, and it's central in the neurological and hormonal disorders that we're experiencing. So basically, I agree with the other people that you've interviewed on what the happening at a very fundamental physiological level.

Josh: If someone is electro sensitive or electro hypersensitivity they feel

more significantly, what are some of the things that they experience? How do they know if they're in that category of more electromagnetically aware humans?

Dr. Havas: Very often, what these people will develop is some symptom. And then they'll notice that symptom and often it starts with a headache for people who tend to use cell phones for example, or cordless phones. And they'll notice when they get the headache, how long it lasts when it goes away. And so if they monitor their symptoms very often, they'll notice that it happens in a certain environment. And when they move away from that environment, the symptom goes away.

And so by figuring out what's in your environment, ideally by measuring it, but if you can't measure it, turning things on and off and getting rid of the potential electro smog. If your symptoms improve, then chances are you're reacting to what you just turned off. And so one of the recommendations for people who think they might be electrically hypersensitive is to turn the electricity off to your home at night, see if you sleep better. Disconnect your Wi Fi for two days and see if any of your symptoms go away. So whether you do it all at once and just suddenly you go from a polluted environment to electromagnetically clean environment, and then you react, whether that's the way you do it, or you do it one at a time, it doesn't really matter. But if you notice improvement, then that tells you that there's something that you just changed that benefited you. And so if you change back, it will harm you. And that's sort of the simplest way of doing it.

You can do other types of testing where we send our blood samples and there's reports of what you're looking for. And very often these people are deficient in vitamin B 12. Sometimes iron deficiency and other deficiencies that go along with the symptoms. And so to recover, you have to do more than just turn things off. You have to build up your system again, because it's been depleted of essential nutrients and elements and things like that.

Josh: Yeah. It's not just with withdrawing from the stressors, is withdrawing and rebuilding. So talk to us about what can people do to protect themselves and then to rebuild their body, and even the mind and the perspective that plays a part in this.

Dr. Havas: Normally, I tell people there's four things you need to do and I use an acronym, it's called RIDE. The R stands for reduce your exposure. You will not recover unless you reduce your exposure. Some people even a slight reduction will benefit them. Other people may need something more severe, which means they might have to actually move into an environment for a few days to few weeks where there's nothing there. And there are places that you can go in different parts of the world to minimize your exposure and recover. So reducing your

exposure is critical. I often recommend you buy some very simple, inexpensive meters to find out what you're exposed to. Great way of learning about your environment by using these meters.

Josh: Yeah, we have a cornet here that we recommend. And one of the things I like about that is, it tells you the specific frequency that is the predominant frequency. So as we're trying to identify what is coming from where and what frequency is it, that's helpful. The downside of these electro smog devices is that typically, they only go up to certain frequency like eight gigahertz. It's still a very broad spectrum compared to a lot of testing devices. But we really need devices that eventually go into the millimeter wave spectrum, don't we?

Dr. Havas: Correct. And we don't have them yet, and the ones that are available are extremely expensive. So it's only going to be the military and the government who are able to measure this until we get more reasonably priced meters. So the cornet meter is one that you can use. I recommend additional ones because that will only measure radio frequency going through the air kind of thing. I recommend one for dirty electricity is called a micro surge meter. And you plug it in to an electrical outlet, you get a number, and we can tell you what that number means. So we know what numbers are healthy and which numbers are not healthy.

And I also recommend that people measured low frequency electromagnetic fields, and there's a tri-field meter out that is brand new one that's somewhat improved over the earlier models. And it's pretty good for both magnetic and electric fields. In the past it was only good for magnetic. So there are different means you buy for the different types of power electro smog exposure that we're talking about. And if you're dealing with ground current, it's totally different. Again, you have to measure the current actually flowing through the ground or coming in through your water pipes that are normally grounded. You know, your grounding of the pipes in your home. So RIDE, reduce your exposure. Do it with meters if you can, if not, there's other ways of doing it.

'I' stands for your immune system. So very often people who have developed sensitivity have an imperative immune system. And unless you build that up, it's going to take you a very long time to recover. And I'm not a medical doctor, so I don't tell people how to do that. But I do tell them to go to a health care provider and make sure they have all the essential nutrients their body requires. Any kind of deficiency has to be topped up kind of thing. And then other things that will benefit the immune system and because I don't have a medical license I don't recommend specifics to people.

The third thing is D, which stands for detoxification. So you will have toxins in your body that are making you more susceptible to the

electromagnetic pollution. And that couldn't be chemical toxins. It can be biological toxins, it can be metal implants. So there's a lot of things that can make you sensitive to this radiation. And so you have to detoxify. But you have to do that, once again, I think in a very controlled manner under the supervision of someone who understands how to do it properly. If you do too quickly, you'll become very sick. And that just defeats the purpose of what we're trying to do, which is to make you feel healthy and to be healthy.

And the last one is emotion. E stands for emotion in the RIDE. There are a lot of people who have now realized they're electrically hypersensitive. Whenever they see a tower, they freak out because they think I'm being irradiated even if the tower isn't pointing in their direction. And so some of the damage that's being done is done from an emotional reaction to this stressor. And whether it's emotional or whether it's physiological, your body can't tell the difference and so it's going to react. And so getting control of your mind, realizing that you can recover from this kind of damage, and then taking steps empowering yourself in order to do that, I think is really the way to go. So emotion and empowerment are the two things that E stands for. And if you don't get control over your mind, you're not going to recover. So we're talking about something that's really very important and a very serious component of all of this.

Josh: Yeah, that's very well said. I would really like to emphasize that myself. I mean, even just in life in general with what's kind of the speed of life, the stresses, what's coming at us, understanding, comprehending these significant agendas. This for-profit agendas that are causing harm, we really need to have that inner strength, don't we? I mean, maybe we could just like take a moment and talk from a soul level, I guess from this standpoint. How important is it that we have a way to connect and empower within whether it's prayer or meditation or dealing with the fear that comes up as we become aware to this level?

Dr. Havas: Well, once again, that's not my area of specialty. So I try not to give advice. But we are talking about it at a spiritual level. And you know, I think I might be delusional, but I have control over my own brain just like everyone else does. And I can tell myself that this is actually helping me and it will have some benefit to that. So as I say, your mind is really, really powerful, and you tell yourself that you can take control over your environment. You are the director of your own movie, the life that you're living. And you can determine to a certain degree how you're going to live that life and how you're going to respond to the things in your environment. We can't control what happens to us, but we can control how we react to it. And beginning to develop that control, whether it's through meditation or prayer or whatever method you choose. I think once you start realizing that you can react to anything any way you want, it's really empowering.

I do a lot of legal testimony, expert testimony in cases. I remember the first time I was involved in something like that, the lawyer who was representing the clients that I was working with, he said -- Now they're going to attack you on the stand the other side, and they're going to try to get you emotionally upset, so that you won't be thinking as clearly. And then as soon as you make a mistake, they'll jump on it and they'll tear you apart. And I remember one of the things he said to me. So now if they're attacking the science -- they should be attacking the science. Once they start attacking you personally, you're winning. Because in a sense you're irrelevant, you're just the messenger bringing the message of what science is out there.

So once they start attacking you personally, know that you're winning. And so I was in this court case in British Columbia, and they were very rude and offensive to me. And they were trying to get me upset and I was just sitting back breathing and saying, "Okay, this is normally what happens, just go with it. Don't take it personally." And then they started attacking me and I thought, we're winning. And so instead of getting upset, I thought, "Oh, this wonderful." And so their ability to attack me just didn't work.

Josh: Because you had that frame of mind, and you went there.

Dr. Havas: Because I assumed we were winning. You know, this is good news. Whether we were or not was irrelevant, right? It was my perception of it. And really, it's hard to know what whether it's your perception or reality. So perception is really important, but I had the attitude that we must be winning, and that's okay and I actually relaxed. And so what they tried to do was no longer effective. And I think people can bring that kind of message into their own lives. And you know, a lot of us struggle with every day, day to day issues from your own health, your family health, financial, personal problems. I think it's just really important to say -- you know, everything is happening the way it should, and just make the most of it, turn everything into something positive to the degree that you can. And I think if you have that kind of attitude, it helps you deal with some of the negative stuff that we're supposed to.

Josh: That's really good. Thank you. And just to add on to that, though, if you're watching this, you might want to get your pen or pencil just for quick suggestions you might be asking like how. These are from Josh Del Sol.

First, there's a book called -- I'm looking at right here. It's just out of reach. It's called The Energy Codes, Sue Morter. And second is, Joe Dispenza's work. His more recent work is very empowering, helping to clear the blocks and really just taking control of your perception. The third is lesser known work called Reality Transurfing, and we're going to be talking more about that going on. But Reality Transurfing, 2.5 million

books have been sold in Russia and it's been translated to English, it's on YouTube for free and you can dive into it. There's a couple curries there that I really like. And the fourth is, this is me personally, really resonate with the Nag Hammadi scrolls. The original teachings from 2000 years ago that were banned by the Catholic Church and around the fourth century, but were rediscovered in 1947. So those are free online as well.

Anyways, that's my little pitch for tips that can actually help on a spiritual level, on a soul level. You know, we lead people, open some doors I guess in people's own self-empowerment in what we're talking about now. Because like what you say, Dr. Havas, it's all about becoming aware, and then what you choose to do with that awareness, you have the perspective that you that you frame. So just diving back into the science here. To what extent do you think the medical community is aware of the effects of electro smog?

Dr. Havas: It really varies from location to location. I think the European medical community is well ahead of us here in North America. In Russia and in the Eastern Bloc countries, they did research on the healing effects of electromagnetic energy a long, long time ago. They also did research on weaponized doing this a long time ago. And so they were aware of both the healing and the harmful effects of electro smog in different ways. And some of you might be aware of the embassy in Cuba being attacked, and in China and previously in Moscow as well. So, there's evidence that some of this might be microwave radiation, that's a phenomenal weapon like it -- You know, what we're using to communicate actually makes a really phenomenal weapon in the form of it, difficult to detect.

So doctors in Europe are fairly well aware of it, there's different organizations. In North America, I think that mostly is the naturopathic community and the alternative health care community that is more aware of this than the traditional Western medicine community. And I think the reason for that is that Western medical doctors really have their hands tied as to what they can and can't do with their patients. And because of that, many of them just go by the protocols that they have. You know, this is the problem, this is the pill that you recommend to someone. And because of that, we're not getting the type of medical care that I think we deserve, that type of health care that we deserve from MDS. But naturopathic chiropractors, a lot of the alternative practitioners talk to their patients a lot more, learn from their patients and then begin to implement what they've learned to help treat their other patients. It really depends on the type of doctor you are, and where you are globally situated as well.

Josh: Okay. We talked about this briefly already, but do you have anything else, any other suggestions on what people can do to protect themselves?

Dr. Havas: Once you know what you're exposed to and you minimize your exposure, additional things you can do. And this might sound a little crazy, but going for a walk in the woods, and being in contact with nature is extremely important and really rejuvenating. Nikola Tesla who is sort of the father of alternating current and responsible for some of the things that we're going through right now you know, from a harmful and a healing perspective. He did 10 miles of walking in Central Park every day. And I think that's why he lived to be in his 80s when people during his period were dying, men were dying when they were in the late 50s, early 60s. So he really lived longer than any exposed himself to a lot of this radiation. So if anything, he should have been an early electro sensitive. But he did things, the food he ate, the fact that he went for long walks is really important. And being in touch with nature, being grounded. You know, I mean in touch with sand on a beach or salt water or granite is just one phenomenal way of having the electrons sort of move through your body in a really healthy fashion. So, I would recommend that to people as well, whenever possible to be able to do that.

Josh: Absolutely. It's been life changing for me. The more frequently I can get out in the woods just to across the way, there from where I live, where there's no cell phone signal, the better, the more energy I have, the more vitality is, the better we feel. It's really about returning to those natural frequencies and cycles, like the circadian rhythm, the natural sunlight, the forest energies, getting away from the artificial.

Dr. Havas: Exactly. Yeah, we live in a very artificial environment these days with concrete everywhere. You know when we travel, we're inside of a metal box called a car. And we're inside of homes that have wiring and all sorts of stuff. So we've really been removed ourselves a lot from nature. And I think going back and making peace with Mother Nature and just hugging a tree or walking barefoot is just very, very important.

Josh: I had a conversation in part of the summit as well with Wolfgang Yaksch, the CEO and founder of Swiss Bionic. So he's worked with you a little bit, you've collaborated on PEMF technology, which actually simulates these natural frequencies in analog waveforms and ways that the body can be sustained. I mentioned in that interview my own positive experience with this. What is your perspective on PEMF like the Swiss Bionic mats, the idea of this technology to use EMF for beneficial purposes?

Dr. Havas: Well, because I've worked with people who are electrically hypersensitive, I'm always looking at ways or what will help them. And when I first heard about the PEMF mats, gosh, that was quite a few years ago now. And my initial reaction was, do they really work? So the claims they make, are they valid. And then can electrically hypersensitive people use them because they are so sensitive.

And so I actually got an iMRS 2000s, I can't remember which one. And the first test I did was with myself, and it was looking at my blood. And I remember doing a live blood analysis, putting a drop of blood under a microscope and looking at it and seeing how the cells fit together and whether they're pumping and that sort of thing. And I remember sort of being a bit surprised about how unhealthy my blood looked when I was in an electromagnetically clean environment.

But then I did a 10-minute session on the mat, and very low setting. And I looked at my blood immediately after and it was single cells free flowing, really healthy looking blood. And I realized that the first time I did my blood. You know, first prick of my finger I had been working on a computer. So I had been exposed not to the microwaves, but certainly to the keyboard and to the electromagnetic pollution coming from my computer. And I remember the next day I thought, "Okay, I'm going to do a really careful experiment." And my home is electromagnetically clean and my lab is electromagnetically clean. And so I did it again. And then I actually deliberately exposed myself to things.

And so when I expose myself to Wi Fi, or to a cordless phone or cell phone, within 10 minutes, every single cell in my blood is sticking together in low formation. So one of the things I can say is that by exposing yourself to PEMF technology, you will improve your circulation. And I actually recommend for people if you're on a computer all day, at the end of the day, do a 10, 20, 30 minute treatment on a PEMF device and get yourself recharged in a positive way rather than negative way. So the technology works, there's lots of products out there, they vary quite a bit. Some of them are more for the medical user, others are more for our own use.

And I think it's really important that people who are electrically sensitive try the technology because some can use it with benefits. Some people are still too sensitive, and they have to recover, they have to build up their immune system, detoxify. But once they've done that to a certain degree, they can then use the PEMF technology. And whether you're using pulsed electromagnetic fields or light therapy, light therapy will do very similar things. You can really benefit your body enormously.

Josh: And to use it on low levels like I said, if you're sensitive, if you're on the very sensitive side, if you get one of these you want to start with, just use it on low levels and build up that slowly.

Dr. Havas: Correct. Yeah. And if you're aware of how your body reacts to things, you can tell if that radiation that PEMF technology is good for you or not. Some people can't tell that. But if you're that sensitive, you should be able to tell if you're benefiting from it or if you're not benefiting from it.

Josh: What about blue blockers, Dr. Havas? These are not the orange Kind. I like them because they look basically clear, but I feel more energy at the end of the day and you have yours there.

Dr. Havas: I have mine here too.

Josh: What's your thoughts on them?

Dr. Havas: Do you see a blue fraction? So they're not letting as much blue light through.

Josh: Yeah.

Dr. Havas: Well, one of the things we've learned is that light is very important, artificial light. I've done testing with light bulbs. Because electrically sensitive people can't tolerate fluorescent light bulbs, like they say universally. "I just hate them for whatever reason, I don't feel good when I'm with them." Some LEDs fall into that category as well. So we've done a number of tests with the light bulbs and we find that with fluorescent light bulbs, they emit radiofrequency radiation for one thing, they produce dirty electricity. Some of them produce ultraviolet light.

And if they have a double bulb over the top of them a double layer, then that UV light is shielded, it's no longer there. They have an inferior spectrum, it's not full spectrum really, high in the blue, really low in the red depending on the type of light bulb. So if you have a cool white light, really high blue levels, so warmer light will have more red. And we know that having too much blue light particularly at night is not good for you.

So if you start off with blue light in the morning, you know, for seasonal affective disorder, for example. That white light that's heavy in the blue actually wakes you up. So that's a good thing. But you don't want that at nighttime. You want the exact opposite at nighttime. And so I'm hoping someone will design the perfect bulb with an ideal spectrum, with none of the negative side effects. So that we can be exposed to healing light when we're at home and indoors.

Josh: Yeah. What about sunlight, and like circadian rhythms and watching

sunrises on clear morning? So how does that rate in your scale of what's beneficial?

Dr. Havas: Well, I think if you can get out and watch the sunrise, and be grounded while you're appreciating the sunrise or the sunset. I think these are all very, very cool. The more time you can spend outdoors but not in a city environment, I think the better it is for everyone.

Josh: You mentioned the CFL compact fluorescent light bulbs. I've heard this before, they emit wireless radiation. Are they designed to eventually integrate with 5G networks?

Dr. Havas: Unfortunately, they're designing bulbs that will communicate with your cell phone. So they have bulbs now that you can use your cell phone and turn them on and off, or you can dim them whenever. I went to a light conference and there were a lot of people there who were manufacturing light bulbs, the light conference. And I said, "Could someone send me their best light bulb?" You know, like just what they think is really their best light bulb.

And I got a light bulb and it was RF, it was emitting microwave radiation. So as soon as you screwed it in and turned it on, it was like having another Wi Fi in your home. And this is just from one light bulb, the levels were really high. And so I talked to the manufacturer, I think he was the President or CEO of the company. And I said, "You can't do this, like you're going to make your clients, people who buy your product they're going to become sick from this radiation." And he had no idea that was the case. And then he said, "but unfortunately, everyone is moving in that direction," and he didn't want to be left out.

So despite the fact that he realized that there were harmful effects, he was willing to make the change and say, "We're not going to produce these light bulbs anymore, because we don't want to make people sick."

Josh: So we really need the awareness to proliferate and also the liability to proliferate, right. I mean, a lot of these wireless parsing technology companies are not insured, or insuring themselves. And Lloyds of London, we know won't insure them. Swiss RE has produced several documents on the risk of wireless and now 5G. So let's touch on that briefly if we could. Other speakers have talked about what is 5G and what does it mean. What's your take on that? And how critical is it that we participate in this awareness shift around 5G and that we take action accordingly. How significant is the risk with 5G?

Dr. Havas: I personally think it's very significant. And the reason for that is, 5G is not just millimeter waves, you know, they said we're going to be using higher frequencies. That's bad enough. These higher frequencies I don't know of any test for long term exposure. There's been testing on short term exposure, both therapeutic as well as potentially harmful effects. So the fact that you're going to now put antennas, you know, hundreds of thousands of antennas every third or fifth home, that's going to be emitting this radiation without knowing how it's going to affect the population, is criminal.

Not only is it stupid, but it's actually criminal that you're going to be doing that. There's no way that we would allow pharmaceutical industry

to force us to take a drug that they've never tested on human health. And that's basically what's happening. So we're all going to be exposed to this. We have no choice, which is to me another problem with the technology. But it's not only millimeter waves, they're actually going to be using 600 megahertz, 700 megahertz depending on the country and the location.

And I actually think that this rollout of an antenna every third or fifth house is just an excuse to use some of the other frequencies as well. So people are sick at the levels to which they're currently exposed. You know, add another layer of the 600- 700 megahertz and then you add on top of that the millimeter waves. We've got a perfect storm, there's no place you're going to be able to go to avoid this radiation if you're going to be in any urban center at all.

But if you're out in the country, you'll have protection for a certain length of time. But governments, or industry is saying it's going to be rolled out everywhere and no one's going to be left out in the cold kind of thing, although some of us would love to be left out in the cold. So I think it's irresponsible to expose such a large population to a technology that we don't totally know how it's going to affect human health.

Josh: Thank you. Any final thoughts you want to leave with the viewer?

Dr. Havas: Well, I'm really concerned about the next generation. We've got young people who are being exposed to Wi-Fi in schools, they're exposed to Wi Fi, smart meters, a lot of technologies at home as well. I think we need to do a much better job in protecting our young people.

And if we don't protect them, we're not going to have a future. And I hate to be a doom and gloom type of person. I've got a really positive attitude about things. I really do believe we are going to win in the end and this technology is going to be turned back a lot. As soon as more and more people are going to get sick, they won't be able to deny that there's a link between this and the sickness.

But I think we have to do a much better job protecting kids. And so I would really encourage schools, school boards, parents to watch their children, recommend safer use of technology, not no technologies, just safe use of technology. And get rid of some of the addiction and some of the other things that we're experiencing as well. Protect the next generation, you know.

Josh: Absolutely. Thank you. And for everyone watching out there, as always, getting this information out is how we reach the tipping point and awareness. So please, please share this talk. Share the link to this talk with your colleagues and contacts, and friends and family. Dr. Magda Havas, thank you so much for your pioneering work. You are a

beacon of light and truth and inspiration. And so good to talk with you today. Thanks for coming on the summit.

Dr. Havas: Thank you so much. I appreciate what you're doing.

Josh: Thank you.

Science of 5G and Wireless Radiation

Guest: Dr. Devra Davis

Josh: Joining us on the summit today is Dr. Devra Davis. Devra, thank you so much for being with us.

Dr. Davis: Delighted to be with you.

Josh: Dr. Davis is president and founder of the Environmental Health Trust and is an award winning internationally renowned scientist and founding director of the board on environmental studies and toxicology of the National Academy of Sciences. She's also current Visiting Professor of Medicine in Israel and Turkey. Currently, Environmental Health Trust focuses on raising awareness of the established impacts of cell phone use on public health and performing cutting edge research on exposure to cell phone and other wireless radiation. Devra has authored the National Book Award finalist *When Smoke Ran Like Water* and *The Secret History of the War on Cancer*, and *Disconnect*, which is the truth about cell phone radiation, what industry has done to hide it and how to protect you and your family.

Devra, you've been a pioneer and you've been leading the way not only in wireless, but other major problems on the planet. So thank you for all the work that you've done in your career. I really appreciate it.

Dr. Davis: And thank you for helping to get the word out.

Josh: So, how do we know that wireless radiation is unsafe?

Dr. Davis: Because we have studies in animals and we have studies in humans. And the reason we do studies in animals is to try to predict

effects in humans and prevent them from happening. Unfortunately, with this technology as with many other situations including lead and asbestos, what we've done is we've introduced the technology and then we've asked the question of; well, does it have an effect on our health. We have never subjected wireless radiation to safety testing.

Certainly not of the sorts that we get today from exposure to cell phones and tablets that are being held close to the body. Our testing for these devices is 22 years old has not been changed since the average user was thought to be a man, six feet with a 12 pound head, who spoke for six minutes in order to see whether or not his head got hot. That test standard is out of date and is not appropriate, given the billions of users of phones today who are young and small, and have no idea about the need to protect themselves from microwave radiation.

Josh: Thank you. Later on in this interview, we're going to get into the specific independent studies that have been done on millimeter wave radiation, which is the basis of the transition to 5G. Industry hasn't done the studies, but there have been independent studies and you're going to summarize some of those for us. So this is going to be very powerful for the summit and all viewers. But before we get into that, I want to just -- if you could provide an overview. The key materials or key points that you discuss in your book; *Disconnect*.

Dr. Davis: Well, in my book; *Disconnect*, I talk about the fact that I was shocked to learn that in 2000, the British government had actually had a top committee of scientists advise the government then that no one should use a cell phone under the age of 16, because of concerns about exposing the young, the developing skull. And that was based on studies done then in the year 2000.

The US ignored that research and in fact, decided in 1996 that no research was needed in this area. There was an industry-funded joint industry government study that produced very little results. And they presumed that because cell phone radiation is weak, which it is, therefore, it cannot have an effect, thinking that the only effect would be due to the power of the radiation. Well, they were wrong. It's not the power of the radiation, but the pulse.

You see a cell phone signal is complex. It has a certain frequency, which means how fast it's going, and then it has a certain power which means how much energy it has. And even though it can be very weak in power, if it's going like this, irregularly abnormal pulse radiation over thousands of minutes over thousands moments in a lifetime, that irregular power has an effect. And we know that because studies have been done in cell cultures of humans and animals, showing that the brain cells of rats when exposed to very weak pulsed signals from cell phone radiation develop damage to their DNA. That was done in 1994. In response to

those studies, the industry mounted war games to try to suppress the science. They tried to defund the scientists. They tried to get their work unpublished after it was accepted. All of that is documented in my book; *Disconnect*.

Fast forward. And now we have the results of the national toxicology program in animals, where they studied not just DNA damage in the whole animal, but they also studied in the largest study ever done, a \$30 million study that took almost a decade to finish although it should not have. They found clear evidence of rare tumors of the nerve inside the heart and some evidence of glioma, which is a brain cancer.

Now, what makes this study especially important is that human studies have found the same rare cancers; that is malignant glioma of the brain, and a tumor of the nerve, the acoustic nerve, which is most exposed when you hold a phone next to it. And although that acoustic neuroma, that acoustic tumor is usually not fatal. It can result in devastating impacts on anyone who has one, including loss of hearing and loss of the nerves in the face so you get kind of paralysis.

And this study of the national toxicology program was subject to an unprecedented triple peer review, never been done before. This national toxicology program, which I sat on the board of scientific counselors, normally has blinded review where the pathologist and the statistician sit in a room and they look at ABC. And they don't know if A, B or C is the exposed, the control or something else.

And they look and they score these things, and they rate them and they rank them. And they were astonished when they got the results that showed clear evidence of cancer. And also multiple cancers in different organs in rats, and some damage to the heart in mice and rats. And the damage to the heart in both these animals is consistent also with the fact that the heart in the rodent is quite close to the surface of the skin. And the animals of course, it's hard to get them to make cell phone calls. So you expose their whole bodies to a level of radiation that did not create any heat whatsoever, but mimicked in the lifetime of the animals the same exposure that humans will get in our lifetimes, supposedly in 70 years. And those animals exposed to a lifetime of radiation in their two years, develop these malignancies and damage to DNA.

Now, that normally would be a slam dunk in the world of science, because the way the government is supposed to work. Is when the national toxicology program evaluates something, whether it's a drug or a chemical or radiation that's supposed to tell the FDA what to do about it.

Josh: So why do the government agencies the FDA, which commission this study, the CDC, other agencies. How come they're not reflecting of this massively important finding? I mean, when you look at it -- was in

1998, when this NTP study, this \$30 million study was commissioned on 2G and 3G? Now we're at 5G. So that study was commissioned for the purpose of finding out is 2G and 3G safe, and it found out it wasn't safe. Now we're at 5G. But still, we have the agencies don't reflect this. Why not?

Dr. Davis: I have to ask that question of Dr. Jeffrey Sherman, who's the Director of the Center for Radiological Devices at the FDA. His wife happens to be Allison Sherman, who is the head of practice for Arnold & Porter involved in getting approval for radiological and other medical devices. So there may be a conflict of interest there, which under normal times, I think would have been subject to attention.

Dr. Sherman issued an extraordinary statement. I've never seen anything like it in my entire history of 40 years working with the government at senior levels, both inside and outside the government. Dr. Sherman said that the results of the MTP are not relevant to humans. Now what makes that especially strange is that we use animal tests to develop drugs, to evaluate chemicals, to evaluate pesticides. And he is saying that although we use these same tests with the same protocols that have been standard for 40 years, in this particular case, he personally doesn't think it's relevant because he says the exposures were all quite relevant to humans.

Well, let me tell you something. Those exposure chambers were built by Swiss engineers who advise the Swiss government, who designed technologies for testing for industry around the world. To reject their system of testing is a mockery of the whole program. Why spend \$30 million on a test system, which by the way, the predecessors of Dr. Sherman approved the whole study design. So it was an approved study design, reviewed by government scientists, built by industry experts. And now that you don't like the results, you say they're not relevant. And by the way, you're married to somebody who makes a very, very healthy salary out of pushing related devices. I think this is egregious, and the CDC actually has been captured. They have brought in the subject matter expert to advise their website named Kenneth Foster. As a subject matter expert, he was asked to wipe their site on wearable wire devices.

We have in our files drafts of what the first advice was that the CDC wrote, which was to take precautions, avoid exposure to children, etc. Foster rewrote the original draft prepared by CDC scientists, so it now reads like an infomercial for wireless devices. That's a huge conflict of interest, because he has for years been supported by the industry. And yet he was brought into the government as a subject matter expert. And I don't know whether they realize the extent to which he was conflicted as an expert. So you have the CDC asking the industry to write their website. And then of course, you've got the same thing happening in

other places in the government. And as a consequence, this government has a revolving door as you know very well with the FCC. Many members who are commissioners of the FCC now formerly worked directly for Verizon, for the Cell Phone Telecommunication Industry Association and others.

And they regularly, for the past two decades had moved back and forth between the industry that they regulate and the agency. So that at this point, the FCC sees itself as an industry enabler, not at all as a protector of public health and safety.

Josh: And the Harvard ethics department report identified that very clearly, and basically said FCC is probably the most captured agency.

Dr. Davis: That report by Norman Alster for the Safra Center for Ethics at Harvard University said exactly that; the FCC is a captured agency. It has not been able to operate independently for years because of this close tie that exists between the industry and the FCC.

Josh: Okay, really quickly. So the so-called safety studies are based on thermal heating effects, which you mentioned and this count thousands of studies that all show biological harm and/or effect from wireless radiation. How many studies would you estimate? There are peer reviewed published scientific studies that conclude that there's a link between wireless radiation, non-native EMF and biological effect.

Dr. Davis: Well, if you take into account that we have a growing literature on effects on plants, as well as birds, bees and bunnies, as well as us. There are many thousands of studies at this point. And unfortunately, many of them are conducted in literature that very few of us read very much. I'm not an expert on plant rhizomes, but I know that they are affected by electromagnetic fields. We have growing evidence now of damage to trees, we have evidence of damage to bees and insects. So the array of phenomena that had been affected by wireless radiation seems to be only limited to whether or not we've tried to study it. Every time one looks for an effect, it seems to be there and let me say something about that.

Living beings depend on electricity. We are all electromagnetic beings, our heart and our brains would not work without electromagnetic fields. That's how we send impulses back and forth. That's what keeps our heart beating. So we are electrical phenomena. And the fact that no change in the amount of exposure to exoticness, to foreign electricity would have no effect on our natural electrical properties makes no sense at all. It's true for plants. It's true for birds.

We all have different electromagnetic properties taking place. And putting additional exposures into our systems is something that we have

to look at very carefully and recognize the potential for harm is quite great. And we have evidence of it from studies that have been done on bacteria and viruses. We know that you can accelerate cells growth. And that's not a good thing.

Of course, if you're an older woman and you want to accelerate the growth in your face, you can get a so called laser RF, meaning microwave laser. And it will in fact accelerate tissue growth, whether it might also accelerate the growth of skin cancer, we don't know. But it's certainly reasons to think that it could. And we also know that this radiation at a high enough power can make your skin feel like it's on fire.

Josh: Right and we'll get into that later in the conversation. We have an epidemic of an increase, almost exponentially in some cases of -- one researcher told me more than three dozen. Journalists' chronic diseases in the last generation are all neurological, autoimmune. You know, conditions of various types are all increasing at a huge rate. What does the science tell us in terms of what role does wireless play in those increases of journalists' chronic diseases?

Dr. Davis: As a scientist, the short answer is I don't know. But here's what I can tell you. Chronic Illness has multiple causes, right? Nutrition is important. Our life is increasingly electrified. And for some benefit, after all, you get responses to emergencies more quickly. And in situations of dire emergency, that's a good thing. However, the role of electromagnetic fields for autism, for autoimmune disorders, for thyroid disease, for chronic pain cannot be fully evaluated at this time because nobody is asking the question.

And yet, if you look at the work of Dr. Martha Herbert and others at Harvard, she is convinced that if you reduce the toxic exposures in the environment to children. You get rid of the toxic chemicals and electromagnetic fields, then you are giving children a chance to grow and thrive and develop in a healthier manner. And if you continue to expose them, so that you give children who already have learning disabilities tablets and things because it does calm them down, then you are actually priming the pump to make it worse later on in life. And unfortunately, we are seeing examples of this throughout the world today.

Josh: Yeah. So really quickly before we get into the millimeter wave science. The first steps that anyone can do to reduce the radiation, you put the phone on airplane mode when it's not being used, especially at night and turn your Wi Fi off at night. Get rid of your wireless keyboards and mice, go online and buy wired devices, wired routers and so forth. I mean, that's just my current list. Get your smart meter removed and replaced by an analog meter. Go ahead.

Dr. Davis: Get a wired landline for your phone, and insist on one. And the lawsuit was settled between Verizon and the government saying they were committed to providing more landlines, you are entitled to one. So get a landline, go to your secondhand store, you'll find one of the corded phones there or you can buy it on a website. Put your phone -- get in the habit of turning your phone off, radical thought. You know, turn it off, put her on airplane when you don't need it. Never keep it on the body when it's on except for extremely short periods of time.

Don't ever give a phone to a child as a pacifier unless it's on airplane mode and you first downloaded whatever distraction you intend to give them, and everybody in desperation that might need to do that. But remember, the distance is your friend. And iPads belong on tables, they're called tablets. They belong on tables. They do not belong on the body. They are tested 20 centimeters away from an adult male body of a 220-pound guy. They never belong on the bodies of young children.

There are certain devices like the iPod and the iPod teething wrap case and the iPhone teething rattle case that really should not be allowed to be marketed because they're inherently so dangerous to children. So those simple precautions, remembering that if a signal is weak, your phone has to work extra hard to get radiation connection to the tower. And it will take -- half of all the radiation going out of that phone goes into you if it's on your body. So keep it off your body, only use phones when the signal is weak when it really is an emergency.

Josh: Thank you. Okay. So on your website, environmental health; *ehtrust.org*, you've compiled a list of independent studies on millimeter wave radiation, which is 5G radiation. And this is incredibly important especially because industries have mentioned in a Senate hearing in February of 2019, admitted that they're not doing any studies on 5G. They don't intend to and they're not putting any budget in the future to do this. So this is on us now because industry is no longer even allowing themselves to look. So I would like to request you to go through and give our audience a quick overview of the most important independent studies on 5G millimeter wave radiation and safety.

Dr. Davis: Well, Dr. Cindy Russell of Stanford has produced an excellent review in the *Journal on Environmental Research*, which can be found on her website where she talks about the public health and environmental implications of 5G. And she notes there that, because 5G is a combination of very short high frequency wavelengths. It's going to be without precedents in what it will mean for humans. More importantly, let me tell you first what 5G is.

5G consists of a combination of 3G and 4G in order for it to work. So what you have to have for to work is a series of antennas that are within a few hundred yards of each other, sometimes right close to your

bedroom window. And under the current rules that have been passed in Washington, you cannot object to location of a tower on health concerns, you may only object on aesthetic grounds.

So there are some effects that have been known from 5G. And the modulation of the signal is what we're most worried about, because it's moving extremely fast. And it has the ability to alter the functioning of all of our healthy nerves and cells, and it's the membrane surrounding our cells that may be perturbed the most because it interferes with the way calcium moves in and out of the cell wall. And what we know about the coil ducts from studies done in Israel is that the millimeter waves are mostly absorbed within the first say, the 164th of the skin. And you think at first that is of no consequence, but it turns out that your sweat ducts are located there. You've got hundreds of millions of them.

And they can be regarded as a helical antenna like double helix. And because of that, they can transmit the exposure from the surface of the skin internally. And this is something that's been covered in a number of the electronic technology blogs, that a growing number of publications show that 5G has the capacity to have serious biological effects, including that it can accelerate the growth of bacteria, mainly by suppressing the growth of those things that are supposed to be bad for you and allowing good things to die. And as a consequence, the cells don't communicate as well with one another because they're both exposed to millimeter waves.

One study has been done in people who live within 80 meters of a cell antenna, that's a 3G antenna, and compared to people who were close to those who were further away. And found that in the blood of those who were closest, there were elevated indications of damage in their DNA, an indication of what's called a micro nucleus, which is not a good thing. You don't want to have that. And there's a significant difference there, in that you can get DNA damage, which we know is a precursor to cancer. So we need to be quite mindful of the fact that there's a number of studies here showing problems including I think, most problematic the effects on the environment, trees and insects. Because more than 1000 different pollinating insects, we focus on the honeybee because it's been glamorized. It's kind of the charismatic, stinging insect, if you will.

But studies have shown there that if you take a cell phone and you put it into a healthy hive, and you take another phone that's turned off and put it into another healthy hive, and then the third hive is not exposed at all, and you see what happens after two weeks of exposure of just two hours a day. The hive that had the phone in it without it being turned on is fine. The hive that was the control is also fine. The hive with the phone turned on, the bees stopped dancing as well. They stopped producing honey and some of them don't come back.

Josh: So that's a 2G or 3G study. That's not a 5G or millimeter wave studied, correct?

Dr. Davis: Correct. However, what we know from other studies is that the 5G wave interferes with the cryptochrome in the insect. And cryptochrome is like an inborn GPS. It's what allows animals to migrate. It's what allows them to navigate. It's been found in every migrating animal that has been evaluated so far, birds and bees, among others. And studies now published in major scientific journals have shown that the cryptochrome can be disrupted by millimeter wave exposures.

In fact, the title of one recent article is "Cryptochrome: the Magneto sensor with a sinister side. Sinister because it can be disrupted. And there are studies finding that low intensity millimeter waves, that means not very high power, can cause the cryptochrome to create free radicals and free radicals we know to be damaging and causing all kinds of degenerative diseases such as you asked me about before.

Josh: I just want to say you did such an amazing job in collating and disseminating verbally in this case, the research. And you're referring to your notes, you have studies you have your website on the screen. So I just appreciate you summarizing this hugely important information on millimeter waves and the science that has been done. Just referring back to your page here, I have it open as we're talking as well. What else in terms of millimeter wave related studies is a key important takeaway for our audience?

Dr. Davis: Well, there was another study showing what happens to microbes in soil in a city in India. And again, microbes in soil we may not think are very important, but they are absolutely critical to agriculture just as bees are. And they showed that the microbes that were at the highest mobile tower exposure were more damaged as well. And Australian studies show that children in kindergartens with nearby antenna installations had many times more exposure than those much further away.

And other studies done in India have shown that people living closer to these antennas have again biochemical measures of damage in their blood that we know will further predict whether or not they're more likely to get cancer. That doesn't mean they will get cancer. It does mean that there's evidence of damage more so in those people than in others who live further away. And I think the Israeli study is particularly important, the study of the sweat duct.

What it is indicating is the ability of a very ubiquitous part of the human body to be affected by this and to create a reflectance of the skin so that -- the skin is, in fact, our largest organ. And what we know with what these millimeter waves do is to weaken membranes, and that means

that any toxic chemical that you've been exposed to, whether from cosmetics or pesticides or cleaning agents, can be more deeply taken into the body as well. In fact, there are some applications in medicine, where millimeter and microwave radiation is being used to enhance the uptake of chemotherapy drugs when people have cancer.

So it's not only that this has a bad effect, it can be used for medical treatments. But that's telling us something, if we can open membranes, if we can use this to enhance the delivery of chemotherapy, what are we doing to our children with this exposure over many, many months and many, many years. We know that insects continually exposed to this will also show some changes in their behavior in their morphology over time. They look different, they act different and that's also a signal. With my colleagues, Lloyd Morgan, Anthony Miller and Hugo Schooneveld, we've looked at studies in people exposed and have found not only an increase in brain cancer, but an increase as well in a rare cancer of the salivary gland, as well as elevated rates of testicular cancer, leukemia, thyroid cancer.

Josh: Can I just jump in there with the salivary gland tumor? That's exactly what LeBron James had, correct?

Dr. Davis: That is right.

Josh: And on the side that he used the cell phone, right?

Dr. Davis: That is right.

Josh: And then is it not also correct that he, subsequently to that, got a huge contract from Samsung?

Dr. Davis: That I don't know. You'll have to ask him about what his understanding is of how he got that cancer and whether -- you know, a contract with Samsung is Samsung wants to do the right thing and start to produce devices with the right hardware and software. And do what the Israelis and the French and the Belgium do, which is to warn everybody, you must use a headset, you must use a speakerphone and don't keep the phone directly on the body. That would be a good thing. Maybe LeBron James is the person to make it happen.

Josh: Yeah, that would be a good thing if that were to happen. But I think there's -- you know, I can tell you he did get a big sponsorship deal with Samsung and I haven't heard of anything about him admitting any problems with wireless radiation. Let's put it that way.

Dr. Davis: You know, Josh, maybe we ought to start to educate him about the fact that this is a great opportunity for him to help millions of people avoid the damaging effects of this. Because the other thing we

know is that if you combine millimeter waves with other co-factors, you get worse responses. And there have been some very detailed technical studies that have shown you can enhance gene damage if you combine microwave radiation with that. There have been other studies that I have looked at, a very important issue here. We don't know how to measure 5G in the environment, and the reason is, it's never existed before. The European Parliament had a policy report recently that pointed out that Singapore is not going to introduce 5G for consumers at all. And you might wonder where are the 5G phones we've been hearing about?

They have bombed so far, they don't exist. And the reason is, in order to work well, they would need several dozen antennas on a single phone. They said they're going to be folding. And they completely fell apart in the first prototypes that were sent around to some of the people to test them. And the reality is, you don't need 5G for voice calls. You don't. The only reason for 5G is to promote the internet of things so that your refrigerator can talk to your coffee pot, and your child's diaper. You want to talk about the most foolish app I've ever heard of recently, is a device that will allow you to put on your baby's bottom so you can tell when the diaper needs to be changed.

Josh: Wow. Yeah, that's over the top.

Dr. Davis: Frankly, I think it's criminal. And I think we need to recognize that what we have here is a technological imperative, where the fact that technology can do something means that people want to try it. And we should not ever mistake the idea that because we can do something, we should do it.

There are some things we should not do. We should not be putting wireless devices on our baby's bottom or on their feet, unless they are in a medical emergency that requires some extreme ordinary levels of monitoring. You have to recognize that for years, the Russians did research on all of this. And they are well aware of these effects. And now we have the controversy of what on earth has happened to our diplomats in Cuba and China, where people have documented MRI confirms brain damage.

And the *Times* magazine ran a preposterous story, quoting experts from the industry, by the way, saying that this damage was caused by a form of hysteria. That's insulting to everyone. And it's widely known in the diplomatic community that Russians have been playing around with microwave weapons for years, and we also have been doing this. And to create the idea that this is all just hysteria -- of course is especially what you might like to have happen when you're about to, unveil even more exposure to this radiation throughout the country. In order for 5G to work, you will need antennas every few hundred yards and you will need to cut down trees because it doesn't go through trees very well. And you

will have to allow them be placed sometimes right into your window.

And that system will be built with housing and in higher end neighborhoods, it will look like a fancy tree lamp. But it will be containing 3G and 4G in the beginning. So you're going to take the more powerful signals of 3G and 4G, bringing them from the mountaintop into your bedroom window waiting for the 5G to get turned on, which will not be turned on for a while. You have to build it first. And the European Parliament report says US is unique in the world in taking a build it first and then we'll figure it out approach.

Josh: Because it's a race.

Dr. Davis: It's a thorny race. The Chinese, the Koreans, the Japanese, they have dense urban configuration we have never had in the United States. Is there any city as dense as Tokyo or Chengdu or Shanghai? None of them as dense as the Chinese cities. They are the most dense cities in the world and in the history of the world. You go to Chong ching, and you see huge apartment buildings that are 50 stories high by 40 apartments wide. And that density doesn't exist anywhere. And you know how those people get their signals? They're wired.

And also the priority for those countries is for military and medical and research purposes. That's where it belongs. Hospitals, the police, the military, those are the ones that need access, and they are in fact wired. They're even wired now, almost without exception. No hospital is going to rely on a wireless system for its most essential communications, nor is in a police station going to trust it. No bank is going to use wireless communication. So what is that telling us? Why should we put it on ourselves when the most secure forms of communication and the most technologies and the businesses that require security would never rely on wireless.

Josh: There's a quote from your article on medium.com in May of 2019 here that you said in the 1950s and 1960s, scientists who showed the harmful impacts of tobacco found themselves struggling for serious attention and financial support. The validity of their views was only accepted after the toll of sickness and death had become undeniable. Is that what's going to need to happen in order to solve this problem?

Dr. Davis: I hope not. That's why I'm talking to you. But that's my fear. Because you see, I was a young scientist in the 1980s. We were tasked at the National Academies of Sciences, with evaluating whether it was safe to smoke cigarettes on airplanes. You're too young to remember, but there was a time when you got on an airplane and it was full of smoke. And it took four years to get that report released, which did say that by the end of a six-hour flight, the non-smoking and smoking sections were identical in the level of pollution. Now, today it doesn't shock anybody

to hear that, but back then that was new science. Although, again, the other scientist [inaudible] because of course, it makes sense. You're smoking in a small space, it's going to spread everywhere.

Well, that report came out. And within short order, within a few years, they began to ban smoking in the environments of young children. Because we also showed, as another report at the National Academy of Sciences, that children who lived with parents who were smokers were more hospitalized often with pneumonia, bronchiole infections and asthma. And that was the most impressive thing. Now, do we need to show now that children and people who use cell phones more have delayed speech acquisition or autism or attention deficit disorder, more behavioral problems and less empathy? I think we're on the verge of showing it. Unfortunately, it's going to take the public waking up to what we're doing to our children to understand we need to take a step back. It's not that the technology is inherently evil. It's that it's not any more appropriate for a child to be playing with this technology than it is for them to drive a car or drink whiskey.

We need to teach them and we need to learn how to use the technology more safely, as we are doing now with wired connections here. And we need to make that standard that people have wired to and through their homes. So you bring a wire into your home and you run a wire through your home. And a wired internet connection is safer, it's faster, and it's more secure. That's what we need to understand. And if you want to have your coffee pot, talk to your toilet and your washing machine, you go ahead and put on the Wi Fi for that. I don't need it.

Josh: There's a quote by Robert C. Kane, who was a senior telecom engineer. And he subjected himself voluntarily to testing of wireless radiation. He said, "Never in human history has there been such a practice as we now encounter with the marketing and distributing of products hostile to the human biological system, by an industry with full knowledge of those effects." Tell us about Robert C. Kane, this quote and the significance of what he's exposing here.

Dr. Davis: In the 1980s, when phones were just being developed, he voluntarily submitted to being a test subject to test some of the early prototypes phones, which were higher power with the same frequency that we're talking about nowadays, about 900 million cycles a second, point nine gigahertz. And about 7 years later, he developed a glioblastoma multiforme, that's a malignant brain tumor. He became very interested in learning more about the biological effects and he discovered all the old Russian research that had been done and all the semi classified work that was coming out showing biological effects. And he wrote a book called *Cell Phone Russian Roulette*, he said that it's like Russian Roulette to put a cell phone to your head.

And I talked on Gandhi, who was another engineer who worked with Motorola at that time. And he said that Motorola actively discouraged any of the other engineers who even talked to Kane. They treated him like a pariah, because of course, they didn't want his concerns to become widely known. And sadly, he died shortly after publishing his book; account of what he knew and what happened to him. He developed several different tumors of the brain. And there was no question in his mind, nor today is there any question in mine that cell phone radiation causes brain cancer, this particular rare brain cancer. So he suffered the ultimate fate of having been exposed, basically he was a guinea pig. Now, the question we have to ask is, do we want to put our children in that place? Should they become the guinea pigs? We're going to wait and count the bodies again. I know that that's what we did for lead in air and gasoline. I know that's what we did for asbestos and vinyl chloride, and most recently for flame retardants.

And all of those cases, we introduced the technology widely. And then we waited and people said, "Well, maybe it's not a good idea. We better look at this." And the more we looked, the worse it appeared until finally, there were so many people with so much injury and death then we said, "Well, we better change what we're doing."

And the reason environmental health trust exists, reason I've written my book; *Disconnect*, the truth about cell phone radiation, is because I believe that by talking to more and more people like you and others, people will wake up to the reality that we don't want everybody to be a guinea pig. We don't want our children and grandchildren to be guinea pigs, and simple precautions of using a headset and a speakerphone, and using phones less and using your phone as an answering machine. And talking on voice protocols as we're doing right now on a wired computer is a much safer and more practical thing to do. It reduces your radiation and radiation can be beneficial in medicine, and it can be harmful. And we know enough to know now that we need to reduce those exposures.

Josh: I just want to dip into the science here a little bit more -- a few more studies on millimeter wave radiation. I'm just looking at your website here, is linked -- in 1977 there was a Russian study that was declassified and approved for released by the CIA in 2012. And it's entitled "Biological effect of millimeter radio waves." Forgive me to put you on the spot like this. But what can you tell us about that study? What it found and its significance?

Dr. Davis: Well, it was a Russian review of millimeter waves, reviewed by the CIA. And it showed that there were morphological, meaning that there were physical and biochemical damage in humans and animals from millimeter wave exposure as evidenced in the skin, in the organs, in the blood, in the bone marrow, in tissue, and in enzymes. So it went,

if you will, from the level of the whole body, into the body, into the level of the bloodstream, into the level of tissue and nucleic acid metabolism, showing a wide array of biological impacts from millimeter waves.

And by the way, that research is one of many, many examples where there were -- I've got boxes in my home from Zory Glaser who worked for the Office of Naval Research, classified research showing the effects of low intensity millimeter wave exposures on cell growth, on the way that membranes work, on the way that tissues get repaired or not. And there are many examples of this. If you look at our website, there are many different studies showing biological effects and millimeter waves. Dr. Magda Havas has many others as well.

And with all of these effects, it's important to understand that biological effects from prolonged exposure at that time had never been investigated, never. And that safety limits had been set based on only short exposures to avoid heating. Why do we know that's wrong? Because the Mayo Clinic and the Cleveland Clinic tell men who want to have healthy children, get your phone out of your pocket. Keep your phone off your body.

Now the Cleveland Clinic is a respected medical institution and the director of that program, Professor Ashok Agarwal, has an MD PhD with over 400 publications. And he has repeatedly said that there's clear evidence that cell phone radiation can damage the testes, can damage the part of the male reproductive organ that's responsible for manufacturing sperm, the quality of the sperm and affect the mitochondrial DNA, which is the engine of the sperm. And those studies have been published for more than 10 years, showing effects from cell phone radiation that existed 10 years ago.

And the Iranian researcher named Massoud Safrenash has recently migrated to this country and is doing pioneering research on the impact on the testicular proteome. We know that you can damage the testis from 2G, 3G and 4G.

Josh: Yeah, if that doesn't convince a skeptic, I honestly don't know what will. What we just need again, the awareness to reach a critical threshold for people to get involved in this conversation, right.

Dr. Davis: And I think the eyes are clearly, you know, we know that the eye is most at risk because the eye has no cooling mechanism. And even if you're only talking about going in a small amount of damage to the eye is irreversible. We don't get a second set of eyes. And same thing is true with damage to the hearing nerve, and there is clear evidence that you get effects into the cell membrane. And the Eastern European countries, they are using millimeter waves to treat various diseases. Now, what does that tell us? If you can use millimeter waves to treat

things, anything we can use to treat something in medicine can also be a double-edged sword. Aspirin for example, is great under many applications, but under some circumstances it can kill you.

Josh: Well, let's dive into that because as we move towards closing our conversation here, I do still want to ask you about what can you tell us about the link between 5G and military crowd control technology or non lethal weapons?

Dr. Davis: Well, I'm sure you'll be able to find the video and your viewers will be able to see it as part of this summit. I would encourage you to insert it here now. It shows the Department of Defense demonstrating the 5G weapon that works at about 95 gigahertz but it's within the 5G range. And it's the same frequency as you're going to get from the 5G antenna that might be pasted on your building. And it shows that when at a high power, it makes people's skin feel like it's on fire. It's now a very effective means of crowd control, and the Pentagon has bragged about it. The question we have to ask ourselves is, so you're going to have these antennas on your building, and they're going to be at a lower power. What if someone decided to take it over and make it a higher power? It's also by the way, rather effective listening device, but only comes in. There are so many different double edged swords here. This is a wonderful technology for medical and military and industrial use. That's where it belongs. I don't want it in my grandchildren's bedrooms.

Josh: Right. And not only what you just said, but also the 5G infrastructure is been forming -- is directional they can point it at specific targets.

Dr. Davis: The weapon only works by beam-forming technology so that it takes the beam and concentrated into a small area to focus on those that you want to control. And when they get within that beam, they have the sensation of the skin being on fire. The 5G from the wireless radiation that's being proposed would have a similar beam forming component, because it has 1000 simultaneously operating antennas they can send and receive at the same time.

That's what makes it able to go so much faster. It's like having a 50 lane highway that can go about a half a mile as opposed to what we have now, which is a 10 lane highway that can go three miles. So you're going to be able to go faster, but a shorter distance. Now, I don't think it's worth it. And I think we should do what others are doing and try to wire the 5G into the system if you want it, if you want to pay for it. And some people do, but that should be a choice.

Josh: Having, obviously wired technology. Timothy Schoechle in the summit speaks on it very powerfully. I also wanted to quickly ask, what's your take on the aspect of 5G that involves -- we've heard up to 20,000

or more potential satellites blanketing 5G frequencies around the Earth?

Dr. Davis: It's a nightmare. I just find it hard to imagine on so many levels, I really do. Just in terms of its impact on the stratosphere. Actually, there's a very important report that I wanted to bring to your attention that you may not have seen from scientists at NOAA who have written. And scientists in the Office of Naval reserves have written as well. Warning that the proposed 5G National Grid will interfere with the ability to predict weather because it operates at about the same frequency as what is used now by satellites to sense moisture in the air over the United States.

And if you use that same spectrum, which is close enough to it, you're going to interfere with the ability to predict weather. That's a warning that the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration issued. And there's a memo that surfaced on that that I will get to you. It said, if we continue with this, we are going to be dangerous our ability to predict weather.

And we will interfere with the ability of aviation to function because the signals will be blocking and close enough to the spectrum that we need for aviation and weather prediction as to make a mess of it. And those so far, the FCC has ignored that. Would anyone want to take the risk to get in an airplane that the pilot won't be able to navigate properly because there's too much 5G traffic interfering? Hell no.

I think where we are right now is where we were with cars in the 1960s. We know they have to be made more safely. No question about it. We know they need the equivalent of airbags and seatbelts. That's what we need to on our wireless devices. We need improvements in hardware that can be done in terms of beam-forming and directional signals. We need improvements in software so that the devices don't ping to the tower 900 times a minute, maybe five times a minute will be adequate for most uses.

We need baby safe routers like they have in China that Huawei makes. A baby safe router is a router that turns itself off when it's not being used and wakes up when it needs to be used. And yes, there'll be a point two five of a second, a quarter of a second delay. We have become so incredibly spoiled, and conditioned to having things like that. You know, we don't realize what the price is that we're paying for that instant connection.

Josh: And the insurance industry even knows it, like Lloyds of London, Swiss RE, Fortune 500 insurance company know and they don't insure wireless, and they put it in the highest long term, the highest risk category for things to insure. So it's almost like these mega corporations and who's behind them are just -- it's like a frenzy, like a free for all, like a bubble that they're just going to fall into. They're just betting everything

and they're doing it as fast as they can. Because it's almost like they know that given enough time, given enough research and awareness and if they actually did a study, it's going to come to a point where they won't be able to continue to do this. Do you see this bubble bursting?

Dr. Davis: You know, they have children too. And I've already been -- people are reaching out to me from inside the industry now, asking me to do something more. I say, "Come on, guys. You know what to do." I met with people. Google has something called the fiber hood. They wired St. Louis. They wired Chattanooga, they have the fastest internet speeds of any cities in the United States because they're wired.

You can have mobile broadband in cities, the cities can provide broadband to all of her citizens. The digital divide will go away if you do it so long as it's wired to and through the home. Wired up to just the way we have now, then you're going to be setting a base for wireless and as Blake Levan has worn, it will be a disaster. We don't want to create a foundation for more wireless. We want to insist on broadband wired internet to and through homes and schools. And in schools we know from the backlash among teachers and parents, children do not learn well if they're on a computer all day long, they do not.

And more and more, just like the Silicon Valley guys send their kids to Waldorf schools, where computers are not allowed until age 12. More and more parents are understanding you want to limit children's use, you want them to be digital citizens. You want them to learn how to code. You wanted to learn how to be makers and do technology, but you don't want to do it to the exclusion of their ability to go outside and play and get their feet money. That's an important part of being a kid too. Now our children are losing that. We have all sorts of problems associated with the fact that kids aren't being more mobile including obesity. Now of course, that's related to processed foods and a whole bunch of other things.

But this is certainly one of the factors. And if we can understand, the school administrators could understand they've been snookered. They've been snookered frankly by Betsy DeVos and her compatriots, who, for years have looked at the public schools as nothing other than a market where they can push computers so that ultimately they will replace teachers with computers. And when the Los Angeles schools went on strike they said the children are going to learn because the computers are there. Children don't learn from computers, they learn with teachers, with computers. Parents should never allow children alone on computers for any length of time. They have to be there with them. If you're not with your kid when they're working on the computer, there's a problem for both of you.

Josh: Yeah, well said. Any final tips as we just wrap up here. Final tips for why do you see how we can enforce safe technology and shift to -- pace in the shift, I guess you could say, to a more positive future here.

Dr. Davis: We have developed safety cards that are available on our website so that you can share information. So whenever you see somebody with an infant or a toddler chewing on a phone, you can give them some information that will make them understand why this is not a good idea. In this harried world today, we don't want to make people feel guilty about what they're doing. We want to give them information so they can make smart choices and have healthy families and healthy choices in a safer world. In order to do that, we do have to become better informed about what this technology is, what it can do, and what it should not be allowed to do.

And we need to declare safe spaces and safe zones. Family dinner table, absolutely a place there should be no digital devices for anybody, unless Mom and Pop is on an emergency for the fire department or the hospital. That's really important to have times and spaces in your family life, where there are no devices. You can go out, hang out and do the things that families used to do together before we got so enmeshed in all of the technology.

I am encouraged by the fact that you exist, Josh. I'm encouraged by the success that you've had so far. And I think what you're doing here is really important because never forget what Margaret Mead said. The only thing that's ever changed the world is a small group of thoughtful citizens who work together. And that's what we're starting here. That's what's on the way already. There been many people who've been leaders of it, and I'm happy to be one of them.

Josh: Dr. Devra Davis, thank you so much for all of your work over the decades and specifically now at this time, at this key moment in time for humanity. I really appreciate it. And thank you so much for joining us today on the summit.

Dr. Davis: Thank you.

Critical Disruption of Mitochondria by EMFs

Guest: Jason Bawden Smith

Josh: Joining us on the Summit today is environmental health expert and a successful entrepreneur, Jason Bawden Smith. Jason, welcome and thank you so much for joining us today.

Jason: Josh, it's such a pleasure. When you called me and contacted me to fill in some of the gaps you thought you might have in the speakers, I can't think of anyone else I'd rather help more than you. I'm so impressed with your original documentary, *Take Back the Power*. It's the best one I've seen done on the subject.

Plus, it's full of [inaudible]. I love your solution focus which is my whole speak. That's what I like to do. There is so much drama, so much people out there that we need to fix this problem. And discuss it and define it. Then support those who really, really want to help. You are one of those guys. I'm all in buddy. I'm all in.

Josh: Absolutely. Well, thank you. And thank you for your commitment and your resolve in the piece that you're contributing as well. Now, you're in a unique position and you have a very strong set of experiences and skills as an entrepreneur. And also, with a very personal and powerful set of experiences on the health side and everything that you've learned.

So, I'm really excited about this conversation because there are going to be a few topics that we are going to be able to hit. And one of them is the mitochondrial function, the quantum biophysics, and what's working at the micro level. What are the processes that are both throwing us out

of balance and causing us harm? But also, how we can empower and take back our health. And increase those beneficial processes in our bodies. So, we're going to dive into that in a moment.

But before that, I'll just share with our audience a little bit about your background. So, Jason Bawden Smith, is a successful entrepreneur, author, and speaker. And Jason holds both a bachelor's and master's degrees in environmental science. And is co-founder of the largest contaminated land consultancy company in Australia. In his latest book, *In the Dark: New Ways to Avoid the Harmful Effects of Living in a Technologically Connected World*, Jason shares his deep concerns about the effects of exposure to harmful EMFs and on the health and well-being of humanity. And most importantly, what we can do about it.

Now, you mentioned your focus and solutions. I love that. That's all about what this Summit is focused on, the awareness and the solutions. And part of that is accountability.

But really quickly before we dive in, we have one of the solutions on the Summit is someone who you actually helped me connect with, who is Raymond Broomhall in Australia. Really quickly, he's doing some amazingly powerful things, blocking and removing 5G infrastructure that are going in. What are your thoughts in summary about what he's doing?

Jason: Ray is the kryptonite for the telco industry. What he's managed to do within the existing structure, so he's working within the normal legal framework and being able to take away the science. Because we end up with a he said she said scientific debate about non-thermal and thermal, this effect and that effect. And he's put that all to the side and commented it through a criminal legislation based around assault. And he will go through that much, much more detail with you, I'm sure.

But I love about what Ray has done is he's given us the ability to show that these frequencies, which are entirely foreign to our biology. They are inundating our environment, our homes, our offices, our schools, without our permission. And they are causing health effects, which are documented through a doctor, and thereby demonstrating a clear assault. And then when he serves papers upon the company, then it's directors, which have a fiduciary responsibility, are potentially liable, not personally. And, of course, open to damages through normal legal proceedings.

So, Ray, through normal existing legal structures has given us the tools we need to stop a small cell being put on the front of our house. To stop a Wi-Fi router next door potentially. It's quite incredible. And I'm sure everyone's going to love that presentation.

The great news, it's not just Australian law or even Commonwealth law.

We're pretty sure that wherever there is assault in any legislation in the U.S. or any European country, the same process can probably be used. I'll let Ray speak to that. But it's a very powerful tool. And something that kind of levels the playing field now. So now, it's kind of like a fair fight. So, I'm very impressed with Ray's work.

Josh: Yeah. I'm so excited just to be able to contribute to that process, getting out in a big way. So, you know, shout out for that. And be sure to watch Ray's two part interview on the Summit.

Now, Jason, you are successful in the business world. And also, an environmental health expert, an expert in wireless and mitochondrial, with a mitochondrial related focus. One of your websites is MitoHQ. And you are really helping this whole conversation go to the next level. In terms of identifying the harm from non-native EMF, as you call it, right? And also, helping people to be stronger, healthier, more robust in their wellbeing. What got you into that focus? You know, coming from a business background.

Jason: Well, it goes back to my mother. My mother, Judith, was hypersensitive to chemicals and to electricity. So, when talking before wireless communication was even invented. So, I grew up with a mother who was hypersensitive to lots of things. So, I had acute awareness about the impact of the environment on human health. And by the age of 16, it got very personal. I was swimming in and searching in Sydney's beaches and people don't realize that, back when I was a kid, Sydney beaches were grossly polluted with effluent from sewage treatments plants nearby from where I was living. And I got an ear infection. That ear infection resulted in me losing a third of my hearing in my left ear. And also, my balance.

So, I was pretty pissed off about that. And I was complaining to my mother one day. And she looked me square in the eye and said, "Jason, you know how to fix it. Go and do it." And I went, "What? I'm 16 years of age. How do I know what to do?" So, it's funny how those words inspired me to get involved in helping clean up Sydney's beaches. I was just a small cog in a big wheel. I'm not taking credit for any of it. But I'm sure the work that I did helped.

I ended up starting an organization that became Stop the Ocean Pollution. It was taken over by kind of greenies. So, I didn't really like that. So, I left that. And then eventually when I finished school, I went and did a degree in environmental health. That degree focused on water pollution. After I graduated with high distinction for that project, specific on water pollution. I went and joined the Health Department. Inside the New South Wales Health Department, I got involved in beach pollution and a Parliament Select Committee forced the government to start

researching it. And the health guys got involved, the epidemiologists. We did a big survey. And lo and behold, we found that swimming in it actually causes health problems. After that, the engineers got involved and they fixed the treatment plants, upgraded them to tertiary level and embarked on new ocean outfalls.

Now Sydney has the cleanest city beaches in the world. Which is fabulous. And we're really happy because the whales come and say hello. And the dolphins will surf with you right at the city beach. It's quite incredible. It's like a present we got for fixing the beaches. It's been amazing.

So, what happened when I was in the health department, I was about to leave. Because I achieved my goal. And my boss said, "Stay and do a master's degree." I'm like, "Oh, okay." So, they funded a master's degree, which is on childhood lead poisoning. We found that half the kids living in the study area had blood lead levels over the safety concern. I won't go into that because we'll be here all day.

But after all the publicity. Unfortunately, really, really nasty publicity and threats against my life after releasing all those results. I decided to leave the health department and go to academia where I started a PhD. Halfway through that PhD., I decided to change methodologies because there was literally a dog that had been involved in a renovation of an old house. And he started convulsing, then went into full seizures, and died in front of me. And it was acute lead poisoning. And I was shattered because it was my responsibility to find where the contamination was coming from. And the Lab back then took seven days to actually get you results. So, the results did not come in time for me to save that dog. But I did come in to save the kids and fix that house. So, that was great.

So, after all that, I got a new instrument in from America and changed the methodology of my Ph. D. So, I had to make a decision because by now everyone's calling me for help, right? "How do I fix this? How do I do this around lead, asbestos, and these environmental issues?" So, I decided to quit the Ph. D. and start a company called JBS Environmental. JBS Environmental has now merged with a couple of companies. It is called JBS & G. And it's now the largest contaminated land consulting company in the country. We have, I think, around 220 staff around Australia. And they've all got double degrees in science and engineering. And I'm proud to say, we have cleaned up thousands upon thousands of sites. And treated over a billion liters of contaminated water.

So, I've been actively involved in the impact of the environment on human health since I was a child. And I've carried that through my whole career. Now, you know, I think you're probably going to ask me, "Well, how did that lead to getting involved in health? And actual human health?" And I got sick. I got really, really sick. What happened to me was

I became the executive, right? You become the manager and all you do is spend time indoors. You are up before sunrise, you are at work, you are in front of all this artificial light frequency. You hardly see the sun. You hardly get in nature.

And now I know through the work through mitochondria, that it was that period of my life, that twenty-year period, where I was disconnected from nature and kind of addicted to technology in many ways, artificial technology. That is actually the reason I got sick. And when I say sick, I mean really sick. I mean, cancer, heart attack, diabetes. All the different pains from having cartilage removed from my knee, that's the VGCC. I'm sure you are going to speak to Martin Pall on this series. So, I had twenty chronic diseases. This was three or four years ago. And I have turned them all around through understanding how the biology really works from a quantum level. As opposed to a standard biochemistry level.

Josh: Wow. So, I've been researching that a little bit. I'm not an expert in it, obviously. That's why we're having this conversation. So, we can all learn more and move towards being an expert. But the role of the mitochondria and quantum biophysics as it pertains to this conversation around 5G wireless and health, is hugely significant, isn't it? And so, what can you tell us about that?

Jason: I want to preface that by, in the eighties and early nineties, neuroscience, the study of how the brain works, led to some amazing, amazing findings. It really brought about what we call mindfulness, meditation, and all the different brain states. So, that has changed the way we looked at brain health. I'm going to go on record here and say, quantum biology is going to change the whole health paradigm. It is going to revolutionize the way we look at health. Because we failed. One in two adults, at least in Australia. And I think is across all the, at least the Anglo American countries, have a chronic illness. One in three kids have a chronic disease.

So, what we've been doing has failed. So, if you're a businessman and you're looking at a balance sheet or a profit and loss statement. You're going, "Right, this company is going bankrupt. We are really in a health bankruptcy state."

So, I am a problem solver. I love understanding really complex problems. And I dive in and I'll try and work out for health, the modes of transmission. So, you have to understand how is this occurring? And then secondly, the biological mechanisms which would allow these problems to occur. And I tried everything to get better, Josh. I mean, I did all the medical specialists bouncing from one to the other, tests for tests, take this drug, do that. Then I went to all the functional, the alternative doctors, and they kind of do the same thing. They do a bit more testing. And then they give you supplements instead of drugs. It's kind of the

same but not really. Then I changed diet, nutrition, and exercise. And then I went into all the energy healings, the Reiki's, sound healing, and color therapy. You name it, I tried it. And some of it helped. Some of it definitely helped. But none of it worked.

And I was at my wit's end. I really was at my wit's end. And I think when you let go. It's funny how you get inspiration to get access to the real answers. And I was literally, it's quite ironic, I was kind of in a meditative or contemplated state on the beach in Madly at sunrise one day. It was in 2015, around Christmas time. And I just got this message. You know where it came from doesn't really matter. Just kind of came into my being. It wasn't even in my mind. And it said, "Study physics and biology." And I went, "What? Physics and biology?" We've all heard of biochemistry. The biophysics is not well known. And even when we did some biophysics at University, it really was just high level biochemistry.

So, you know, you do what you do. You get on your search engine. You start looking around. And I stumbled across a neurosurgeon. And when I hear the word *neurosurgeon*, I'm thinking, "Okay, this is top of the tops medical guy. This guy pulls your brain apart, works on your spine. He must be pretty clue-y. So, his name is Dr. Jack Kruse. And Dr. Jack Kruse is quite popular now, especially on Facebook, in the Internet, and many of the biohacking community. He's quite brash and he's very opinionated. But I can tell you, this guy is six steps ahead of anyone else I've met in the medical community. I listened. I really listened. Now, I called bullshit because there's no way that such a simple prescription could actually heal all these chronic diseases. And so, I'm super skeptic.

I'm a double degree scientist. I'm not going to accept something until I really understand it. And actually, do it for myself. So, I said, "Oh, what the heck. Going to eat a few more oysters, go the beach, change my ways a bit, my lifestyle. And we will see what happens."

It's unbelievable. The effects started within a couple of months. And three and half years in, I can say seventeen of those disease are totally gone. The other three are well on their way to being fixed. So, what's the difference? The difference is we have two genomes. Now, people have heard about of mitochondria, probably. But they don't fully appreciate it's a separate genome. You've got your mitochondrial DNA, which is your software. That you only get from your mom. Then you have your nuclear DNA, which is responsible for your blue eyes, or the color of your skin, and all the genetic material that we were taught about at school.

Now, even at university, like I spent eight years, almost ten years doing the impact of the environment on human health. And I knew nothing about the importance of mitochondria. Absolutely nothing. So, I understand why people were skeptical. I understand why the medical

professional doesn't understand this. And that's our carry. Now we've got the data. And this is all published. Like it's all available, this whole process. You type in your disease and the name Dr. Jack Kruse. And your mind will be blown on the amount of information about each and every disease that everyone has listened, including AHS to this podcast.

Josh: You mentioned you started doing things. What things did you start doing that resulted in you getting better a couple of months later? To the point that you said, seventeen of the twenty conditions were gone.

Jason: So, before we go to the practical things. We need to appreciate that it centers around a mitochondrial function. So, we need to know what mitochondria really are and how to make them healthy. That's the key difference. So, the technical term for mitochondrial dysfunction is called heteroplasmy. It's a word developed by Professor Doug Wallace. And it really is how much dysfunctional mitochondria, mutant mitochondria you have versus the healthy ones. It is a percentage.

So, what we need to do is fix our heteroplasmy and mitochondrial dysfunction. Now, mitochondria work on a few things. The main thing they work on is light frequencies. And for this podcast, I want people to understand that 5G and 4G and all the different electromagnetic fields, the artificial ones are forms of light. They really are on the same spectrum. They are just different forms, including electricity. So, light and water are the two key things for mitochondria. Everyone thinks it is energy. And energy is important. But energy can only be made by the mitochondria if the light frequencies and the water generation are accurate.

So, what did I actually do? So, I used to work in the Sydney business district. So, downtown in American terms. And those frequencies in the middle of Sydney are horrific, right? You are surrounded by cell towers, everyone's got mobile phones, everyone's got wireless devices. You've got towers right next to you. They're really high in many, many offices. The other problem is they are full of blue light. So, the artificial frequencies from the light is up. So, I left the office.

Josh: So, from the screens and from the compact fluorescent light bulbs or whatever, right?

Jason: Correct. Even glass will take out the good frequency. So, you won't get any UV's through there. And you get limited infrared as well. So, even glass can actually give you higher blue light. People don't understand. Naturally, you can get high blue light being indoors.

So, I then moved to a home office. I kind of took an executive position with that company. And I'm still a board director, but I'm not involved operationally anymore. And I went about getting myself better. So, the

number one key thing you need to do is get am sunlight. So, this is all to do with circadian biology.

A few researchers won a Nobel Prize in 2017 based on circadian biology. So, this is a real thing. So, we are designed to be wirelessly connected to the sun and hard wired to the Earth. So, the best thing you can ever do for your health, the number one thing, no matter what disease you have, is get up and see the morning sunrise. Now, if you can't see the sun come off the horizon because you live on the West Coast or there are things in the way. Just get in the daylight. Because you are going to tell your body that all the hormonal functions, everything sets through circadian biology. That's what we have been missing.

The other key thing for morning light is working with the sun to give you a natural suntan. So, you can handle the UV stuff later on. There are a thousand other reasons to get sunrise as well. But I don't have time to go through them today. Because there are so many things we want to cover.

The next thing I did, in terms of light management, when I'm on a computer, and I should be now. I put on these blue blocking glasses. So, I like these glasses because they don't change the color. And they don't change the vision. And they block about sixty percent of the blue light. So, the artificial light coming off this screen is specifically the same frequencies for melanopsin. Which is this photo receptor that's in your eyes and also in your skin that controls mitochondria. It is one of the key receptors to actually help moderate mitochondrial function properly. So, we need to make sure that we reduce those frequencies during the day.

And then at night when the artificial lights go on. I'll be wearing these, they are the total blue blocking, gray blocking glasses.

Josh: Is there a brand that you like?

Jason: Well we have started our own company because people have been asking me, "Jason, what do you use?" So, I said, "Okay, I'll put my name behind a brand." And that brand is MitoHQ.com. And the lenses are from a vision expert called, Greg Nace. He runs a company called BlueTech Lenses. They're amazing. There's a heap of science we are coming out with studies on sleep. Just these ones, just the daytime ones have shown to improve REM sleep by at least forty-five minutes just wearing them at night. Let alone these ones, these ones do a better job.

Josh: I would love to try a pair. These are actually blue light blockers from the company called Swann Wick. They have the orange ones, and these are mostly clear. You can maybe kind of see the bluish reflection because that's what is being reflected. It's not coming and being harmful.

Jason: They are kind of okay. They are really designed to be effective for four hundred nanometers. So, we really want to protect between four forty-five nanometers as much as we can.

Josh: I want to try yours now. So, after this conversation, maybe we can do a deal where I can try yours.

Jason: And the other thing you need to do is put on the armor software on your computer as well. Because the software will help block it. And also, flicker. We haven't talked about the flicker effect. This is the blinking effect that you can't see with a natural eye. But it's actually hurting, and it actually causes a lot of eye problems. So, you can actually reduce the flicker, you have to buy the premium version. But that's really important as well. Because every LCD flickers. The only things that don't flicker are the sun and actually lasers. Every other block, it doesn't matter what it is flickers. So, we need to address that as well.

Josh: Including incandescent bulb? Does an incandescent flicker?

Jason: Yes, it does. Not as much. Like the worst ones of the LEDs. The compact LEDs. TVs. Everything flickers. Incandescent bulbs are better. They're the best bulbs. Because, you know, when you used to replace one, they used to get hot, right? So, they are losing heat energy. So, the spectrum of incandescent lights is much closer to sunlight, than any of the other bulbs. Halogen would be next. Compact fluoros and LEDs are the worst.

Some LED technology is coming around where we are getting a lot better with LEDs. It's kind of a cool tech. And they are getting better. But as a general rule, standard LEDs are terrible. They've got a very sharp spike at 455 nanometers. And that spike is just deadly for your [inaudible]. So, you really got to get that down. That's what I do at night.

Then you have to get as much sunlight as you can. So, it's the middle of winter in Australia down here. I know it's nice and hot up in the northern hemisphere. But here it's freezing and it's raining. Half the time, I'll be working outside. So, I'll run an ethernet cable outside, plug it into my laptop, and I will work outside in the sun. Usually under a tree when it's really hot. Because you don't want to get burnt. Not because it causes cancer, because it hurts. There is very little evidence the sun causes cancer. The war on sun is the biggest cover story I've ever seen.

Do know that the original mean that sun causes cancer comes from a study done on rates studying jaundice in babies and it caused like eye cancer. And guess what UV they used? Big UV lamps. They didn't use sunlight. So, what people don't understand is that UV light, by itself, is quite dangerous. So, you don't want to have too many tanning beds. Because straight UV is not sensible. But UV is balanced with all the red

light, the colors of the rainbow, and even some of the blue light. So, when you have balanced natural sunlight, you absorb those frequencies. Not just the wave lengths but also the inflammation. So, we have talked about Vitamin D production. We can talk about a whole host of stuff. But we are going to move on because we'd be here all day talking about stuff.

Josh: Just really quickly on the sunlight thing, what about an over exposure to sunlight to the point of regular sunburns? Surely, there is some evidence that it's linked to cancer, no?

Jason: Sure. But that person is pretty stupid.

Josh: Okay, right.

Jason: Why do you want to get sunburnt every day? Like the problem we have is we spend 97% of our time indoors. And then we think, "Oh, it's the weekend or a holiday, let's get out in the sun." And they go out to the park or the beach. And they get burned. Because they haven't built this solar chalice. There is a way to build your chalice, that you must do. And that starts with am sunlight. AM sunrise sunlight is an SPF of about eleven, naturally. So, if you build up your skin chalice, you'll end up like, even like me. I've got British and Scottish white skin.

And when I build my solar chalice in summer in Sydney, which is some of the hottest sun in the world. I can be out for a couple of hours and not get burnt. I go pink. But pink is good because it's the hemoglobin coming the surface of your skin to absorb those frequencies to take them to all your cells and mitochondria, to tell the hardware what to do. So, pink is good. Red is bad. So, you need to manage your exposure. But you don't need to wear any sunscreen. I don't wear any sunscreen anymore. I used to use a lot.

The other thing you don't want to do is wear sunglasses. Your eyes are the best way to get all these frequencies. So, you don't want to wear sunglasses when you're outside. "Oh, the glare, I can't see." Put a hat on. Just put a hat on. That's why you have a sun visor in your car.

The other thing, when you're driving around, always open the window. Just a little bit, the light can get in. Now I have my sunroof open every day, even in the middle of winter. Unless it's raining, the sunroof is wide open. So, I'm doing everything that I can to get as much sun as possible. It's really, really important. Without getting burnt.

We are on an EMF show, so we better talk about intermittent fields. I live in Sydney. I live in the oldest suburb in Sydney, apart from the Roxy. But the original suburb of Sydney is Randwick, [inaudible] at Botany Bay. So, I live in this city. So, I'm surrounded by cell towers. So, I purposely built this house to allow us to get as low frequencies as we can. And,

you know, I've got all this technology here. And this is our little moto meter. And you can see that I have two green, which is really low levels. I'm not going to get into units because people get very confused. That's why I love this meter. And two green, is what you get in the country. It just means that there are some cell towers around here. And I'm getting the leftover radiation. No direct line of sight, nothing. My daughter's bedroom, which is just the other side of this wall, is zero. So, I've got zero RF frequencies in this house when she's sleeping. And that's the key. The sleep sanctuary part of this is the other big key to the puzzle. Because at night, everyone thinks your melatonin is a night hormone. It's not. It's created in the morning. That's another thing that happens in the morning. It takes four hours of complete darkness for your melatonin to actually come out.

So, you want to be in a sleep sanctuary. So, you don't want to have any electronics. You don't want to have a lamp. You don't want to have anything turned on. In fact, if you can turn the power switch off over on the power board. That is great. You want black out blinds and you won't be able to see your hand. If you can live in that every night and sleep. You can really handle a lot more exposures than any other person. Because you've got this process called autophagy. And I suppose this is like cell repair and natural cell death. And that clears all the crap out of your body at night. So, you can start afresh with really healthy cells again. So, that's another big strategy.

And the final one, and there's more. But the final major one, is understanding that DHA. DHA is an omega three fatty acid that is really only absorbed by the body eating seafood. Now, what blue light does, these artificial frequencies do, it destroys DHA in your cell membranes. Absolutely obliterates it. So, I had really poor mitochondria. So, I had to really and I still do pump my body full of DHA.

The best way to do that is eating raw oysters. So, I get really good oysters. Oysters are wonderful because we are very low in electrolytes and minerals. So, it has all those minerals that you want from the sea into your body. And DHA levels are the best because soon as you start cooking any seafood, it can actually change the DHA into ALA or EPA into other fatty acids. And you really need the DHA in the SN2 position. So, unfortunately, the vegans that are watching, fish oils won't work. Fish oils are useless because fish oils are processed.

And during that process, all the DHA goes away or most of it. And converts into something else. So, you really want to have seafood. And for all the vegans watching, oysters do not have a central nervous system. My wife's a vegetarian. So, I understand the problem of this. But I keep saying to the vegans, your number one rule when you come down to it. What is your biggest problem? It's usually around the central nervous system is their definition. So, oysters don't have one. So, they fit

your definitions. So, even vegans should be eating oysters.

Josh: Okay, so DHA, the best overall source of it that you've identified that works for you is oysters, raw oysters. My real question is this, oysters have long been recognized as sort of like a natural aphrodisiac. Is that because of the energy, you know, the increase in overall energy production at the mitochondrial level that they facilitate?

Jason: Yeah, absolutely. So, I've been lucky enough to spend some time with aborigines. I call them aborigines because ab means not of. So, not to be normal is called abnormal. So, I spent some time with aborigines, a lot of times some senior elders and I'm very, very lucky. The number one thing they taught me, they taught me some amazing things. Is that, "You white fellows have got it all wrong. You think an apple a day keeps the doctor away. No, no, no. It's a mussel a day keeps the medicine man away." So, they talk about mussels. which they mean oysters as well. Because of mussels are inland kind of oysters.

And I just, "Wow." I'm getting all this DHA knowledge from all these neurosurgeons and published articles. And here we have this ancient wisdom from a culture that's been around sixty thousand years and probably longer. Telling us that the secret to health is eating a mussel a day, an oyster a day. So, yeah, it's incredible food. And if you buy them and you learn to shuck them. They're not expensive.

Josh: So, natural light, sunrises, circadian rhythm, blue blockers, minimize your screen exposure, minimize your exposure to wireless and non-native EFMs, eat oysters. And if you want to add to that list, please do. But I want to dive back into, tell us more about the mitochondria. What are the key things that we really need to take away and be aware of in regard to that? And quantum biophysics piece?

Jason: Okay. So, mitochondria, you need to get into the quantum level. And it gets a little bit detailed. So, the best way to explain it is that animals and plants are tightly coupled. So, plants will take sunlight, water, and carbon dioxide and make food, make twigs, plants. Animals will eat them. We then consume those plants and those animals. And we've always thought it is carbohydrates, proteins, fats, that are the reason for energy. But that's not true. All those are broken down to electrons. So, in the mitochondria, this process called the electron chain transport. It's not called the fat chain or the protein chain or the carbohydrate chain. So, the ECT, the electron chain transport, takes its electrons through these different cytochromes. These different kind of parts of the mitochondria that do different things. The key one at the end is cytochrome C, just before the ATP. It uses chromophores. It uses sunlight.

So, the key sunlight frequencies for that one is in the red and infrared

spectrum. That's why red light panels are really healing because they're taking those frequencies that are similar and putting them in our bodies. So, that's the other thing I did. I've got one behind me. I can turn it. But it turns everything red. I did a lot of extra red light therapy because that was the part I needed into my body.

So, what do mitochondria make? So, they make water and they make carbon dioxide. So, the two things plants need, we make, and animals make. So, we have got this tightly coupled system. So, for all the greenies out there, plants cannot live without animals. Let's remember that. We need everything here.

Josh: It's totally symbiotic when you look at trees and all plants require carbon dioxide. And we require oxygen. They produce what we need, and we produce what they need.

Jason: Exactly. We are totally, tally interrelated. If you actually want to get really into the physics and maybe, we can get some pictures later. If you look at the chlorophyll and you look at a hemoglobin, the molecular structure is nearly identical. Except we use iron in blood, that is why we have red blood. And they use magnesium, that's why we have green pigments in plants. It's amazing how similar they are. It just blows you away when you really dig deep.

The other important thing about mitochondria that everyone forgets and it's the number one concern that I have with EHS people. And actually, the whole world. Is water. So, what kind of water do mitochondria make? They make a very special water. That's low in deuterium. Now, we've probably got time to go into full deuterium story here. But basically, it's an isotope of hydrogen. And if you have too much deuterium in your water, in your diet, or you are breathing in, then you can stop your ATP phase from actually spinning. Because it bogs up this kind of bicycle with a TCI and your rear cycle meet. And it just clogs it up. So, it doesn't spin the motor anymore. So, deuterium polluted water is really, really important. And your cell water is really low deuterium water.

And what that allows? It allows you to absorb more of those sun frequencies, those important light frequencies. The EMF that we love, it's the natural EMF that we love. And that allows those signals to be absorbed so much more when the right water is DDW.

Now what happens when mitochondria stop spinning and making DDW? We became dehydrated. And it's intracellular dehydration. You can't measure it by looking at the colors of the urine. There is this test called a BUN creation ratio. It's kind of used for kidney tests. It's the best measure of dehydration. And I can tell you, everyone that lives in Sydney, every major city, not everyone but almost everyone, is

chronically dehydrated. So, the water part is really important. So, the last part of the therapy that I did to fix my mitochondria was to drink low deuterium water. The other piece of the puzzle that we should tell people about mitochondria.

Josh: What is deuterium's chemical makeup? Like it's not H₂O. Is it H₂O₂? What is it?

Jason: It's H₂O₂. So, basically, you've got three isotopes of hydrogen. You have protium which is like the hydrogen. You've got deuterium which is the stable isotope. And then you've got tritium which is the radioactive isotope. Now, tritium doesn't really occur naturally. You've got to make it with a nuclear power plant. But deuterium does occur naturally and it's really important. Deuterium is not a bad word. It's not a contaminant. Because babies would never be born if it wasn't for deuterium. People go, "Oh, deuterium, that is related to cancer." And I say, "Well, think about it what's a baby? Babies like a little growth thing. Like a tumor is a growth." So, what happens in the third trimester of pregnancy, a mother will transfer these deuterium loads over to the child, so their brain doesn't malonate. So, all the nerves don't modulate. Malonation is like a plastic cable electrical wire.

So, it's really protective and it's really important. But if it's malonated than the head would be solid, right? So, to allow that kind of cone head to come through the vagina naturally. You don't want the malonation and the deuterium prevents that. The problem is and that's why babies and kids are more prone to EMF because they have unmalonated brains right up to about twenty-five, twenty-six years of age.

So, the malonation is a really big deal. That's why kids love carbs. Kids crave carbs. I'm sorry, they don't like veggies. The reason why they like carbs is because they are loaded with deuterium. Because they want to malonate their brain. It's like nature knows what it is doing. Just let it do its thing and it will work itself out. Deuterium is a massive subject and requires a different podcast. But there are a couple of important things regarding mitochondria that I think your audience needs to know.

Josh: So, Jason, we need deuterium. And you've explained why we need it. But it's non-native EMFs create too much of it in the cells or between the cells. Really quickly, help me understand that piece.

Jason: So really, most of the deuterium comes from our diet. It's not specifically related to non-native EMF. However, these artificial frequencies that come into our system ruin mitochondria. They ruined our cell membranes. I'm sure you're going to have Dr. Powell talking about the VGCC pathways and all the biochemistry stuff. It is the same with the biophysics. So, these frequencies are foreign. Our biology has never experienced them. We've evolved over millions of years with

natural frequencies. Those are the [inaudible] residents of the Earth and the sunlight. Also, the plants and the animals. But they are the two main ones.

When we get inundated with all the different artificial frequencies, that ruins our cell of biology. That ruins our mitochondria. Therefore, we can't make the daily W that we need to actually allow the process to continue. So, it is totally related. But it is not specifically related to deuterium per se. It's more dieting, you either eat it, drink it, or breathe it in.

Josh: Okay. So, tell us more now, specifically about 5G and other forms of wireless radiation. What is the most significant fundamental effect that it causes that your research is uncovering?

Jason: So, 5G is the next generation of wireless communication. Before we get into the specific effects, I'd like to do a little bit on the technology. Because a lot of people get the technology wrong. And the reason they get it wrong is the RF engineers, the radio frequency engineers, they don't talk. They talk to their mates, they talk to their work, but they don't go public. They are gagged. They are not allowed to talk publicly. So, we get a lot of health people and community people talking complete rubbish about 5G. And I'm really concerned about it.

So, let's get it straight. First of all, there's no confusion about 5G. There is a very strict standard been written, it's called the 5G NR. The 5G New Radio. It's an industry standard by the 3GPP.org. So, you can go there and look it up. It's all technically available. It's all there.

So, what's 5G? So, 5G is the next generation. We started with 2G, which was texting. And then we had 3G, which was texting and kind of internet access. 4G took both of those and gave us video. And what 5G is doing is allowing us to roll out the internet of things, all the smart stuff, autonomous cars, and all that stuff.

Josh: Global surveillance and control platform?

Jason: Yeah, we will get into that maybe a little bit later. So, that's another layer. It's like adding, and adding, and adding, and adding, and adding, and adding. Like the whole spectrum is being licensed by the government. The whole electromagnetic spectrum is being license because we need the 5G frequencies. Because all the other frequencies are taken up. And now we've got all these new devices and all these new bandwidths that are required. We need to put another one up there.

So, remember we talked about heteroplasmy? So, you naturally lose ten percent of your mitochondria every ten years. So, let's say we live to a hundred. So, every decade we lose ten percent. And that's a normal

aging process. That's really what aging is about. It's not about telomere lengths and DNA. It's really about mitochondria.

When you are younger, you don't lose as much. But let's just do it for a linear fashion. Because quantum has nothing to do with linear. It's non-linear and it gets really spooky as Einstein told us, right? So, it's totally different. But let's do linear for now. So, as people heteroplasmy get higher than mitochondrial age. So, we have our chronological age and a mitochondrial age. So, when I was forty-eight and really sick, my mitochondrial age was probably seventy. Because I got all the diseases of a seventy year old. So, I've been working really hard to bring back my mitochondrial age. Ideally lower than my birth age. That's really what I'm trying to do.

So, what happens when we start adding all these artificial frequencies? Our mitochondria function goes down. So, we get older. This is the reason kids are getting brain tumors. And this is the reason that we have suicide. This is the reason for the opioid addiction. We can explain all the biophysics around that. But not today because we'll be here all day.

Love is the most powerful energy on the planet. Nothing comes close. And we forget that. And we get dragged down into this fear and all this negativity. And that just brings us more fear and more negativity. So, that's why I kind of talk about 5G just as a tool. I kind of just bring it back a bit because I want people to understand that, "Okay, we've got a challenge. We've got a government. And we've got industry that are trying to give us a service that we begged for." Like we line up at Apple Stores for a new smartphone. So, we are begging for this technology. They are just giving us what we want.

Now, it's a little bit nefarious the way they do it. And we won't go into all that. But we asked for it. So, if we are asking for it, then we need to manage it. It's just like electricity. And there are fields that we should be really concerned about. So, we have to manage our data electricity. We have to learn to manage these hazards just like we put a pool fence around a pool, so we don't drown. Put in strategies that minimize our exposures, do things that improve your mitochondrial DNA. And that's the nature part. It's really amazing when you dive deep. Remember I said type in your disease and the words Doctor Jack Kruse. And your mind will be blown. I mean that for the practitioners and the medical people who are listening to this right now.

Josh: Yes. K-R-U-S-E.

Jason: Correct. Dr. Jack Kruse. He is a world famous neurosurgeon. And is really a quantum theorist being really what he is. He makes all these predicts understanding nature and they all come there. He is twenty for twenty, I think, his last count. Because he understands how it works, he

doesn't have time to do the research, so he just does the predictions and lets the research catch up with him. People don't like that process. They want to see peer reviewed studies. But we know most the scientists are captured these days. So, it's not really the most reliable thing.

But getting back to 4G. So, what makes 4G unique? It really is the digital processing signals. It's the computing, improvements in computer, and these really fancy algorithms. That really takes it to the next level. We never hear about that. Everyone wants to talk about being forming, you know, massive in massive memo, which are two unique parts of 5G. And they're dreadful. They are terrible inventions. And I'm not happy with them at all. And then the other part is millimeter waves.

But we need to understand that the low band, below one gigahertz, is like the coverage layer. And then from one to six gigahertz, where most of the 5G waves are currently working now and will for the foreseeable future, is the capacity layer. And as we get to the really high bands about sixty gigahertz, right up to sixty, seventy, eighty. Some people say that they are even going to go higher. That is usually a point to point hotspot. They are typically being used for many, many years as microwave backhaul processing. A lot of talk has been using for a long, long time on these dishes. But the point to point, it's like sniper shooting a bullet. It's not going to affect anybody because they don't want anyone to get in the way of that directional beam because they lose the signal. So, they design it, so it doesn't hit anyone, a tree, a human, a plant or anything. So, millimeter waves have been used for many, many years. And they are totally safe.

Josh: Devil's advocate here. Since we know that there's organizations let's say on the planet that are behind the scenes. That don't really want their power to be messed with. What if that's in the hands of people that want to target or use it for nefarious purposes? That you know, we're giving them the ability basically to do that if the volition is there, right?

Jason: Same argument, I can give a murderer a knife and he will stab me. So, I don't like blaming the technology or the tool. So, what we've done wrong as a society, we've set our standards incorrectly. And most city engineers think that these non-thermal effects don't exist. It's only when it heats you up a certain amount, that actually causes a problem. They've been told a furphy. Like all the science on it, didn't even include mitochondrial DNA, right? Let alone all the body sites just on normal DNA.

So, the problem's been in the way we've set the standards to use this tool. That's really the problem. I think, millimeter waves have an ability to really help us longer term. If we set the standards correctly. Now, we haven't. And we have invented and come up with these beam formings. Instead of having a rifle, now we are using a shotgun. And we are

sending all these frequencies out broadly just like a 4G broadband does it. They don't do point to point. They do mass kind of style distribution. That's the problem. And it's usually the last mile, I don't know about America as well as I do about Australia. But we have fiber optics pretty much all the way to the towers. And it's that last mile, that last kilometer, where all the problems come up.

So 5G is an additive layer. That's going to tip so many people off into the heteroplasmy disease category. So, you get to about forty percent, you are kind of okay. You get to sixty percent heteroplasmy, you have to be symptomatic. And those symptoms can be a myriad of things because your software tells your DNA what to do. So, depending on the DNA preposition. You might have cancer. You might have heart disease. You might be autoimmune. It depends.

And also, the frequency that you get. Different frequencies cause different effects as well. That's why it's really hard to design studies to prove this scientifically. Very, very complex. But I agree with that. The way we are rolling out the millimeter waves, the beam forming tech, and the overall 5G plan is horrific. It really is horrific.

Josh: And so, I just want to clarify this for our audience. 5G does not equal strictly millimeter waves. In fact, that most of what we are being told about 5G is really an evolution of 4G. Or evolution of long term evolution. Maybe that was the plan to evolve it. You know, LTE you see on your phone. And a lot of this infrastructure that's coming in is additional layers of, what three and a half gigahertz, right? And then the addition of eventually more and more, you know, higher frequencies on top of that. So, 5G is kind of like a marketing term that delineates the next evolution or the next milestone to make people think that it is faster, better, the latest, and I need to have it, right?

Jason: Correct. It's a marketing term primarily. You know, it is new tech. And it's highly advanced in the computer algorithms and the digital processing signals. But it's just another one. It's nothing that special. It's just another one.

My biggest concern is they are going to use the point to point stuff a lot in high density places. Like football stadiums, casinos, high rise apartments. So, city areas. There they are going to use it a lot. And the new rules that are coming in America, I saw that they have to let you put them on your roof. And your neighbor can have a small cell memo tower beaming straight at you. It's terrible what is going on in the States. I don't think they will allow that here. And if they do, I will be getting raised steps and sorting it out.

Josh: Absolutely. Yeah, they are calling that the Otard, new regulation at the FCC is pushing on everyone. So, high density areas using beam

forming millimeter waves, what if a flow of birds fly through them, right? There is so many random things that could happen that would be devastating in that particular instance.

Jason: Yeah, totally. I know in Australia the twenty-four to twenty-six gigahertz is mainly being licensed for indoor use. Now, I don't know in America. You guys are a little bit gun ho over there. I know a bit different then us down here in Australia. But we're not sure that they get to use really, really high gigahertz levels, millimeter wave levels for anything other than point to point source. Which they are doing now and have for a while. Now, I could be wrong. I could be wrong. I don't know the future.

The other thing I want to talk about Elon Musk and all these startling satellites is going to kill every bee, every bird, every baby. It's going to be saturated with this stuff. That is just not true. That is not going to happen that way.

Josh: How do you see it? What is the risk level?

Jason: So, it's going to be a point to point. So, you are going to have to have a satellite dish on your house. I don't want these frequencies. I'm just quite happy to have a fiber optic into my house. But if I'm going to choose between tower based ground millimeter waves or this 5G tech versus satellite. I'll take the satellite every day of the week. Because I'm going to put a satellite dish over by my windmill.

Josh: Away from your home, yeah.

Jason: Five kilometers away from where I live. I'm going to run fiber optics all the way to the farmhouse. And wire my whole house. And I will have very little exposures.

Josh: But not everyone has five miles away from their house that they can still put infrastructure up.

Jason: But you know, the inverse square law. Double the distance kind of thing, half the exposure. I'm exaggerating there. I would actually take it as far away as my land would let me. But if don't put in the chook shed because you don't want to kill the chooks. But you know, put it on a pole as far away on your boundary as possible and run fiber optics. Your exposure is going to be quite low. So, it's not blanketing the whole world with all these millimeter waves. And it's not going to happen like that.

Josh: So, you know, the satellites that Elon Musk, One Web, and Amazon are putting up. There are twenty thousand or so. We keep hearing that number. You are saying that the way they are being deployed and the plans that they are designed to beam form and communicate directly just with stations on the ground. That are designed to receive that

information that are going to minimize the risk for everyone else. And it's not going to wipe everything out.

Jason: What they'll do, which we don't want them to do. Is when that satellite dish comes down, then they can put other antennas to stop beam forming out from that disk. So, we have to be careful on how they are taking that signal and distributing it to the community.

Josh: Right, right. Right now, the worst from your perspective, the worst scenario is having these lower frequencies. These wide distribution arcs or ranges just bathing everyone. And the lower frequency, three and a half gigahertz or whatever it is, is radiation. That's every two to ten houses or whatever that the FCC says they are planning. So, that's what we should be more so focusing is what you're saying?

Jason: Absolutely. Like we are going a tsunami of devices. This internet of things means every house is going from six or seven devices I have down to thirty. So, every apartment in a high rise has thirty devices. And I haven't got into all the names of all the machines and the machine communications. But the amount of RF that is coming, the centimeter waves, I think is a bigger problem than the millimeter waves. Because that is going to be bulk of it.

And to go back to the NPT study, like they used rats. They used nocturnal animals. And they found that they developed cancer, right? So, that has been proven by government study that took twenty-five years on 2G and RS. Now, I'd be really worried about that evidence because when rats absorb those frequencies, they have a very tightly bound melanopsin, Vitamin A linkage. And this is getting into some serious biochemistry and biophysics. But I want to explain it. That what happens with these frequencies and blue light, it breaks off the retinal, the Vitamin A of that bond. And that Vitamin goes through your whole body just tearing all your fighter receptors apart. And ruining your mitochondrial function.

So, for humans, we are loosely coupled. So, the study found that in tightly coupled kind of bonding. And we are loosely coupled. So, those effects are much worse for humans than they are for rats. No one talks about the NDP study anymore. It's all been hushed, hushed. It didn't really happen. They put it under the carpet. But that scary to me because now those RF frequencies, I think it is just as damaging. Maybe even more so than some of the millimeter waves.

Josh: Yeah. And we have, Dr. Ronald Melnick, who designed the NTP study. He is on the Summit. So, I encourage everyone to watch that. He describes the whole process before, during, and after. And how the agencies just didn't even want to look at the science. They are claiming that it is inapplicable. And it's just shocking. So, fantastic story and

resource. That NTP study has to be looked at. It has to be valued for what it is. Thirty million dollar government study and what it found. The whole thing is amazing. We need to focus on it.

So, I wanted to ask you, now you live in Sydney. And Sydney has been earmarked as one of those so-called smart cities. 5G, early deployment, and all this stuff. How do you plan on living there? And, you know, how do you expect that to unfold because you are very active in the business world within Sydney, right?

Jason: Yes. So, if I had my choice, I'd move. And of course, I can move. You should put yourself ahead of anyone else. Your health is so important. But, you know, I'm a little bit crazy. I haven't told many people this story. But I went and rented an apartment with a cell farm. So, 3 to 4G towers or three Telcos about two hundred meters away. Line of sight straight through glass into the living area. And I did everything I knew to try and mitigate. I wanted to prove to myself that I could live in a highly contaminated environment.

So, when I tested it with a little moto meter, they went red line. Extreme levels, 100,000 micros a square centimeter. Well, I failed. I had DDW, I had [inaudible]. I had every tool known to man because I know the subject pretty well. I could hardly sleep, get a proper night's sleep. And within seven weeks, I had tendinitis. And I never had tendinitis in my life. So, you can't live in front of these towers. And putting cell towers in front of people is just a joke. And it's not going to happen. And we can talk about how we stopped it in our community with raised techniques.

But what am I doing? I'm doing everything I've done today. Now, remember, I've reversed twenty chronic diseases living in Sydney. So, I know I can live here and improve. But I'm pretty militant. My house is very well designed. I get a lot of sun. I have DDW. I've got all the tools. And most importantly, I have a very good sleep sanctuary to let my body repair. And I'll stay as long as I can.

Now, there's some biological tests that we use to determine the kind of biomarkers, to see how we're functioning to keep an eye on our body. And I'd like to stay in Sydney. I like going to the Opera House. I like going to all of the entertainment. I have lots of nieces and nephews here. I'm the oldest of the family because my parents have passed. I have responsibilities. I have companies. I have lots of reason to stay here.

But if it gets too bad, I'll leave. And if I do leave, I will let people know. And I can tell you, I'm leaving a smart city, everyone needs to leave. I would have a backup plan. I would definitely start looking at a backup plan. If you are going to live in the city, you must live on the ground floor. It's really important to live on the ground floor. The levels will be much lower on the ground floor. And I think, they are going to be the

penthouses of the future, the ground floor apartments.

So, I'm doing everything we mentioned earlier. What else am I doing extra?

Josh: Well, let me ask you this. Now you helped a lot of people, including electro hypersensitive people or people with microwave sickness, in addition to yourself. Others come back and really improve their health and wellness. And you also talk about, you shared with me before this interview, when we spoke. About an experience that you had in nature that really years ago, with I believe you said with a group of people that were deeply connected to nature. And also, you say when people get nature, they really heal, right? So, in closing here, maybe take a minute or two Jason, and tell us about either that experience or the central importance of getting natural frequencies as we minimize our exposure to these artificial ones.

Jason: Yeah. Great point. I'll finish with the nature frequencies. But I want to explain to people that when you mention the word 5G in a crowd. The energy just falls. It drops. This is fear around the word 5G, that is just destructive. It is not healthy. We have to think of it as a knife, we can use it to stab someone, we can use it to cut up a piece of steak to feed ourselves. So, it's just a tool.

So, when I was a greenie for about five minutes of my life. And I got involved in Old Growth Forest when I was a teenager and in my early twenties. Doing environment degrees, you get caught up in it all. And I went down to Tasmania where they were having a big fight over the logging of the Old Growth Forests. And I was with the greenies. And these greenies were just so angry. And so, upset. And they'd be chaining themselves to trees, so the bulldozers wouldn't be able to get through.

I was only a kid. I'm going, "Is there something wrong with this? It just doesn't seem to be right. I'm not sure how this is going to work." And as the universe does, it kind of gives you those messages right when you need them. And over in the distance, a few hundred meters away. I saw these bush walkers, going down the trail. And they were so happy. They were so grateful. They are so appreciative. And I could recognize that was the energy that was going to be required to save the Old Growth Forest. It wasn't going to be the anti-protesting, chain yourself to a tree types, it was going to be those that use love.

But I can tell you, and you told me this. You went camping in the bush for a few days, and you noticed a dramatic effect. I can guarantee you, anyone with any chronic disease, to spend two weeks. Especially at a higher latitude is better. So, you got more sun. So, we've got adequate sun. And you're spending a lot of time barefoot on the ground. Camping with campfires. No digital tech. No artificial light. I guarantee you will

come back feeling the best you felt for years.

So, nature wins. Get out there as much as you can. Every holiday is going to be a nature holiday. We really got to repair our mitochondria. We really need to focus on getting our health back. Because when we come back into the city, or the sewer. The AMF sewer that we find ourselves in. We need to make sure that we go and have that bath, that shower to clean our body out, so we can actually manage this. And we can. I think we can. I really do think we can.

Josh: Excellent. I love that nature wins. And I really like how you delineate the information and the fact that we need to act. But being in fear, and resonating in fear and anger, isn't the energy that's going to do this, right?

So, that's part of what this Summit is all about. Thank you for highlighting that. It reminds of a film from a few years ago. Sometimes Hollywood isn't all bad. But obviously there's a lot of crap that comes out of Hollywood. But some of the films are really inspiring or can take nuggets of wisdom. There is a film a few years ago with Will Smith and his son Jaden. And it had the tagline, "Danger is real, Fear is an illusion." Right?

So, I don't know if that's a hundred percent perfect. But it seems to be. There seems to be something to that. So, we need to be mindful of the danger, mitigate it, and really take action. Take ownership and responsibility like we as a species asked for this. We put those politicians in power. We're electing them. You know, we're kind of on one level agreeing to this. We need to step up. And to be the counterbalancing agent for safety, right?

So, thank you for helping to dispel some of the fear. And focusing on what we can do. And your work with MitoHQ.com. I mean we just scratched the service of the wealth of information and empowering tools really that is available there. So, I encourage everyone to check that out. And I encourage everyone watching us to share this link. Share the link to this talk and the Summit with everyone you know. That's how we move the needle. It's all about you guys. It's all about everyone watching this. We are doing this together and moving this whole conversation forward.

So, Jason Bawden Smith, thank you so much for taking the time to be with us today. And we'll look forward to staying connected with you as we go forward.

Jason: Thank you, Josh. I appreciate it.

Harmful Effects of 5G and Wireless

Guest: Paul Heroux

Josh: With us today on the summit is Dr. Paul Heroux. Paul, welcome.

Dr. Heroux: Hi, how are you?

Josh: Good. Thanks. Thanks so much for taking the time to join us.

Dr. Heroux: You're very welcome.

Josh: I'm just going to share your bio with our viewers at this time. Dr. Paul Heroux is a scientist with experience in electrical engineering for 15 years and in the health sciences, 30 years. After rounding out information with courses in biology and medicine, he became interested in health problems connected with electromagnetism. On the occasion of a project linking low frequency magnetic fields to occupational cancers, he was appointed associate professor at McGill University's Faculty of Medicine, in the Occupational Health Program of which he is the current director. He teaches toxicology and the health effects of electromagnetism in this program. Paul, that's a very solid background. Is there anything you'd wish to add to that?

Dr. Heroux: Well, to work in this area, you have to scan many disciplines. And I think this has been a very dominant problem in the area that many of the people involved know about engineering or the know about health, but very few people are equally comfortable on both sides of the fence.

Josh: Excellent. Well, thank you for helping us bridge that gap. My first

question is the telecommunications industry and the power utility industry claim that there's no way that a mechanism can be devised to explain harm from EMF, what can you tell us about this?

Dr. Heroux: Well, the most charitable thing that I can say about that, is that this is fake science. And the notion that there is no mechanism was popularized by industry, essentially to escape regulation. In other words, if you claim there is no mechanism, there is no basis, there is no effect, and everything vanishes. You can achieve this even in discussion with biologists by always raising the bar of the proof that is necessary to acknowledge a mechanism.

So if you have a very resistant mind that you never find anything. And unfortunately, industry has been able to voice this opinion from so many different directions that it has had effect even on people who might, I would say who should know better. For example, the epidemiologists that sees in human populations the effects of this radiation, both at low frequencies and higher frequencies. But the parrot, the opinion of industry is that we don't know what the mechanism is.

To excuse them, they're also embedded in the culture of molecules and biochemistry, that doesn't make it easy for them to see what the mechanisms are. But in truth, very quickly after these problems associated with electromagnetic radiation were discovered even in the Western world, people very quickly converged on the problem, they solved it, they have accurate comments on what was happening.

But this was absolutely ignored, because you can raise the bar as high as you want. And so the mechanisms that explain the action of electromagnetic fields are very well known, they're better known than they are for most drugs that are on the market today. But if you have of the opinion that we will not accept the mechanism until the last aspect that we believe is important is clarified, you will never admit to anything. And this is what essentially industry has -- how they have acted essentially because of self interest.

Josh: In terms of mechanism, is your perspective similar to that of Martin Paul and others who were talking about voltage-gated calcium channels, and peroxynitrite and other elements involved in that model?

Dr. Heroux: If you know anything about science, is that every scientist has a slightly different opinion, and different angle on a given problem. So Martin Paul focuses on the one thing, I focused on something different. I focus on the inhibition of metabolism in mitochondria and how this generates reactive oxygen species, and how this can affect various diseases. In the past, calcium has been involved to the work of Ross Eddy. And what Ross Eddy found is that he had calcium efflux from cells in the nervous system when he stopped radiation. And the reason

why that occurred is that when you apply the radiation, you minimize metabolism. And when you stop the radiation, the cell is now able to expel the calcium out of the cell, which it wasn't able to do before.

So calcium was, in my opinion, accidentally involved. And is not the central figure, but it is an immediate consequence of electromagnetic radiation. So if you want to discredit an area of science, you can always point to the differences between scientists, because they're all looking at the same rock from different angles. So if you want to maximize these differences, and you can quote your comments by Paul and comments by Heroux, and say they're in consistencies. You can always go that way. But I think both Paul's work and mine are entirely valid.

Josh: Good, thank you for that. Just to jump back to the industry standards, you know, they still only recognize thermal effects. And could you talk just for a moment about that. What's your perspective on the industry perspective that the only mechanism is heat, or that related to heat being caused by wireless radiation?

Dr. Heroux: Well, heat is a criterion that was retained by industry to design protection for populations, simply because it is an extreme effect that occurs at very, very high intensity. And what this would do to retain this criterion would be to essentially give industry free hand to deploy almost any type of telecommunications systems that they want. And they achieve this by placing on committees people who would have these opinions. In other words, historically, industry has supported research on the heat specifically. And the scientists, who were, so to speak, supported to work on heat, sort of naturally gravitate towards this variable, as opposed to anything else.

So they have created, so to speak, a small community of scientists who view heat as the end all and don't want to see anything else. So you can create a strong bias in science by having a bit of funding thrown at universities, by having a lot of participation on the professional committees and essentially controlling the evolution of the discussion by numbers of participants. And this is exactly what happened.

Josh: Very good, thank you. Tell us, if you could speak a little bit more on reactive oxygen species and help us to paint a picture of understanding, of how EMF and wireless cause reactive oxygen species?

Dr. Heroux: So, as you know, reactive oxygen species are a very important actor in biology, in the sense that we know that reactive oxygen species are essentially radicals of oxygen in great path that are able to attack and injure the cells internally. They are part of normal metabolism. As you live, you inevitably generate a reactive oxygen species as a normal course of the act of living. And as early as the 1950s, people like Denham Harmon theorized that part of aging is due

essentially to a reactive oxygen species. And since then, a little bit like the notion of stress in psychology, the notion of reactive oxygen species being biologically active in a number of diseases has taken hold.

So, any agent that generates reactive oxygen species will be considered to be more or less deleterious. Of course, in some cases, a small amount of reactive oxygen species can stimulate defense mechanisms. But overall, they are seen as agents that can aggravate the tendency for various -- I would say diseases to become aggravated. So these reactive oxygen species are very -- I would say inevitably generated by electromagnetic radiation, because electromagnetic radiation changes metabolism in mitochondria, these little bugs inside the cell.

If you inhibit the transfer of charges, you increase the polarization of mitochondria. There is only one value; 139 million volts that is optimal for mitochondria. You apply the radiation, this goes up. If you apply the radiation for a long time, the cell will compensate by increasing metabolism. If you then withdraw the radiation, the polarization becomes too low. So however way you see it, if you depart from this optimal value, you will have more reactive oxygen species than is normal in a given tissue. And so if for example, as an individual, you'll have vulnerabilities in your pancreas, in your brain, in your heart, in your digestive system, wherever that happens, increasing reactive oxygen species will accelerate the development of these diseases.

So this is the way in which electromagnetic radiation, which is a very irregular form of exposure, which the body has known means of defense, will essentially depart from the optimal value. And there are many examples in physiology of similar systems in mitochondria. For example, in mitochondria, it's known there is only one concentration of iron that is optimal. Higher and lower is very, very bad for you. And this is why in the human body, you have all sorts of molecules that manage the concentration of iron. But in terms of electromagnetic radiation, that is entirely artificial, we haven't had the time in the last hundred years to compensate for this entirely new agent, because our body plan mitochondria have been around for 2 billion years. They can't adapt to, I would say, the engineering community's plans within the short span of 100 years.

Josh: Yeah. Well, is Peroxynitrite (ONOO-) an example of a reactive oxygen species?

Dr. Heroux: Yes, they are. You can imagine that there's a zoo of molecules that are created. We have enzymes like catalase that are hydrogen peroxide base, which are all sorts of precautions that physiology has taken to eliminate these noxious agents from the body.

Josh: Okay, very good. And in your work, you also talk about action

metabolic disturbances, correct? Can you explain what that is, and how that relates to EMF?

Dr. Heroux: The most important molecule in the body is ATP; adenosine triphosphate. Are you familiar with this?

Josh: Yes. I'm not a scientific expert on it. I need to put that out there as a disclaimer, but yes, I'm familiar with ATP.

Dr. Heroux: So how much are you weigh?

Josh: 185.

Dr. Heroux: Okay. You consume 185 pounds of ATP per day.

Josh: Okay.

Dr. Heroux: In other words, you generate that. You consume it. And this is your daily turnover. So it's a substance that is a little bit to the cell-like money. So, you know that no government wants to run out of money. You know what happens to the US government when Trump closes it down, right?

Josh: Yeah, it stops working.

Dr. Heroux: Everything stops. So in the cell is the same thing, you can't run out of ATP. So even though there is electromagnetic radiation in the environment, the cell knows it cannot run out of ATP. So there is a large molecule called AMPK alpha, which is tasked with tracking down and turning on processing, so that the budget is respected. So whenever you have electromagnetic radiation in the environment, this enzyme manages for the cell to stay alive. So all of these processes are ongoing. You apply radiation, AMPK alpha has some work to do.

And there are downstream consequences on practically every physiological system in the cell. The truth is that we're relatively insensitive to the presence of electromagnetic radiation, unless we're hypersensitive. So few people can sense it, most of us cannot courtesy of AMPK alpha. But what AMPK alpha is not telling you is all the things that it's doing to compensate. And so essentially, when you have to compensate for something in your environment, this prevents you from doing other things that you would like to do at the cellular level. So essentially, this leads to a type of metabolic exhaustion that becomes more of a load, the older you are, and the more marginal your physiological systems are. So this is why electromagnetic radiation varies a lot depending on whether you're phoning or not. Even if you are just walking around the streets, you are subjected to radiation that isn't pulses, which means that they come on and off. Within the pulses

of radiation, there are frames that have variations within them, and so all of this radiation that is entirely irregular in your environment, sort of requires biology to make adjustments on a continuous basis. And it is this adjustment that in the end, can increase cancer, can increase neurological diseases, can increase diabetes, and so on and so forth.

Josh: Very interesting. So whether somebody is, you could say, electro sensitive or not, feels the effects or not, their body from exposure to 5G, 4G, all kinds of wireless, has to compensate at the chemical level and that requires taking more energy. So the metabolic processes are negatively affected, even if you feel it or can't feel it. And those metabolic processes are associated with these -- by the sounds of it, is what you're suggesting -- are they associated with these increases that we're seeing in all of these neurological and autoimmune and degenerative chronic diseases. Is that correct?

Dr. Heroux: Yes, there are many diseases that have increased over the last century, ever since we had exposed ourselves to new types of radiation. I don't want to give the impression that all these diseases are completely caused by electromagnetic radiation. But since radiation is very, very intimately connected with reactive oxygen species, a predictable view is that they will enhance these diseases. Apparently, at the beginning of the century, there was practically no diabetes around. You could say that there wasn't a diagnosis as well. But the increase has been very, very substantial. And when they introduced digital cellular phones, there has been an increase as well.

So what this indicates is that in all probability, the environment that we invented through technology for electromagnetic radiation, an environment that has increased by billions and billions of times from what it was originally has a real impact on diseases that, in a sense, we have been accustomed to. So we all die from cancer, we all have Parkinson's, we all have Alzheimer's. And when you're a victim of these diseases, you think it's some somehow inevitable. Well, maybe it's not. And maybe if we took better care of our environment, the incidence of these diseases would abate. So in my opinion, it is well worth the while to purify progressively our electromagnetic environment. We will recuperate the costs very substantially in decreased health costs.

Josh: So you're saying the science is indicating very strongly that EMF is one of the main agents of the increase in these diseases? And is this a long time term irreversible thing once you have exposure up to a certain point? Is that irreversible? Or how do you see this in the long term, both at an individual exposure level and cumulatively, throughout society?

Dr. Heroux: Well, you're touching on a very, very delicate point here. You know, if you're an engineer, one of the things that you assume about this question is that, well, if this radiation turns out to be

deleterious, well, we'll just turn it off, and everything will go back to normal. Biologists know better than that. And the reason why a biologist might be worried about this situation is that some things in biology, in other words, the evolution of the species can be thrown in a certain direction in a way that is irreversible. So if you look at the evolution of humans, from what was essentially unicellular billions and billions of years ago, 2-3 billion years ago. Essentially, what happened is that we have relied since the earliest times on a proper supply of ATP. This has been a mantra of living systems.

So if you look at various processes in evolution, even in reproduction, sperm is racing towards the egg is essentially an ATP race. In words, it's a truly hundred yard dash to the egg. And what you're selecting for is effective ATP, effective energy, because life feels it can't do without it. Now, you come into the modern world, and you're decide we're going to interfere with this ATP generation mechanism. We're going to confuse it. And so what will happen over time when you apply this confusion to germinal cells in the body? Is it possible that the mitochondria could become altered at the population level? And since we've become competent in things like in-vitro fertilization, and we've been knowledgeable about the evolution of populations of mitochondria within cells. You know in the human egg, there are -- how would you say, Josh, how many mitochondria are there in a single human egg?

Josh: I have no idea.

Dr. Heroux: Well, it's a third of a million.

Josh: Wow.

Dr. Heroux: So it's a population there. So you apply fields to these mitochondria, maybe you will switch the population to a given type of population. And as you do this over decades and decades, essentially, I would say confusing the efficiency of ATP utilization. This means that the main driver of human evolution and of all animal, and plant evolution has now been downgraded. In other words, the stock market doesn't recognize that this is a blue chip anymore. So you're altering perhaps in an irreversible way, what will happen to humans and to all living systems. It doesn't mean that it's death for everything. It simply means that you're going to impose a detour on biology that it did not foresee. We have counted on ATP and on mitochondrial metabolism in all organisms on this planet until now. And people who know these problems that last -- so perturb this mechanism at your peril.

Josh: Wow. That is a heavy comprehension, heavy understanding. Thank you for explaining that, the risks specifically related to the mitochondria in the egg. We know that a female is born with all of the eggs that she will produce in her lifetime, right?

Dr. Heroux: Yeah.

Josh: So that's very significant. Shifting gears a bit, I am a lay person interest in quantum physics. So, this is interesting to me. You have discussed in your work that wireless signals have a fractal structure, fractal nature, can you tell us more?

Dr. Heroux: Well, what I mean by this is that in data transmission using electromagnetic waves, you have a carrier. The carrier can be 950 megahertz, it can be 1.9 gigahertz, can be 2.45 gigahertz, these signals vary continuously at that frequency. And then in order to add data to this, essentially, this signal, you create a modulation, which in the industry is labeled as time domain multiple accesses, which means that you chop the signal on the carrier into small quantities. And you also have FDMA which mean Frequency Domain Multiple Access. So you change the frequencies, you change the altitude very, very rapidly. And within the frames and diverse that you send, you have encoded data, which means that there have to be discontinuities in the signal that essentially carry the data. And of course, when you walk around in a city, you are subjected depending on your proximity to an antenna to various levels of radiation. And then when you put the cell phone to your head against, you are subjected to different levels of radiation. So on many, many, many times scales, this signal is very, very variable.

So remember the compensation that biological systems have to perform, if you add too many of these irregularities in the signal, in the end that you increase the load of adaptation that biological systems have to perform. Now, there are electrical systems in the body. But these are very, very old electrical systems.

And this is part of natural radiation, for example, the magnetic fields of your heart are 100 times smaller than the magnetic fields from power lines. But the heart over time has had a long, long duration in which to adapt and handle these signals. And all of a sudden within the last 100 years, you add 100 fold level to this signal. It's not unexpected that you would not be able to adapt immediately. So on many, many different time scales, unfortunately, electromagnetic radiation requires the body, the cells, the mitochondria to adapt to various varying circumstances.

Josh: Yeah. I appreciate that explanation about the adaptation that is required of us, even though we're not conscious of that. That makes a lot of sense, especially since we can't see wireless signals, our brain like we don't process this stuff consciously. So that helps. I just have a question about -- you mentioned those signals are chopped. Is that anything to do with the square wave? And secondly, is it the chopping of the signals like that is being put through several milliseconds and then ends? Is that firm on/off mechanism, is that what creates the actual fractal that you mentioned?

Dr. Heroux: Yes, it is. In a sense that, for example, in the particular application of cell phones, you have to broadcast electromagnetic radiation. You're going to do this by compressing the sound of the voice that you're trying to broadcast into a fraction of the original duration. Compress that digitally and you're going to activate an oscillator that generates the carrier, and encodes the data for a short amount of time. So typically, you'll know you might have signals that occupy only less than 10% of the duration of your voice signal. And this is essentially to allow many users to use the same frequencies.

Of course in a single call, the system might shift you to another frequency, which would mean a further adaptation. But all of these good engineering ideas that would be perfectly good inside an optical fiber are a bit troublesome for humans who are exposed to them. Because digital transmission means that you have to have a type of sudden change, as you indicate a square wave.

This has a large signal to noise ratio. So it's easily regenerated over repeaters and over long distances. But this digital transmission essentially means a shock. And if you have shocks in all sorts of time frames, it's very difficult for biological systems to handle this, if it is radiation that they have never encountered in the last 2 billion years.

Josh: Really interesting. This might be a bit of a stretch, but I'm just going to ask it anyway. Do you think that these mechanisms, what you're talking about now have an effect on, for example, how we as biological beings experienced time.

Dr. Heroux: I think that it is inevitable, but the brain doesn't have a great feedback on itself, for example, levels of serotonin in the brain, you can change that by eating a banana, but you don't feel it. Because your consciousness is sort of a free-flowing balloon going through the atmosphere, and you're not necessarily informed of things that are not incredibly critical. So if you slow down, you think that others are ramping up. And if you ramp up, you think that everybody else is incredibly slow.

So, for example, we believe that the radiation from cell phones diminishes the sensitivity of your hearing. And it doesn't do this in a massive way, but it does this in a detectable way. And as well, it probably affects your thinking. It's very well documented that exposure to cell phone radiation has a tendency to impair memory, yet we use this radiation. We want to use this radiation for schools in young children. And so this is an aspect that is widely unrecognized, but there are immediate mental impacts of this radiation that are not easy to detect.

But then lead impacts, you know, lead as a neuro toxic, and these effects are essentially people who are -- the victims are completely unconscious, they're just dumber. So you were able to introduce tetraethyl lead in

gasoline in the 1920s, and 15 million American children lost 10 IQ points as a result, they don't know this. And General Motors will never be sued for that, because all you have is a dumber American population. So essentially, you're going to have impacts undermined, inevitably, but it doesn't mean that you're going to feel them.

Josh: Wow. So you're talking about impact specifically of 5G? What do you see as the impacts if 5G is widely deployed?

Dr. Heroux: Well, 5G as you know, is just an extension of the cellular system. So the first impact of 5G, which is really the plan of industry, is to increase cellular phone use, because they want to buy a new cell phone every year, because they have become dependent on this success. In other word cell phones are very, very appreciated by individuals. And so they want to increase the data rate, so that people will use them more and more and more. So what this means, unfortunately, is that if you use your cell phone a lot more, you are going essentially to expose yourself a lot more. And if people want more, you're going to need more antennas everywhere to provide more signals. So this is the first problem, there is a second problem, you want to increase the data rate.

That means that you'll have to increase the frequency, because the bit rate is proportional to frequency. So to provide more data, you have to increase the frequency. So by increasing the frequency, you concentrate the radiation on the surface of the body. And so industry is saying, "Oh, isn't this great?" We're not going as deep within the human body. Of course, you know, that all depends on your point of view.

If you talk to Olle Johansson of the Karolinska Institute in Sweden, who is a specialist about the effects on skin of these radiations. He believes that melanoma is essentially caused by electromagnetic radiation, and not necessarily by ultraviolet radiation. And in this regard, you'll have to notice that 5G radiation, even at its highest frequencies, would have a penetration depth much larger than ultraviolet radiation, which is already known to create cancer. So it's by no means true at all, that you are immune to health effects if you simply increase your frequency. That is not true.

The other thing is that, if there is a large increase in data transfer requirements, you have to put antennas everywhere, which means that these people that we call the hypersensitive. I don't know if you know any, but I know that many of them are looking for places where the radiation and defeats are not too high. Proliferation of antennas everywhere means that the antennas will always be closer to them. That means they will have nowhere to run.

And this terrifies them, because they feel although there may be a small

segment of the population, they are the ones who feel the radiation. Some of them feel it as it happens. And so these people need them to get away from the radiation, some of them shield their homes and can barely come out of their homes. So there's a big problem for them. And the other thing is that 5G is a bit different from the previous antennas that we had. In the past, they would find some land or some rooftop, and they will install antennas. Now they're going to install them in communities almost everywhere, which means that this will define what we will recognize as a normal environment for decades to come.

In other words, this wireless link, in my opinion, should have been an optical fiber link, instead, will become part of our lives in the same way that power lines have become part of our lives. And of course, there is the last ingredient and that in the recent decades, you realize that the proliferation of electromagnetic radiation signals everywhere means loss of privacy in the sense that, do we want the society in which everything we do and think almost is available to someone else.

So with 5G, because they're beam forming, they will not only know in which region of the city you are, they will know in which room you are. And with other types of information that can be retrieved from devices that they would like to sell you in the future that emit radiation and information. They'll know everything that you're doing. So do we want this type of society? To what extent do we limit the individual to have privacy? Shouldn't all of these Internet of Things devices be turned off when they're sold to you. And you have to agree, maybe on an annual basis, and there has to be a visible reminder that they're sending information to others. Otherwise, you're owned by somebody else.

And so you already see this in software industry trying to, I would say, train people into accepting submission. You have this software that asks you, "Do you give us authorization to retrieve data from your premises with this piece of equipment?" And you have two choices; yes, or I'll think about that later. This says everything about the intentions of industry. You might be worried about spying from foreign governments. What about spying from your government? What about spying from all corporations? You are an individual, do you have any rights left is also a concern?

Josh: Thank you so much for that piece and just helping to contextualize, that's very helpful. You mentioned about beam forming in 5G. Can you tell us, Paul, about the origin and purposes of beam forming and its applications around 5G and what that entails.

Dr. Heroux: There is a widely viewed video of Tom Wheeler, formerly a director of the FCC, saying that he was going to deploy 5G without waiting for standards. And this was the result of innovative new stuff by American engineers. Actually beam forming used in 5G is a very, very old

thing. In other words, if you have a large array of antennas as opposed to a single one, you can actually steer the radiation. You know that in the radar you rotate antennas continuously to see where the planes or the ships are coming from.

The advantage of these arrays of antennas is that you don't have to rotate anything, you can by very subtle adjustments of the internet itself, send the beam in one direction or the other. For example, the Russians were the first in 1981 to deploy in their MiG 31 on the radar. A very, very powerful radar, which allowed a fighter aircraft to send the signal in one direction and then totally quiet. And then another signal and then be totally quiet. And you can keep track of an enemy without broadcasting your position all the time.

So in the implementation that would be in 5G would have beams that are five to 10 degrees in width being shot a little bit like similar to laser beams in one direction in the direction of a customer who has a need for communication. So this, in a sense, is very, very nice to pack more information into a given volume. In the sense that before we use different frequencies, and then we use different time slots, so the frequencies in frequency domain, and the time slots in time domain.

Now we can slice the volume, because we can use beams that are very, very narrow. This means that we can transmit even more data, isn't it wonderful? But also, it also gives you information of exactly where the customer is. All of this beam forming means that you will be able to pack more devices within a given space. And of course, having a beam of that sort, which is higher frequencies and higher frequencies don't penetrate as well, you would need to increase the level of the radiation. Because higher frequencies of radiation don't broadcast very, very well. They tend to be stopped by leaves and by rain and things like that.

So they're not 100% reliable, so you want to have more signal level. Also this radiation is absorbed by water and oxygen in the air, the air is not quite so transparent. And then there's the antenna aperture that is smaller at these frequencies. So all of these factors combined in the sense that there are higher levels of this radiation, and it's going to be more lasers like. In other words, you're not using the radiation, you might not be exposed unless you're in the path of the radiation.

But when you are using it, you will be exposed very strongly to radiation at that time. So there's going to be more of a variation over time in your exposure. So this is higher technology that is directly derived from the military that is not anything new, but is a logical expansion of the performance of wireless systems. So it all speaks to the notion how much wireless do we need in our lives. And my contention is that the important contributions of wireless in terms of having communications mobile have already been done. I don't think that you really need to

download three dimensional movies in buses.

And all of the promotions around 5G which is really inspired by the need for you to upgrade your equipment are presenting applications that may or may not work that are fantasies. And that can only occur, many of them, only if you increase the data rate tremendously. And this data rate increase with only the possible with optical fiber. In the case of cars, industry, the telcos are trying to convince both the car manufacturers and everybody else that self driving cars are impossible without 5G.

This is not true. You have self driving cars that rely entirely on laser scanning and on computer vision that will outclass 5G, because they don't need telecommunications, they can see what's happening around them. So the future will not crash if we don't have 5G. But this is natural for industry to give you the impression that if you don't have the next upgrade to your equipment, you will die in the dark frozen. And that will be that.

Josh: So you've mentioned self driving cars not needing 5G, but that being one of the talking points of proponents of 5G. You mentioned the surveillance and privacy aspects of 5G. Both of these relate to the Internet of Things. Is there anything else you want to say about the Internet of Things and any problems that you see associated with that?

Dr. Heroux: Well, the Internet of Things is the engineering idea that every object we've saturated more or less with the subscriptions to the internet from individuals. So if you want to expand your commerce base, the next thing is that you're going to put emitters in everything that you sell.

And data will exchange ongoing with all of these things. In other words, everything in the world will be exchanging data. And what will happen to the people in the middle of this radiation is a little bit unknown. But this vision of having emitters everywhere runs a bit into a problem because there's what we call the Shannon's equation in engineering. And what this says is that the amount of data that you can send is dependent on the signal to noise ratio in the environment.

And if you increase the number of radiating structures and radiating items, the noise is going to get higher. And if the noise gets higher, you're going to have to install increasingly selective filters and digital. I would say noise exclusion to improve the transmission of the signal. So obviously, this is I would call a self limiting possibility IoT. Because the first thing is that maybe we don't want everything to transmit. And in particular, I don't want to go to a store and buy an object that will irradiate me without my knowledge. I think this is very, very important. But the main point is that this dream of having everything radiating is a dream that is essentially one of engineers', who have been told that this

radiation has no impact whatsoever, in a sense, or perception of reality can be distorted sometimes.

Another way in which it is distorted is by NASA. NASA is giving a picture and Hollywood is giving a picture because it's very amusing of us humans exploring outer space and meeting civilizations from other galaxies and so on. The truth is that this will not happen soon. Not only because there's not that many civilizations out there, but the main reason is that they're incredibly far. And far means in comparison with human lifespans. And so the thing that NASA does not talk very much about is what happens to humans when they go into space. And it's not good things that happen to humans when they are in space.

So engineering has a tendency to see a rosy picture ahead of themselves. And fine, it drives their industry, but they have also a tendency to be rather a blind to how the human will fare within this technological development. And in case of IoT, it's more or less the same thing. They want to convince us that there's a need when, in fact, the need may be legitimate within say a plant, where you want every device to communicate together. And they're also very, very quickly passing over the subject of interference and reliability. Whereas if you use optical fiber -- do you know what is the ratio of capability of transmission between the 5G and optical fiber?

Josh: Optical fiber is probably -- I don't know. If I had to guess it's 10 times more data through put-in, many times more secure. I don't know though.

Dr. Heroux: Well, as you know, optical fiber is totally secure because the signal is confined within the fiber. Now you have 4G, 4G is about 1 gigabyte per second. With 5G, maybe it will get 10 gigabytes per second. Or some people say maybe even 20 gigabytes per second. Now, optical fiber, Bell Labs has demonstrated 100 million gigabytes per second internet split speed over two kilometers.

So there is no competition. That doesn't mean that we have the electronics right now commercially available to reach these speeds. But there's absolutely no comparison at all between optical fiber and wireless. Ultimately, you install an optical fiber, it can go at tremendous speeds if you only upgrade the electronics. And if you circle the earth three and a half times with an optical fiber that is mechanically stable, because it's very thin the ground and trees don't fall on it, it will have one failure every 35 years.

So you're talking about a completely different horse. In other words, any sophisticated society in the future needs and will depend on optical fiber, which is what the telcos use for themselves because they knew their stuff. But it seems at the moment to be more commercially. I would

say desirable for you to depend on wireless, because you're going to buy cell phones, and you're going to buy subscriptions, whereas if you put the fiber in one building, the guy can buy a router, and internet the whole space. So we want telcos to make money. Sometimes we have to tell them how they should do.

Josh: Yes, thank you. I had a great conversation as part of this summit with Dr. Timothy Schoechle, who advocated a very clear plan for using existing copper and new fiber, and would highly recommend that interview as well. And just to clarify, my guess was 10 times faster. I'm learning about this as we go and having the experts on. And what you're saying is optical fiber is 5-10 million times faster than 5G.

Dr. Heroux: It has been demonstrated to have this potential.

Josh: Okay.

Dr. Heroux: It's what -- maybe it has. And of course, if you bring a fiber to your home, your speed will be limited by the backbone fiber than the telco uses. But what I'm saying is that then investment in optical fiber can be upgraded to incredible speeds in the future, whereas wireless, you'll always have to change the whole system.

Josh: Yeah. So Timothy Schoechle and others were really advocating, teaming up with and educating our local governments, letting them know not only is it their job to protect their constituents and to make sure their health is not harmed, but to see the bigger picture to see solutions, to see the efficacy of wired solutions, such as optical fiber to the building, to the company, to the home. So thank you for mentioning that. You mentioned NASA as an example. I just want -- that got me thinking to ask you about the satellite aspect, the satellite system for sending 5G signals. We've heard that 20,000 or more satellites are set to be deployed. What's your take on that?

Dr. Heroux: Well, I have not explored all the aspects of this deployment. Of course, there are aspects that are very, very simple. If you're going to send that many satellites into orbit, you will have to have that many rockets maybe picking them. And maybe this creates pollution. But from the point of view of the electromagnetic environment, I think this is a rather interesting solution. The reason being that if you want fast worldwide communications, what you can do is that you could have on the roof of houses large antennas that have a lot of gauze that can use very small levels of signals. And you could have satellites that broadcast telecommunications signals from outer space at very, very low levels that you could use in your home. So in a sense, those would be fixed systems. And of course, these antennas could be solar cells as well. So a solar cell could double as an internet antenna at very, very low levels.

So you know, we are protesting 5G, because it brings these cell phone antennas so much closer to us. If there is a technique of telecommunications that removes these antennas from us, in my opinion, we should be happy in as much as it reduces the exposure of people. But this is the type of solution that could essentially provide worldwide coverage at very low exposures may be that will be entirely tolerated by humans. And would be very, very effective because of the opportunity of using solar cells coupled with a receiving antenna and a transmitting antenna, and there's no one in the path.

Josh: At low power. Right. So you're saying that there's a way potentially according to your model understanding that we can use a satellite based system to communicate. Like, a satellite dish on homes, for example, to communicate with the satellite based system at a low level, which should scientifically be at levels low enough so that there's no harm. Rather than having small cells every two to 10 homes just blasting in all directions. So you're saying that, that could be done safe?

Dr. Heroux: Yes. Well, from the point of view -- electromagnetic exposures, if we're going to use that type of wireless instead of optical fiber, which is still very much faster, that would be the least damaging solution that you can think of. And, you know, in my house, I have an atomic clock, which is essentially synchronized by an antenna in Colorado. And these clocks synchronize using extremely, extremely small signal levels. They're not very, very fast, but they use very small signal levels. And the cell phone system that we have today uses levels of signals that are enormously higher than that. What we aim to do if we're going to use wireless is to use the smallest levels of radiation possible. We don't necessarily mean to exclude wireless entirely, and we know we won't.

Josh: Good. Yeah, thank you for visioning that potential solution. And in terms of minimizing the risk, I'm very much on board with that. It's more difficult to stop, you know, all aspects of locomotive train. But if we can reroute the train with intention, with knowledge, with care for humanity, then that's much more doable, is it not?

Dr. Heroux: Yes, I think so. I think you're right. Nobody wants to stop progress. We all want have more access to data. Wherever that leads us, we see that it's leading to some political and economic difficulties. But hopefully, humans are wise enough to manage those. What we don't want is to shoot ourselves immediately in the foot in developing telecommunication methods that are immediately deleterious to health. We want people and technology to grow together, not at the expense of each other.

Josh: Yes, thank you. So just as we wrap up here, I want to close with a question that is related. And it's also about our children. We're realizing

that the effect of tech addiction and screen addiction, and kids using phones is far worse than we anticipated this problem, is far more prevalent. It's having effects biologically, it's having effects just socially. What can you say in terms of kids and smartphone or tech addiction, and bring some wisdom and insight, and perhaps some science into this part of the discussion?

Dr. Heroux: Well, Chandon province in China is controlling the access of school children to cell phones, because of the increase in myopia. You're going to get curvature of the spine. There are a number of aspects to cell phones that are very troubling, and I hope we can handle them. One of them is the obsession with not missing any communication and the increase in such signals.

The segmentation of attention, these media tend to want to draw your attention for commercial purposes, which means that a book is going to be a challenge in the future, because it's a lot less exciting than the dancing pictures that you see heightened the intensity on the cell phone. So it speaks to excitation of our visual system, it speaks to the segmentation of our capacity to be attentive. And in many communities that I have seen, people used to talk to one another. Now they all walk with their nose on their cell phone.

And of course, they're talking to somebody or something. But if you've seen, for example, the communication that is a quality, that is a consequence of emails or of commercials. It's not the same thing as human communication. So we should not let one type become totally dominant over the other. So cell phones have great tubes, they can be redesigned to minimize human exposures, and we have to do that. Don't worry, we're not going to take your cell phone away. We would just like to harness it and to provide you with a channel of incredible rates of communication to a workstation that will make you leave your cell phone to decide.

Josh: You could, for example, have a system set up within the home and within buildings where you just have like a docking station for your phone. And quickly and easily wire it so that you only use the wireless capabilities on the phone when you're not in a room with a docking station, for example, right?

Dr. Heroux: That's right. And it's probable that using frequencies of light that living systems grew up with like infrared or visible light, as in life 5, for example. I'm sure you've heard about that, instead of microwaves, is probably a good idea. It would minimize biological impacts. And if you have a docking station, you could without making a connection both charge your phone to light and transfer data at incredible rates into your phone as well. So we can have sane engineering if only we asked for it.

Josh: Very good. Well, that's an excellent point to end on. Dr. Paul Heroux, thank you so much for your time today and for being with us on the summit.

Dr. Heroux: All right. Thank you, Josh.

5G: The Agenda for Total Control

Guest: Patrick Wood

Josh: With us today on the summit is, Patrick Wood. Patrick, thanks so much for joining us today.

Patrick: You're welcome, Josh. Good to be here.

Josh: Patrick is a leading and critical expert on sustainable development, green economy, UN Agenda 21, 2030 Agenda, and historic technocracy. That basically means he's one of the best researchers out there that in the past decades, has really helped to delve into the conversation around these topics and around how the dots connect behind the scenes. He's the author of *Technocracy Rising*, and co-author of *Trilaterals Over Washington*, volumes 1 and 2, with the late Anthony C. Sutton. Wood remains a leading expert on the elitist Trilateral Commission, their policies and achievements, and creating their self-proclaimed New International Economic Order, which is the essence of sustainable development on a global scale.

So we're going to be diving into it today. We're going to be kind of separating out the truth from the lies and really distilling some dot connecting. We're going to get into solutions. We're going to get into really understanding the bigger picture here, in terms of technocracy. Technocracy is a word that you're really helping, Patrick, to bring forward into our lexicon; to understand how technology is intentionally being used to be the new control mechanism in our society. So let's dive right in. Tell us about your perspective. What is 5G? What is the Internet of Things and how do they intersect? What's the purpose here?

Patrick: Right, exactly. Just to lay a little bit of background. Technocracy originally was conceived at Columbia University in 1932. They got

kicked out, the whole group got kicked out of Columbia for a couple of reasons. But they started a commercial operation called Technocracy Incorporated, where they had membership, people paid dues, and membership cards. And it was very popular in America, they had up to 600,000 card carrying members at one time. It was a pretty big deal. It pretty much fizzled out in the late 1930s.

But it was resuscitated in the late 1960s, early 1970s, with the foundation of the Trilateral Commission, 1973 in particular, with David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski. Brzezinski had written a book, while he was at Columbia University, by the way, called *Between Two Ages, America's Role in the Technetronic Era*. That's what started the modern iteration of technocracy again. We could call it neo-technocracy. I just choose not to because nobody knows what technocracy is anyway. So I don't have to really make that distinction.

But the Trilateral Commission fed the doctrine of technocracy to the United Nations in 1992, under the auspices of sustainable development. We hear this everywhere today, sustainable this, sustainable that; sustainable development. It's a resource based economic system that depends on allocation of resources. Not allocation by a price based economic system, which we understand today but direct allocation of resources by the "managers" of those resources. And now, the UN has kind of got this idea of setting up a global common trust, where resources will be transferred to them. They will manage the allocation and the licensing and so on of resources and you and I will basically be excluded.

The program completely wipes out private property, not allowed. The United Nations has sworn that they are going to uproot capitalism and free enterprise altogether, for the sake of replacing it with sustainable development. All of this is baseline stuff and I cover all that in my book, so I'm not going to go into it a lot more; but this is kind of the background. In the original Bible, if you will, of technocracy, it was called the Technocracy Study Course, written by M King. Hubbert; mostly. That also was the guy that started peak oil theory, by the way, in 1954. We've heard a lot about that too.

But Hubbert was a co-founder of the Technocracy Incorporated Organization. And in that, they described the criteria that were necessary for technocracy to take root. In that criteria, energy management was number one. They wanted to track every single erg of power that was used within the economic system. Secondly, they wanted to surveil and monitor everything in society, all consumption, all production, of where people were, what they were doing, and so on. They didn't have the technology back then but we do today.

And I believe they saw the day when technology was coming, if for no other reason that when they were at Columbia, they were housed together in the same area, with the early iteration of IBM. Which was then making the first Hollerith computer, the tabulator. It was later used

in Germany and Europe and so on for tracking statistics and things like concentration camps, and ugly stuff like that. Well, anyway, they were rubbing shoulders with visionaries, and they considered themselves to be visionaries anyway, because they were with Columbia University after all.

So that is the background. Technology now has matured greatly since 1973. We have things today that were barely even conceived of back then. As computers have advanced, as software technology has advanced, for instance, we now have artificial intelligence. This was not really a discipline back in 1973 at all. We now have the ability to transmit data in ways that we never conceived of, back in 1973, using wireless technology. This new body, this recent body of technology now, is being used to accomplish the original goals of technocracy.

That's my point in this whole thing. The technology has advanced. Some people would say, "Well, it's just people inventing things, after all," and that's probably true in a sense. But as soon as it's invented, the technology gets hijacked by this group of technocrats, if you will, turned around, weaponized and used back against the people that it seeks to control. That's where we are today. We're talking about 5G, I'll just throw this out; 5G is not about cell phones. It's being sold that way. "Your cell phones are going to be so much faster." You can get the latest and greatest new iPhone, you could pay whatever. Probably by the time it comes out you're going to pay \$2,000 for a smartphone that will do 5G. And you can get your movies downloaded in three seconds, instead of three minutes." They say, "Wow, what a benefit!"

It's not about cell phone speed up. I've listened to the speeches of the CEOs of Verizon, T Mobile, AT&T, and consistently, you can see them salivating. Not over voice communications or human communication on cell phones, but they're salivating over the Internet of Things. And this is what they're talking incessantly about. That 5G is going to light up the Internet of Things that will allow all of the data collection, all of the devices out there that could be connected to the internet, it's going to draw all that data back in real time. And when I say real time, that's hard for most people to understand what that means.

The latest wireless technology, 4G, is fast, no doubt; but 5G takes it to a completely different level. Not only are the data transmission speeds higher, much higher but the other factor in internet communications, is called latency. Latency has to do with how long it takes that first little ping back and forth, to say, "I'm ready to send," and the other one says, "I'm ready to receive." And so they have to go back and forth, back and forth all the time. Determining, "Are you ready to receive it? Are you ready to send it?"

Now, this sounds like a miniscule thing. Typically, in a home situation where you have a Wi Fi router, your latency time can be something like 20 to 30 milliseconds and we say, "Ooh, that's really fast," and it is, but it's not real time. 5G technology has gotten the latency period

down to one millisecond or less. This is incredible, this is absolutely revolutionary. What this means is, the sensors embedded in a city will be able to send data in real time back to the central computer. Where artificial intelligence will be waiting to analyze it, to model it; to extract all of the useful information out of it. This is what the biggest carriers are salivating over. They want that data.

We used to say in the 70s, Josh, follow the money; follow the power. That's still true to some extent. Well, of course it is. Money always seems to come into it somewhere. But today, as far as technocracy is concerned, here's how you watch this; follow the data, follow the power. Go where the data is. Look for the data flow. Look for who's receiving... not first collecting, and then look who's receiving the data. And what are they doing to it? All of the people in the data world today are claiming that data is the new oil of the 21st century. And they're absolutely right. The money and the value today, the income stream is in the data that these technocrats are able to extract from society.

So when you talk about smart city, implementing all these sensors around. Whether they be light poles with microphones and cameras and the 5G transmitters. Whether it be sensors in elevators and buildings and thermostats and smart meters on the sides of homes and businesses and smart meters for the water and the gas, all that kind of stuff. Autonomous vehicles, by the way, driving around in the city and so on; all those things are going to be connected via the Internet of Things. By the time they're done implementing 100%, smart city technology in one given area, a computer with sufficient resources will be able to literally model the city in real time. And to rotate it and look into it in different areas they want to look at. This has never been possible.

Josh: What are some of the applications of that? And before you answer that, I'll just maybe say that I have a good friend who has coined this saying, "We scare because we care." And so we're going to go into a little bit of these, you know, potentially scary areas, to really look at, like what this technology is and or could be used for. So that we can deal with this, with what is actually happening, bring the conversation forward, and intentionally change course, collectively. Like that's what we're talking about here, right? We're talking about having a period of time in which we're coming to terms with this reality. We're investigating solutions. And we're getting intentional about it. But let's just go into this, Patrick. What are some of your deepest concerns? What are you seeing in terms of application here and in the future, with this technology?

Patrick: This whole body of truth we're talking about here has to do with social control. That's what technocracy was about in the first place. That's what sustainable development is about today, with Agenda 21 and the 2030 Agenda and the New Urban Agenda and so on, from the United Nations. It's about social control. This is what the Green New Deal is all about that AOC has introduced into our country, with a firestorm I might add. Everybody's talking about it now. This is about social control;

getting you to do what they want you to do. It takes away private choice, it takes away citizen choice, it takes away citizen concerns completely and says, essentially... this is such an ego trip, "We know what's best for you. You should trust us to make all your decisions for you."

Your purchasing decisions, your medical decisions, your travel decisions, your consumption decisions; how many children you have decisions. Everything under the sun is envisioned right now, is on the table for them to exercise social control over you and I. This is not just by mistake or unintended. This is the way it was from the beginning. Now we're really feeling the bite, Josh, is the problem. Look at China. China has implemented the social credit scoring system over there that's affected every person in their country. All 1.4 billion people have been enrolled into the social credit system, with their pictures, with biometric data, with all of the data. Everything that happens, they know; the government does.

They're applying artificial intelligence now to rank and rate and sort all the people in the country. The outliers that are troublemakers, like you and me... the outliers are simply dropped out of the system; they're excluded. There's 13 million people right now in China on the blacklist that have been relegated to be second class citizens. They can't travel the way other people do. They can't go to the same schools that other people want to go to. They can't live in the same areas that other people want to live in. They can't buy the same stuff that other people want to buy. This is so dystopian. It's beyond dystopia. This is what's coming to America, because this is the heartbeat of technocracy. This is the heartbeat of social control.

Josh: Wow. And I remember you writing on things like pre-crime; like that movie, *Minority Report* that probably a lot of people are familiar with. Do you want to touch on that and any other specific ways that you've been reporting on, on your website, *technocracynews*? Other specific ways that this technology is sought to be implemented?

Patrick: Well, you have it, pre-crime is a pretty good example. You have, in our country today, in America today, a rollout of surveillance technology that's very similar, if not identical, to what's being used in China. Although American companies now have the technology and they're selling it to police departments across America. Exactly the same concept and functionality of the software used in China, to be able to identify people walking down a street, using a public camera. Tracking people by name by, you know, a little box or whatever, a balloon over their head, saying, "There goes Josh del Sol. He's going down to get a coffee at his favorite coffee place," or whatever.

This technology in America is being sold to police departments across the country right now, by aggressive, pinstripe suit types, you know, not IBM salesman but that's kind of the picture you have when you have professional sales people. They're going out to police departments to market this surveillance software. Police departments are gobbling it

up at incredible rates. And a lot of people will say, "This isn't legal," or, "It isn't right," or whatever, that, "We don't want that here." But police departments come to find out, Josh, there is no federal regulation, not one single federal regulation or law that prevents a local police department from implementing this ubiquitous type of surveillance software. And implementing any kind of AI software for pre-crime analysis that they can get their hands on.

It's just a matter of money. Now, police departments don't have a lot of money. So as the price came down on this software, hardware combination, more and more police departments said, "We can afford that. Well, we can get rid of maybe a half a dozen patrolmen we don't need anymore, but use their salary to pay for it." That's what they've done. So now this is sweeping America. Americans individually, have not caught up mentally with what's going on in police enforcement across our country. But when they use this pre-crime technique to try and predict where crime is going to happen, when it's going to happen, and by who it's going to be perpetrated, this goes into such a dangerous, dangerous ground.

Because to a technocrat mind, it's perfectly acceptable to be 90% accurate. If they can get something that's 90% accurate, well, they're thrilled. "It's wonderful. We have pre-crime analysis and we can go out now and do all this stuff." But here's what they just ignore; what about the 10%? What about the 10% that get busted for something they had nothing to do with? This is such dangerous, utopian like thinking; that Americans haven't yet got their mind around. "90% is good enough," that's not the way America ever worked. Our legal system, the rule of law. Okay, it's not perfect because maybe people aren't perfect sometimes, but the rule of law applied the same law to everybody uniformly.

Not so with pre-crime analysis software or any other thing like that, that works on artificial intelligence. It's not going to apply equally. It's been proven to have biases, in other words, the bias of the programmer has been seen now to be reflected in the software. And 90% accuracy leaves the other 10% out in the cold to get busted for any cockeyed thing that somebody comes up with. And even if they are proven not guilty in the end, they've ruined their life in the meantime, by the mere accusation that they did something.

Josh: Yeah, I mean, thank you so much for painting that picture because this is obviously scary, to move from the rule of law to an AI system making assumptions that affect people's rights, because that's what we're talking about here. It's technocracy. It's the potential for chaos. It's the potential for complete and utter dependence on the system and loss of individual rights and common order. So thank you for that. Obviously it's disturbing. So, Patrick, you've also been doing work on exposing smart region initiatives, smart cities, and smart region initiatives. Tell us about that.

Patrick: Well, okay. First, certainly we have the technology. We've talked a little bit about some of the things that go into smart cities. We've missed a lot of stuff too, it's a very complex area, and it's a big area; but we've kind of laid the groundwork. There are some really disturbing technologies out there that these technocrats are trying to impose upon cities, to implement the data pump, to get data out of the cities. The money is in the data, remember. So when you hear these large companies like the AT&Ts of the world, talking about getting the smart city technology out to entire cities, they're talking about creating a huge data pump within that city.

Now, there's a problem in cities. A problem not to us, we are the city. The problem to them, is that there's those pesky city councils out there that just continue to ask questions. And they continue to want to know, "Well, how is this going to really protect our citizens?" And there are representatives, right? We elect them. We may not like some of them. I don't like all of mine, but still, they're on the front line to protect the people in the city and do things for the city, the way the city wants them to be done; the people. Technocrats hate... this entire smart city crowd hate city councils because there's so many of them.

There's thousands and thousands of cities across the country that are kind of woke, if you will, now. They're watching for this kind of stuff. So, instead of trying to go directly to the cities to negotiate for smart city technology implementation, in Phoenix, Arizona, of all places, there's a pilot program going on right today that every other community in the country is watching like a hawk. And it's called Smart Region Initiative. How it started here, Arizona State University, which bills themselves as being the most sustainable university in the country, they actually offer up to a PhD degree in sustainable development. So they're really up on it.

They have risen up, gotten ahold of three other NGOs in the area. One is a chamber of commerce like organization. Another is just a new startup, kind of a data development management company. And they've all created this consortium together, called the Smart Region Initiative. This is very similar to the Council of Government concept that's already implemented across the country. So a form of regional government, patently unconstitutional, by the way, but it's out there. We have locally, councils of governments called the Maricopa Association of Governments. It also is concerned with 22 cities and 4.2 million people, something like that. And this Smart Region Initiative is working hand in hand with the Maricopa Association of Governments to develop smart city technology to be implemented across the region.

Josh: Without the consent or permission or approval of any city government. That's the basis of this FCC law that basically is a power grab, right? I mean, they don't want to have to ask permission anywhere.

Patrick: You're absolutely right. So the cities have contributed no input to this group whatsoever. There's no elected officials that belong

to this particular group. In the case of the Maricopa Association of Governments, every city is supposed to contribute one council person to this larger Regional Council. But that does not give representation to the people in the cities. That's a model of the European Union, for Pete's sake, where each country gets to send one or two representatives to the EU Congress. They get two minutes to say something, once a year and they complain.

So, this form of regional governance is off the wall. But in the case of smart city technology, this little consortium, this little cozy consortium of academia, the ASU, along with these other nonprofit groups who have all kinds of different motives for being there in the first place; they have simply stood up and said, "We know what's best for this region." And they don't know anything about this region, other than most of them may live here. They don't know the 4.2 million people in this region. And this whole thing, the whole program, Josh, is absolutely bogus, as far as I'm concerned. It should be scrubbed off the face of the map.

However, because the cities and the Maricopa Association of Governments are involved in this, all of a sudden, they have this newfound authority in the eyes of people that live here. "Whoa, you mean the smart region initiative says we need to do it this way, huh?" Yeah, that's what they said, "Well, I guess we'd better do it that way then." They're not even questioning these decisions that come down. In the meantime, this is an absolute goldmine for the AT&Ts, the T Mobiles and so on of the world, the Verizons that are coming in, setting up this data pump; because now they can get uniform deployment of technology across the entire region.

And imagine how much more valuable that is to them than having 22 individual systems, having to be negotiated, implemented, etc. around. Now they get everything in one fell swoop. They get it faster because it's going to be done all at once across the entire region. And meantime, the region here in our area, I can tell you, knows nothing about this whatsoever. They're completely oblivious. There's been no publicity. Maybe just a couple of press releases sent out but no publicity whatsoever.

And even worse, people from all over our country are looking at Phoenix as an example, waiting, saying to themselves, "If they do it, man, we're on the bandwagon. We're right behind them, we're going to do it too." There's even people in Europe that are watching the Phoenix situation right now. They want to do the same thing. Set up these smart region initiatives, where they can just blanket the whole technology, the whole suite of things across an entire region. And in our case, in Phoenix, they're going to catch 22 cities and 4.2 million people; bang, slam dunk.

Josh: Wow. So with smart meters, that has gone forward in the name of climate action. With 5G, that is being pushed forward in the name of convenience or keeping up with the progress of technology or

competition with China. And it's like a new Cold War, right? That's been kind of propped up, perhaps, between US and China. Isn't that what Trump is saying why he wants 5G, 6G and any kind of G?

Patrick: Well yeah, any kind of G. President Trump has said that the United States must win the 5G war. Whenever you have something complex like this, the way to get it done quickly is to turn it into a race. I've seen this so many times. In fact, I used to do this with my two young sons when they were young. All you had to do was suggest, "Let's have a race. Let's run," or whatever. "Oh, yeah." Well, they want to compete against each other. That was guaranteed to burn off some energy, if nothing else. Anytime, like President Trump says, "We have a race with China. We have to beat China," everybody, all of a sudden, "That's a challenge. That's a challenge." "Oh, you're darn right, we need to beat China." "Why?" "You know, those people over there are doing all kinds of things to their citizens or whatever. We need to beat them to the punch and do it even worse..." I say this jokingly, "Do it even worse to our people."

But this is the mentality, I believe, of the Trump administration, saying, "We need to beat China in this race." They're actually speeding up the implementation of 5G in our country. We've seen them work through the FCC, which you just alluded to, to take away the authority of cities to charge and do independent negotiations with carriers. So now, there's a federal mandate from the top down to get this 5G stuff implemented. And it goes even beyond that because all of the smart city things we're talking about, Josh, are part of a larger construct called infrastructure.

Infrastructure. We think of it as, "There's a pothole in front of my house. I'd like to get it fixed." Or, "There's a bridge that is unsafe down the road. I'd like to see that fixed." That's not infrastructure to the technocrat mind. Infrastructure is all of the electronic stuff that's being implemented across the country, to connect people in cities together. And the data centers together to suck the data. This is infrastructure.

Just recently, President Trump emerged from a meeting with Senator Chuck Schumer and Representative Nancy Pelosi, having concluded a deal for infrastructure spending in America. And Schumer came out of the meeting... he's an arch enemy of Trump, he hates Trump's guts, and I think probably vice versa... he came out of the meeting saying, "We had a great meeting with the President. Why, he even suggested more money than we suggested for infrastructure, and he upped the ante." And so President Trump put on the table for infrastructure spending, \$2 trillion.

Josh: Wow.

Patrick: Huge. Where will this \$200 million go? Are they talking about bridges? Are they talking about potholes? Are they talking about repaving the freeways? No, they're not. They're talking about the infrastructure that we're talking about here. To blanket our country with

smart city technology, and everything that goes to shore it up, for the largest social engineering project in the history of the world.

Josh: Wow. I just want to confirm, is that two trillion or 200 million?

Patrick: Two trillion.

Josh: Two trillion, right, they're two vastly different numbers. I just wanted to clarify that. Wow. I just want to kind of put this in context. I'm kind of struggling to do so right now, other than to say that this is the biggest thing that's happening. What Patrick is talking about is 5G, and we need to understand that it's not just a one dimensional conversation. So this is going to be something that we encourage you to do your own research on and get educated about this aspect; this dot connecting aspect of 5g. I think Patrick perhaps could help people really understand the 'why'. Really understand things in a big picture and really be able to then reach an even larger amount of people with this information. So it's not just about the health. That is a serious concern that this is going forward with no safety studies. Would you agree?

Patrick: I would agree.

Josh: But there's a huge other conversation. So yeah, please continue. Help us to contextualize this and lead us to... you know, eventually we want to get to what specifically our best steps to take are.

Patrick: Right, let me just add on top of this, the philosophical idea which is prevalent with this whole technocrat crowd, going back to the 30s. Going through the United Nations, we see this everywhere. When we talk about resources. When we talk about resources, we're thinking about timber, lumber, oil, food coming off the land, things getting mined out of the earth; resources. We think of water as a resource. To the technocrat mind, resources also include you and me. All humans are simply resources on the table, with all these other resources. That need to be worked and managed in concert with each other, to save the planet, so to speak. I say save the planet figuratively. That's what they say. They're not saving the planet, trust me.

But humans are reduced to being simply another resource on the face of the earth, no different than the cattle or the sheep, or the goats or any anything else. Even trees in the forest and the farmland growing cauliflower up on the farm. We're just resources to be managed. In their mind, we're no better than a cow or a sheep. So we're just there to be managed. Now, when Americans or when people concerned about the health effects of 5G, get all worked up and they go to wherever they go to protest... when they're facing a technocrat, in the technocrats mind, "Why are you talking to me? Why should I care? You have to break a few eggs to make an omelet."

"So what's the problem here? You're just a resource, don't you understand? You're just a resource. The health issue, we don't care about the health issues. Because you know what, if you've got 50,000 cattle in a feedlot, you obviously don't want to lose the whole herd. That

would be dumb. But you know what, cattle die in a feedlot for all kinds of reasons. They pull up a tractor to put them in the bucket and they haul 'em off. They take them to the sausage grinder or something, I don't know." That brings up another bad thought about an old movie called *Soylent Green*. I didn't mean it, folks.

But you see, when you reduce humanity to be just another animal, the mindset that comes out of that, Josh, is dangerous, and it's anti-human, in my opinion. It's flat out anti-human. So all of the health concerns, if you're addressing technocrats, will fall on deaf ears. They won't have anything to say to you, because they're going to be looking at you and saying, "You guys are really crazy to be talking about this to us because there's just nothing to be concerned about here. Who are you anyway? You're just an animal, like all the other animals."

Josh: Let's talk about this sort of anti-human type mentality. I mean, perhaps in the microcosm, it can be that part that we struggle within. It could be the dissociative mind or the ego or whatever, right? But on the on the larger scale, it seems to be that yes, there is like this, whatever force or source it's coming from, it is a collective unconsciousness that seems to have a death wish, let's say; or have a death wish, and then project that on to other people, in the context of control. So, this is something that, again, another aspect of this, I came across, perhaps when reading your work about the Club of Rome. When which they concluded... basically, they created the context for this battle. What did the Club of Rome do or say, and what's the takeaway?

Patrick: First, I'll say there was a great overlap between the Club of Rome and the Trilateral Commission. And we wrote about that in our book, *Trilaterals Over Washington*, back in the 70s. What the Club of Rome did is they threw up a kind of an Al Gore-esque panic attack, sky is falling. By saying that we have a radical shortage of resources in the world. And if we don't allocate those resources more wisely, that we're all basically going to die. And humanity is going to come to a screeching halt. Well, their book, their work, called *Limits to Power*, was widely, widely circulated amongst the global elite especially. I doubt many people, even in this audience that we're addressing right now, probably have ever heard of that book before. But it had a huge impact on the global elite.

And so the Club of Rome prescribed, essentially everything that the United Nations is doing today with resource management. A resource based economic system; control all the resources. Myself and Sutton said this, by the way, even though we didn't understand technocracy back in the early days, as I do now. We said that the goal of the global elite was to get their hands on the resources directly, not just on the money that comes out of them, generated from them, but get their hands on the resources directly. This makes sense. In a historical sense, this makes very good sense to them, not to me, but it does to them.

Because there comes a time when money runs out of usefulness, there

comes a time when money becomes worthless, by definition, because they're chipping away at it a little bit more every year. Since 1913, the dollar has lost like 99% of its value. There's going to come a time when it's 100% and money will meet nothing. We're almost at that point right now, by the way. But when money becomes worthless, and I think they saw this even back in '73, when money becomes worthless, what do you do for an encore? Well, if you control and own the resources, it doesn't matter what type of accounting system you put on top of it. If you've got the resources, and everybody else wants them, just wait for it to sort itself out. And you're going to own everything again because you've got the resources in your pocket.

This is why the United Nations has been busy gobbling up heritage zones and stuff around the world. This is why, in our country, in America now, the US government owns, I think 38% or 36% of the landmass of our nation. It's owned by the government. And people go, "What? Our government owns that much property?" Yes, they do. "Are they allowed to?" Well, the constitution doesn't say they can but they just went and did it. And that's land that you and I can't use for legitimate economic purposes.

And the United Nations has been doing this all around the world. So the global elite now are in a position to, I think one day, let the financial system go all together. It won't matter to them anymore because they will have the actual resources behind everything to recreate themselves in any way they want to recreate themselves, when the time comes.

Josh: Wow. Some of your work has gotten into opportunity zones. What is that?

Patrick: Well, this is new. Again, I get shocked... people say, "How can you get shocked?" I get shocked at the stuff I run across; that I never saw coming. And I think my ear is to the ground on a lot of stuff but recently I discovered this whole opportunity zone concept. This was created by an act of Congress in December 2017, signed into law by President Trump. And it was called the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017. In that act was a provision to create opportunity zones. These are supposed to be low income designations within states that will achieve certain tax advantages, if people invest into these opportunity zones.

They're self-certifying zones that the governors of every state were allowed to define. "Well, what do you want your state to be in an opportunity zone?" So they started drawing the maps, whatever, in every state. The President then sign an executive order one year later, in December 2018, that created a national administrative council, including some cabinet members; that will shepherd the opportunity zone initiative across America. So it's actually been formalized within the government now. It's a big thing. Today, Josh, there are 8,700 opportunity zones created across America and they're all focused on investing money into these areas.

Now, here's the thing about this. If you have an asset that has a very, very low tax base. In other words, you bought maybe for a penny, and now it's worth 100 bucks. If you sell that asset, you're going to pay through the nose, capital gains taxes. Big investors hate that because it just drives their income, and they pay the highest possible income tax rate on it. And so they want to avoid capital gains taxes anywhere they can. Well, this opportunity zone setup allows for somebody to sell assets like that, reinvest the money into the opportunity zone, and defer their capital gains taxes for at least six years. Now, that's huge.

And what we've seen in practice so far, is that the biggest opportunity here is for public private partnerships to be created, where people can pool their money together in these opportunity zones, invest the money into the city on anything they want, including light poles, or sensors, or street sensors, or anything else. Invest the money in there and they can reap whatever benefits they can get out of it; and they defer their taxes for a long time. Now, what's happened in practice so far, is that I found some opportunity zones early on, that said, "This is our opportunity to implement smart city technology in that area," in that low income area.

Well, low income areas have no ability to really to fight anything like this because they're low income and they don't have the resources. They don't have the political infrastructure, probably and they simply just don't have the money. Maybe they don't have the education. So it's easy to get this implemented. So here's the big question; where did this legislation in 2017 come from? Who backed it? And what was it all about? This organization called the Economic Innovation Group that was kind of the primary NGO behind this legislation, the founder and executive chairman is, Sean Parker.

Now, for those who don't recognize Sean Parker's name, I'll just read one line from his bio. He was a co-founder of Napster at age 19, and Plaxo at 21. In 2004, he joined with Mark Zuckerberg to develop the online social network, Facebook. Has anybody ever heard of Facebook? And served as Facebook's founding president. And the bio goes on. But you get the point. Here is a guy who is Mr. Data himself, right? And he's pushing this, Now I can tell you what, this is all about the data. Remember, I said, "Follow the data; follow the power,"? This is a data grab of epic proportions. We'll see how it plays out.

Josh: Yeah. Before we get into actions, kind of moving towards wrapping up here, Patrick, I wanted just to touch into this. So 5G, linked with Internet of Things, linked with AI, linked with transhumanism. What's your take on that?

Patrick: Well, it is and I've suggested this quite a bit. Both transhumanism and technocracy...

Josh: First, let's define it. What is transhumanism?

Patrick: Well, transhumanism is the religious proposition that, through the use of advanced technology, man can escape the human condition.

In layman's terms that means, can become immortal. They want to escape death, that's the bottom line. This philosophy, and the father of transhumanism, and the father of technocracy are the same person. It just so happens, it's the same person. You can check the books on it, if anybody doesn't believe that; you can. His name is Henri de Saint-Simon. He was a French philosopher that lived around 1800. He wrote extensively on both topics, and he is now considered to be the father of both.

He developed the religious concept of scientism. That science was the solution to man's everything. Got a problem? "You know, scientists can come in and save the day, because they're better than everyone else. They're smarter and they can predict the future." Well, we're not going to go into scientism right now, but there's a lot been written about scientism. CS Lewis, by the way, wrote a number of papers against scientism, fighting it; debunking it, if you will. Transhumanism is based on the concept of scientism. We can use the technology to escape death. That's the ultimate problem.

Josh: Merging man and machine.

Patrick: That's right. And I describe it like this, technocracy is to the formation of society as transhumanism is to the people who will inhabit society, if that makes sense. Okay, so a technocratic society would be most perfectly filled by transhumans. The transhuman philosophy believes today that by using this advanced technology, they will create humanity 2.0. They believe through genetic modification especially, that they can hijack literally, the forces of evolution.

Okay, now evolution is not a Christian biblical concept, of course, but to those who come from an evolution frame of mind in the first place, where they believe everything was just incidental and you know, just happened; they believe now that through science, they can take over the process of evolution and direct future evolution, themselves. This is really twisted, I hate to tell you. It really is just wow, these people are out on a limb. They think that they're going to create humanity 2.0. Now, humanity 2.0 would be the perfect type of humanity to live within a purely technocratic society.

Josh: And when you say 'they', like the elite, you're talking about the Trilateral Commission, the Club of Rome, the Bilderberg Group, right?

Patrick: Anybody that adopts that philosophy; absolutely. I mean, there's billions of people outside of those elite groups that you could look at and you can see them involved in scientism. You could call them a technocrat, you could call them a transhuman; they may not have any idea what the global elite is doing. But the philosophy has permeated, the religion of it has permeated people's thinking process, and it is a religion. Scientism is a religion.

Josh: It isn't just materialism, it's what can happen, the depths of depravity to which the human mind can go, when it ceases to see the

essence, the value, or the spark of divinity or the soul in other human beings.

Patrick: Science becomes a god, bottom line. To a scientismist, science is the god. Science can do no wrong. Science is settled. Science is indisputable. Do what science says. Don't be a denier or you'll be punished. It's a religious proposition all the way down the line. But science is set up as some kind of an immutable god that can provide answers for everything man wants to know; all truth, it's found in science. "Just listen to science. Don't listen to God. Don't listen to ethics or moral discussion or whatever. Just listen to science."

Josh: Wow, well you've given us a ton to think about today, Patrick, and thank you for helping to bring light to all of these topics. And really, just to explain the 'why', the bigger picture, the dot connecting around 5G. I really appreciate that, on behalf of the audience. Just as we wrap up here, what can you tell us in terms of solutions? From your perspective, where do you see it most effective for the people to put their energy, if we want a positive future outcome here?

Patrick: Absolutely. At this point, the only possible line of defense that we can put in place is at the local level; the city, and county level. And I encourage people to get active locally. To get to know their city council people. To run for city council. To run for all kinds of various offices around their city. And intercounty, get on any kind of board you can get on and get your seat at the table. Somebody, a liberal actually, suggested one time to a friend of mine, "If you don't have a seat at the table, you are what's for dinner." Don't do that anymore. You can get involved in your local civic matters and make a huge difference.

Case in point, of all places, San Francisco; San Francisco, the bastion of liberalness and progressiveness in America. And I was born there, I should know, there's no city in America that's more progressive and liberal and off the wall, than San Francisco. Their city council just banned facial recognition technology from the city.

Josh: Excellent.

Patrick: They've banned it. Okay, don't tell me that the cities don't have power; they do. But if the citizens don't go and request the local city, magistrates, and the council members to take a stand on their behalf on these issues, they won't do it. You have to go and get involved. That's one reason, by the way, that I created Citizens for Free Speech last year, in turn which created localactivist.org, as a social networking platform just for local activists to go after issues like this. And people are welcome to go there if they want to; localactivist.org and sign up.

And believe me, if you come in and you're disingenuous, and you're a troll or you've got some other idea that you're going to crack the safe, we'll throw you out faster than a country heartbeat. This is a private network for people like us that are really desiring to get in and set our country back straight again on a local basis. And you can check it out,

citizensforfreespeech.org and localactivist.org.

Josh: Excellent. Patrick, thank you so much. I absolutely, to the highest level, recommend that people check out your book, *Technocracy Rising*. And also your previous work, which was, *Trilaterals Over Washington*. You just bring such a grounded, research based depth, without the conspiracy theory, and help us to really understand; and there it is.

Patrick: And my latest book, by the way, *Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order*. I'm not sure you've seen this one yet.

Josh: I haven't seen that one. Thank you for letting us know about that.

Patrick: Absolutely. This is the more current iteration of how... kind of like what we've been talking about here, using current examples to demonstrate these initiatives and stuff. On how they're implementing technocracy. So it's worthwhile. I call it connecting the dots.

Josh: Absolutely, yeah. And just to everyone watching out there, I just want to... just from my heart, you heard Patrick's message just right now, about how important it is to educate and communicate with your local officials right now. Not only your local officials, but local community members, and people both online and offline. This is off the cuff, I just wanted to... I'm just trying to figure out from a business standpoint, if this is even possible, but I'd want to somehow encourage you to share this talk and this series with your local governments. That's one of the reasons why we're putting on this summit. So, please... We're going to make it more clear on how you can do that.

But if you do purchase this series, at the end of the free period, you have my permission to take that video and put it on a zip drive or upload it privately and send a link to your local elected officials. Okay, this is really important that we understand that this is the type of research right here, being done by Patrick and others on this summit, that can change minds and perspectives of those in positions of power and gatekeepers in local government. So, while we don't have everything defined, we do know that our intention is to get this out to as many people as possible. And I, from my heart, want to support that as being as easy as possible. So, Patrick, thank you so much for your time today. This has been an incredible conversation, and we look forward to keeping in touch with you.

Patrick: Thanks for the opportunity, Josh. I really appreciate it.

Implications of Surveillance Capitalism

Guest: James Corbett

Josh: With us today on the summit is researcher and geopolitical analyst, James Corbett. James, welcome.

James: Thank you so much for having me.

Josh: How long have you been doing the *Corbett Report* now?

James: It is going on, it's the twelfth year now. I am into the twelfth year of *Corbett Report*. It started in 2007 from very, very humble beginnings, and I am amazed, constantly amazed, and I have to pinch myself to think about the ways it has grown since I first started it. I like to think of it as an object lesson for people out there that what you do can have resonance and it can make a difference, even if you are just the guy sitting there, as I was when I started this, on a clunky old laptop with a \$20 microphone sitting there in my apartment in Japan. It's amazing to think about, but we are in an age where you can reach people around the world with a very humble set up. So, I am trying to take advantage of it while I can, and I always encourage other people to do so. Because, if I can do, trust me, pretty much everybody out there who's listening to my voice right now can do it.

Josh: Very good. We definitely, collectively, each of us are the change, so thanks for your example there. Something I have always enjoyed about your work is that you don't do things just to be popular or to have a big following. You have never done Facebook, right? So, you are just really about the facts and the truth and getting the information to people and empowering people. So, thank you for that and so glad you are here

with us today. I will just share your brief bio with our audience and then we will dive in.

So, James Corbett has been living and working in Japan since 2004, originally Canadian, right?

James: That's right.

Josh: From where?

James: Calgary, Alberta.

Josh: Excellent! I am from near Vancouver.

James: Well, no one's perfect. You're not a Grizzlies fan, are you?

Josh: Was in a previous life. James started the *Corbett Report* website in 2007, as he mentioned, as an outlet for independent critical analysis of politics, society, history, and economics. Since then, he has written, recorded and edited thousands of hours of audio and video media for this website which is corbettreport.com, correct?

James: That's right.

Josh: Including a podcast and several regular online video series. He is the lead editorial writer for the *International Forecaster*, the e-newsletter created by the late Bob Chapman. So, James, why Japan?

James: Excellent question. I wish I had an excellent answer for it, but it is really just because I was young and impetuous and wanted to see more of the world. And that's the long and short of it. I didn't have any particular interest in Japan before I came. I never really studied Japanese or anything like that. It was literally just a way to spend a year killing time and maybe earning a little bit of money teaching English, and then I was going to come back to Canada and start my real job, whatever that was going to be. Famous last words because now I have been here 15 years. I have a family here, so I am pretty settled in.

Josh: That's excellent. So, diving in. What is 5G's relation to the internet of things?

James: So, people might be tempted. If they only ever encounter the PR propaganda surrounding the 5G rollout, they might tend to think as just another generation of mobile network technology. It is just going to be a neutral mobile network for carrying information from one computer device to another.

Of course, we tend to think of computer devices as big clunky things that sit on our desktop or maybe things that sit on our laptop or maybe

now, yeah, it's the little gadgets we have in our hands. But, as each generation of mobile network technology advances, of course, the computers tend to get smaller and smaller until they reach the point where the computer, well that's kind of a strange concept at this point. What is that? Is it a thing with an embedded RFID chip that can be read and scanned and tracked and databased and catalogued in real time as it moves through the economy?

We are getting to the point where absolutely everything in the world that is manufactured can have such a device embedded in it and can have space for such a device to be individually registered by an IPV6 which is another technology that helps to enable this internet of things that comes along. Basically, everything that exists and has been manufactured can have its own address in the new IPV6 naming convention that is coming along to replace the old one. So, literally every, I was reading a PR piece recently, every floor tile that is ever manufactured can have its own individual address on IPV6, so they can keep track of it and locate it.

This is where 5G comes in because, obviously, with that amount of data flowing through the networks, I mean, 4G just could not handle that amount of data that quickly that's being processed in real time, tracked, catalogued, databased. So, essentially, this could provide a God's eye view of everything happening in the economy in the world really. That's kind of the dream of 5G technology and that's what it helps to enable. As you say, the internet of things. This new vision that is coming together where it is not just internet of devices like we are used to, like computers and laptops and phones and tablets. Now it is going to be sneakers and fridges and toothbrushes and everything you own is going to be part of that internet and going to be broadcasting information at all times. That can only be enabled by something like the 5G mobile network.

Josh: So, do you think that there is a plan in place to have people be part of this internet of things and basically microchip everyone and to use biometrics in that level? 5G and the internet of things--

James: Yes, unfortunately, that is where this is heading, and I think that might be a later stage of indoctrination. I think technologically we are already there, and some people are already embedding themselves with chips. There has been a number of waves of PR over the last decade and a half surrounding the VeriChip, for example, and other commercial implementations of this technology.

I have seen stories from bars in Spain and other places that will let people cut in line. You can get in the club if you just embed a chip and they scan it and you can get in the club early. And these types of stupid PR type events, which are really just promoting this technology and letting the public know it exists and trying to make it seem cool and

fashionable, I still think they have a long way to go to really get a lot of the public on board with that. But I think it is coming.

I think the first stage of it will be the wearable devices of various sorts and eventually it is going to be augmented reality through Google glasses or some sort of equivalent and eventually, eventually it will be, well why are you wearing this technology when we can just embed it in you and that will be the brain chip or its equivalent. At some point, that is eventually where this is heading and, again, that will be connected through the internet of things to everything else via the 5G network.

Josh: We have seen, and I mentioned this in *Take Back Your Power* included the clip and you talked about Google's *Creepy Line* and Eric Schmidt's comment about implanting chips in people's brains when the technology is good enough. Kind of with a little bit of a chuckle almost. So, it seems like this is just embedded in the, I guess, the elite culture to move more and more toward that total control, total logging and control and manipulation and whatever else that comes out of it from all of this data. So, just diving in, the internet of things and privacy. What are the implications of what you are describing of how everything can be interconnected in this?

James: I think we can start but just taking a look at what has already been openly admitted about what the internet of things is going to be used for. And, this is coming straight from the horse's mouth, as it were, from the then director of the CIA back in, I believe it was, 2014 at a conference being hosted by In-Q-Tel, which the CIA's venture capital investment firm is. Yes, such a thing exists. So, people who are not familiar with it should look it up, In-Q-Tel. At a summit that they were hosting, then director of the CIA, David Petraeus, openly boasted about the fact that the internet of things was going to be used as another vector by intelligence agencies for spying on the public. And this got picked up by *Wired* and other outlets that talked about the CIA admits that your dishwasher will spy on you, which kind of elicits a chuckle, doesn't it? It is kind of silly sounding, but this is the reality we are moving into.

In the smart home which people are more and more buying into, literally at this point with their Google Nest or their Amazon Echo or their various implements that they are implanting in their house now, which people know are surveilling and spying on them and broadcasting that data back to corporate headquarters. Well that is going to be an even greater treasure trove of personal information about you and your daily activities as more and more devices are connected into that smart home nexus.

So, you are going to have a dishwasher and a toaster and a fridge and a washing machine and lights and thermostat and all of these devices

are going to be connected in, so that you can make your life more convenient. You can set things with your app, you can automate things, your fridge will be able to order your favorite food when you run out and things like this. This is the way it is being sold to the public. Meanwhile, people like David Petraeus are talking about how, well, of course, the CIA is going to use this to spy on targets. And that was further confirmed in 2016 by the then director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, who once again affirmed that the internet of things provides many possibilities and one of them is that, yes, the intelligence agencies will use this to target, track, locate, and surveil targets.

And as we know, as has been revealed over the past few years, the targets that these intelligence agencies are essentially everyone. The NSA is collecting data wholesale on everyone and storing it and, now, that is openly admitted and understood, but it seemed to be just a fact of life in this age. Well, that fact of life is fast catching up to us, because, as I say when every device and appliance and item that you own is broadcasting data about you and your activities at all times to corporate headquarters and, oh yeah, by the way, to intelligence agencies that are listening in, that means, essentially, every aspect of your life. It will be an open book. There will be no such thing as privacy possible. Again, this is only enabled because the 5G networks are able to carry that much data and to ultimately make this a reality. If that was not technologically possible, this would all be pie in the sky thinking but we are getting to the point where, with 5G enabling this, this will be a real possibility.

Josh: In my conversation with Dr. Timothy Schoechle as part of this summit – I encourage everyone, first of all, watch that interview – he lays out the plan for how to wire, wired alternatives to 5G and how local cities can take control of their infrastructure and provide wire fiber to the homes, to the businesses, and so forth. And then there are technologies within the home that can facilitate wired connections. So, help us just to understand here, just to clarify this shift to wireless that seemed to have happened in the early 2000s from fiber from a planned big rollout of fiber to wireless. The internet of things and all these privacy and surveillance concerns would not be possible if everything was wired, correct?

James: Not to the extent that 5G enables. And that's for a couple of reasons, one of which could be psychological in a sense or at least technical because, as I say, every single device and item and appliance and everything in your home having its own chip and ability to communicate with the internet of things obviously wouldn't be possible if we had to literally physically plug every single thing in. We might be persuaded to plug in the fridge or something, something that happens once in a while but literally, all your floor tiles and your sneakers and your hats and whatever else they want to put on the internet of things, people aren't going to be physically wiring that in.

So, yes, in order to enable, literally everything, you have – And I can't stress this enough. People think this might be an exaggeration but literally every can of coke or whatever other poison that people are ingesting these days will have its own individual device embedded in it. Not a pack, if you buy a pack of coke, it's not the pack, it's each individual can. So, again, it will be able to monitor your daily intake of everything that you do.

People who don't understand the privacy implications of that, I am not sure how I can spell it out any more clearly than to say, literally, every aspect of your life and everything you do and when you go to the toilet and everything else will be data that will be databased and collected and analyzed by artificial intelligence. But, if you ever become a target of interest to these intelligence agencies, I am sure they individually will be able to use that information in any number of ways to understand your habits, to track your networks, to know what you are talking about, and who you are talking to and eventually be able to predict rather accurately what you are going to do based on what you are searching or what you are talking about with your friends or where you are going.

Again, the level of control this provides over people is almost unimaginable and the best way to get a handle on it is probably to look at dystopian science-fiction because the things that people were warning about and were nightmares decades ago are turning into reality that people are almost eager for at this point. In 1948, George Orwell could write about 1984 and Big Brother and the telescreens. They are in every home and they are watching you. Now people are literally buying objects that are spying on them that they know are spying on them. "Alexa, order me a doll house," and are inviting this technology into their home, which is something almost unimaginable for someone from a previous generation who would have thought of that as the ultimate nightmare.

Josh: When I was making *Take Back Your Power* in 2013 is when the Snowden story broke and you have a really, I think, very empowering perspective on Snowden. But how it was filtered through the media or how the media, I think on purpose, directed this story was not to look at the data of what was actually being revealed, so that something could be done about it. But is he a good guy or a bad guy?

So, it seems like that the way that that was portrayed, perhaps even like subconsciously, psychologically, gave us the message that there's nothing really you can do about it. So, how do you answer that question, James? If you have explained all of these privacy implications and the fact that this isn't done yet, we can still change this, but somebody might say, "Well, they already have all the data or whatever" or "I'm not doing anything illegal" or "I don't mind being transparent." How do you respond to that?

James: I think the first thing is to acknowledge and understand that there are psychological operations underway to make the public accept and normalize this as a fact of life. Well, yes, it is spying on you but what does it matter? I mean, who cares if they know what you are watching on TV or something, what does it really matter? You're not doing anything wrong, so it doesn't matter anyway. That attitude is being actively implicated right now as part of a coordinated propaganda campaign.

I would like to think that that is readily apparent but, if not, then yes studying something like the reaction to the Snowden revelations, which I always put in quotation marks, because there were other NSA whistle blowers before Snowden who revealed much of this information who don't seem to get as much of the spotlight which is interesting in and of itself because, as you say, they make it about the person rather than about the details. Details, shmetails. Is this guy a good guy or was he a traitor? They spin the conversation off which I think is part of that propaganda campaign.

But the interesting, I guess, ramification of the fact that there is a coordinated psychological campaign being waged against the public to get them to normalize and accept this technology and the spying is that your opinion matters. Your psychological relation to this technology is an important point. So much so that there will be active coordinated campaigns to try to get you to see and embrace this technology in a certain way. If your opinion didn't matter, they wouldn't be so actively trying to sway your opinion on issues like this.

So, the question then is what stance or what position can we take that will actually empower us, that will actually bring the power of this technology. I am not a Luddite and I don't think technology is evil or that we should avoid it but, obviously, we have to embrace it in the right way for the right reasons and knowing that it can be used this way or that way or in a different way. So, if we embrace something consciously and with intention, we can direct that technology in the direction that would be good for humanity.

So, it does involve, what I call, buycotts and boycotts. It involves actively supporting things, it doesn't necessarily have to do with monetary exchange. I mean, we could be talking about free and open-source software, for example, and things like that, but supporting things that are in line with our ideals and not buying the things that are spying and surveilling use. I don't look at this from a position on the clouds, "I am so perfect, and everyone should be like me." Certainly not.

I have a pocket sleeve device. I know, not only is it irradiating me and all of that, but I know it is tracking and surveilling and spying on me. I am not perfect either. I do insist that my next phone will be a flip phone but, for the time being, I've got the little tracker in my pocket, so I am

not floating on a cloud about this. At any rate, I don't have Alexa or Echo or Google Nest or any of these other devices that are now being normalized in my home. Honestly, I am getting detached enough from the general culture to the point that I have to be reminded that there are people who want that technology in their home. For me, it IS still the nightmare. I still look at it from that perspective. Why would you invite that spying technology into your home, but I get that there are people who are enticed by that. "IT is so great. I can Google things on the fly by asking Alexa" or "I can order things and it is so easy and convenient."

So, it is choice that we have to make, OK how far are we going to immerse ourselves in this technology and when are we going to start pushing back and saying no and taking our power back. When will that happen? And what line do we draw? And will we stick up to it? In the face of overwhelming social pressure, "Oh, you are one of those weird conspiracy theorists that thinks the government is spying on them. Oh, the government is spying on you? Well you are still weird for thinking that's weird." Or, not only the social pressure but, as I say, the convenience. It will be more and more convenient to get along with these technologies. It will be more and more difficult to live without these technologies. More and more jobs and positions will depend on you being able to be on Facebook, to carry this little slave device, to participate in these technologies. So, it will get harder and harder and we have to draw a line somewhere. And we have to start pushing back because if we do not, then, unfortunately, it's the herd immunity type of situation where, yes, you personally might be opting out of these technologies but 99% of the people around you will be and the 5G network will be going up around you so, there is no way to physically avoid it.

Josh: Yeah, which is why spreading this awareness and information is so important. We get together and organize and self-organize and, like you said, draw a line in the sand. Very good. When Tom Wheeler, FCC chair at the time in 2016, was so excited to announce 5G, he was talking about tens of billions of dollars and we have to be the first. And now we are seeing this new cold war that Trump's talking about, USA versus Russia, we've got to win the race to 5G. How big – have you heard any numbers, James, or dug into the research and maybe verified – how big do you think this new economy is, this 5G internet of things, surveillance capitalism, related economy? How much money and financial motivation are we talking about here.

James: I've heard various figures thrown around and I'm certainly no economist, so I wouldn't venture to guess which one of them is correct or even in the ballpark but, perhaps, it is one of those things we can't even properly fathom at this point because there are certain things that invaluable or inestimable. I think there is a lot of hype that goes around trying to sell this technology to the public, but, one thing I probably

agree with people like Wheeler who in his press conference in 2016 said, "When everything is connected to the internet from your cell phone to your watering can, who knows what the next big app will be or the next killer app that this technology will enable will be." And he has a point. We don't really even know what's going to take off and what kind of things are going to be enabled through this yet. Because, again, it pervades our life in a way that we can't even begin to fathom at this point.

And as much as this technology and 4G networks enabled all sorts of things that people wouldn't have expected even a decade ago, things like Uber and Lyft and these types of things that are changing the economy in ways that we are only starting to grasp. But now the technology is moving on and it's going to be something else. So, I don't think it is really estimable, but it is going to be a profound effect.

And, as you say, every step of it will be monetized to the point where data, as I have pointed out on a podcast before, and is becoming something of a coined term at this point, data is the new oil in the way that oil was the lifeblood of the economy in the early part to the mid part of the 20th century and even the late 20th century. In the 21st century, data is going to be an important part of the economic matrix that we are living in as information is power. Information is the new currency, well data is the new oil and people are going to make incredible fortunes off it and we are already, of course starting to see that with the Silicone Valley big tech giants, billionaires arising from the pile out of this.

So, it is a new economy and how big it will be, who knows, but then again, that's just how many zeros on the end of that figure. Does it really matter at the end? What is money anyway? It's dead. There are a number of things to examine when we try to keep points on the score board with dollars and cents. At a certain point, it doesn't even matter. The point is the power that comes with it. Money is essentially about power. When people are playing at that level of the game, when you are starting to talk about the billions and trillions, eventually it is just about the power that you have over people.

Josh: So, on the other hand – I mean, I am starting to see this – what are your thoughts on this, the idea that with all of these problems associated with 5G, for example we are seeing carriers move away, some of them, indications of moving away from millimeter wave technology because it doesn't go through walls because they need it every few homes. Just higher raising up the power and realization that there are health effects. The IEEE website is talking about the health effects from millimeter wave radiation. Are you seeing the potential, as we get involved in this conversation and help to shift it and wake people up, for bubble and bubble bursting situation with all of this investment and all this big push for 5G and nobody really knows what it is?

James: It is possible. It hasn't happened yet. This isn't set in stone, so I certainly do think it is absolutely possible that this agenda that is clearly a driven agenda can be derailed and the health issues and the health effects that are now becoming undeniable is certainly one of those vectors. And it is starting to catch on in the general public awareness and I am seeing signs of that and that is to the good.

But, I think, there is also a trap that we can stumble into here. If the health effects are the only thing about this technology that we concentrate on and we miss the surveillance factor that is also enabled by these technologies, then, if they can demonstrate the safety of the technology or at least for the normy, the average population, "Well it's good enough and it probably won't cause cancer." If they can demonstrate something like that, or if they could replace it with a different technology that has the same properties but doesn't have the health effects, then there is no reason to oppose it, right? It is good to have this constant flow of data and everything connected to everything else in the internet of things. That is a good thing. The only problem is the health effect. Well, if we can put the health effects to the side there is no reason to oppose it. Well, no, that's not true.

The internet of things is a nightmare, a nightmare in terms of our ability to live our lives in anything approaching freedom. Freedom from constant surveillance and control. Because, again, something I have gestured toward in this conversation, but I hope people will cogitate on, is that the amount of data that we are talking about in terms of the micro understanding of every activity that you do is data that you can use predictably. And people who are interested in that concept should look at even some things that have come out publicly about things that are going on in the skunk works of the Pentagon.

There was a project whose name I am not going to remember off the top of my head, but there was a project for constructing essentially a simulated reality that was going to take in all of this information that they were already collecting at that time. We're talking about a decade ago that *Wired* and other mainstream publications were writing about this project. Taking all of the data that they were scooping up from whatever it was, whatever sources they admit and what they don't, your e-mails and your telephone calls and your mail and your credit card transactions and everything else and putting that into basically a simulated profile of you.

And I say you as an individual, because this program was going to try to construct a simulation of the real world and every single person in it which sounds insane and is insane if you think about it, unless you have the type of data that is enabled with the 5G network with the internet of things where you really can start to construct profiles of every single person on the planet. It is a mindboggling task.

And the idea of this, again this is not coming from me it is coming from mainstream sources – I know *Wired* did report on it at the time. The idea of this was they were going to start using that to predict future events because with that amount of data coming in constantly in real time, you can start to see patterns and you can start to make predictions about what is going to happen. Again, it sounds like science-fiction fantasy but the more that you look at the way this is being directed – at any rate, people in positions of power do believe that this is possible with artificial intelligence and other things that are coming to deep mine, data mine your personal individual profiles.

It is extremely unsettling to think about and I think the one thing we have to underline in this conversation is that the reason that this is being done-- There is a guiding ideology behind this, one called technocracy, I hope people listening to this conversation will be familiar with. But, if not, this was a philosophy that was developed in the early part of the 20th century. It was actually formalized in the 1930s with the incorporation of a group called Technocracy Inc. It was co-founded by Howard Scott who was something of a charlatan and a conman but, apparently a very good talking one or an effective one because he got many people including M. King Hubbert, who many people might remember as Hubbert's Peak, i.e. Peak Oil, the geophysicist at Shell who came up with the concept of Peak Oil in the 1950s. Well back in the 1930s he was one of the co-founders of Technocracy Inc. with Howard Scott. They were literally roommates at one point.

M. King Hubbert wrote Technocracy Inc.'s bible called *The Technocracy Study Course*, where at that time, in the 1930s, they were talking about how, in order to have a technocracy, i.e. a community which was going to be run by scientists and engineers and economists and people with special knowledge of certain things, so they could precisely scientifically order society and make a utopia, of course. Well their idea was, in order to do that, they were going to need information on everything in the economy in real time. They were going to have to know what was being manufactured, how much, how much energy input did it take, how was it being sold, where, for what price, who's buying it, and where is it moving and how are people using it and consuming it. All of this information, if they could collect it all and analyze it in real time, they would be able to use that in order to perfectly balance society and direct it in the best way that the scientists could to make everything happy, blah, blah, blah. It sounded, I am sure, like absolute crackpot insanity in the 1930s to be talking about it.

Fast forward less than a century and here we are talking now about the internet of things where literally everything that is manufactured will have its own address and have its own chip and will be connected to the internet of things and monitored and tracked in real time, giving all of this data to central bureaucracies of various sorts, intelligence agencies

and others, in order to enable the technocratic dream. Now, of course, people like Howard Scott and M. King Hubbert may have forwarded this philosophy because they genuinely believed that scientists could perfectly order society and make everyone happy, but, unfortunately, as always, there are other people who are paying the bills of people like Howard Scott and M. King Hubbert, again Hubbert literally working for Shell Oil. People who pay the bills of these idealists might have different agenda items that they want to take off when it comes to a philosophy like this and what they are going to do with that data.

So, I think this is part of the explanation for the headlong rush toward 5G. This is the reason why we are never going to get a reasonable answer from the people who are pushing this agenda as to, well why now? Why do we have to do it right now? Why can't we hold off a few years? Let's do some more tests. Why don't we have an open debate about this? No. It has to be done right now. I think it is that they're rushing toward the implementation of an agenda that they have been working on for decades and decades behind the scenes. I think if the public becomes aware of that, it might be harder to sell that to the public.

Josh: As part of the summit, I believe it was mentioned, researcher Patrick Wood also speaks on technocracy. I encourage everyone to check that out. Now Patrick as done, for decades, research with, I believe, Anthony C. Sutton, on the Trilateral Commission going back to the early 70s. Zbigniew Brzezinski, key player in this technocratic movement you talk about. Again, behind the scenes, David Rockefeller and Zbigniew, coming together and basically forming the Trilateral Commission, right?

James: That's exactly right, yeah, back in the early 1970s. Then very shortly after the founding of Trilateral Commission, they ended up essentially taking over the White House with the Jimmy Carter Administration being comprised almost entirely of Trilateral Commission members. The Cabinet members were almost all Trilaterals. For a brand-new group, it is surprising how quickly they essentially gained control of the White House.

Josh: Wow! Then even in the mainstream media was reporting that, behind the scenes, Brzezinski was a mentor, a guide, to President Obama during his time in office, so having been groomed at an early age makes a lot of sense. I am just going to read for audience here a Zbigniew Brzezinski quote from *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technotronic Era*. Was this 1973 also, James? Do you know the approximate date on his book?

James: I believe it was 1970, but I would have to double check that.

Josh: So, this is the quote from 1970: "The technotronic era involves

the gradual appearance of a more controlled society. Such a society would be dominated by an elite, unrestrained by traditional values. Soon it will be possible to assert almost continuous surveillance over every citizen and maintain up-to-date complete files containing even the most personal information about the citizen. These files will be subject to instantaneous retrieval by the authorities.” And a second quote, a little bit shorter here: “In the technotronic society the trend would seem to be towards the aggregation of the individual support of millions of uncoordinated citizens [so herding and controlling people], easily within the reach of magnetic and attractive personalities [PR for selling it to us] exploiting the latest communications techniques to manipulate emotions and control reason.”

This is the most critical agenda that we really need to become aware of in terms of what’s happening on the planet right now and how we are being engineered, as you have already stated, to accept this new normal, where people no longer have rights essentially. There was a court case, I believe in 2018, to do with smart meter data and privacy and now courts are balancing the rights of the individual with the greater good. Can you talk a little bit about, more about this mindset and about this side of things here?

James: Well there is an interesting addendum to those Brzezinski quotes and perhaps that helps us to take a little bit of our power and put this in a more positive framework. Several decades later, so about a decade ago in 2007 or 8, Brzezinski was on the talk circuit at that time talking at a number of events and even pending an Op-Ed for the International Herald Tribune about a different era that we have moved into in the internet age. The point that he was making was essentially that, in the internet age, the ability to transmit information and to spread awareness, like what we are doing, hopefully with this conversation and ones like it, is transforming the world. It is politicizing populations in a way that had never really been experienced before.

So, millions and millions of people are becoming more politically aware and engaged, which he saw as a problem, obviously, because now we have many more people trying to take up a slice of this pie that was previously the realm of the Trilaterals and a very select few. So, how do we deal with this problem? And, he made the interesting point that it used to be easier to control a million people than to kill a million people, but that calculus might be flipping. It might be easier to kill a million people than to control a million people. Please look this up. He really did talk about this and there’s recordings of it. It’s a chilling statement for someone like Zbigniew Brzezinski who has been in and around the corridors of power for decades. He is recently deceased, but who was a very high up member of the cabal that has been steering this and the technocratic mindset. To talk so blithely about, “Well, yes, we may have reached a point where it might be easier to kill a billion people than to

control them.”

And, what does that mean for our position in all of this as we approach this era where we are starting to make very important decisions about how we move forward with this technology. The technology that might be the literal technology of our own enslavement and, potentially, our own destruction. Some pretty important choices we are making, I hope you will grant. So, again, I think if there is a positive message from this, it is once again – again what is it that these technocrats and these micromanagers, would-be micromanagers, to society fear? It is an aware and engaged population. This is what they spend their time thinking about, “Uh oh! More people are becoming politically active and aware and engaged. And they are talking to each other through this technology. Hum, this might be a problem. How do we control this problem?”

Well it is a problem for them because we can make a difference and what we choose to do, what we choose to buy or not to buy, who we choose to interact with, what ideas we take on board, what we do, the way we act in the world does make a difference. And these people at the very top are not all-seeing gods that can manipulate reality in whatever way they wish. They too have to influence the public to go along with it. Essentially to accept their own enslavement and, perhaps, their own destruction. Well, let's not accept that. And, if we do start digging in our heels, we can make a difference on these issues.

Josh: Well said. I would add to that list, an action that I am seeing, that we as an organization are seeing as a very powerful and prominent step for us to take is a blanket awareness campaign onto and toward our elected officials, because they are getting lobbied by industry. The wireless industry and the energy/utility industry are two of the three biggest industries on the planet and they are not made aware by enough people so far. But that's starting to change now. So, that's what this summit is really helping to facilitate. The actions to our elected reps to not only inform them and say, “Look we are all in this together.” Nobody gets a get out of jail free card on this. That's why we are seeing a lot of local governments really start to begin to sue the FCC, begin to pass legislation. In other countries, this is going very strongly as well.

Jumping in, James, we need to wrap up in a few minutes but I have three questions, and if we can do these each in a couple of minutes, it would be great. Touching in on the Chinese social credit system, already, speaking of control and surveillance. What can you tell us as far as what's going on in China and is that same controlling system, the ground work, being laid in the United States and other countries and, if so, what is it's relation to 5G?

James: Right. So, for people who are unaware, in China right now, they

are starting to roll out, and it already exists in some form and is being used, basically a system of control that is not over boots in your face control. It is a point system where you can earn points, social credit points, if you do things that the government approves of and you will be docked points if you do things that the government does not like. It sounds rather innocuous, "Well it is just social credit points. I mean it's not like they are putting you in jail or anything. It could be worse." Well, actually it is even more insidious than actually being physically enslaved because at that point, people tend to revolt.

But when it is a system of control that is based on rewarding this behavior and punishing that behavior in a nebulous way that people can't necessarily connect to their lives. It can be brought in as an exceptionally impactful way of controlling a society as large as China with over a billion people. How do you corral all of those cats? Well, if you have something like a social credit score. So now people are literally being banned, for example, from flying or taking high speed trains and other infrastructure because they are deemed a risk because their credit score is too low.

It is interesting to see the mainstream media reaction to this and portraying it from the Western perspective, "Oh, look at what those evil Chinese are doing!" But, obviously, there are aspects of this that are coming in at home, not only actual literal ones like in Canada right now there are things like the "Carrot app". It's rewarding people for taking a jog or getting your vaccines or doing other things that the government tells you is as good as fresh air. It is so good for you. You have to do it and we'll give you some points. So, that is already starting to come in but, even in less obvious ways or at least less score-based ways.

For example, I mean with the recent waves of social media censorship of various sorts. Banning people for having political wrong-think or saying the wrong words is a form of controlling people's behavior through technology and that is one of the key aims, I think, of the technocratic – I shouldn't use term elite – the technocrats is they want to control people through the technology. Control their behavior so that they don't even have to predict what you are going to do. Essentially, they are going to shape what you are going to do by giving you certain choices and making you choose the easy path rather than the hard path.

Josh: Can you talk about if the climate change and the environmental movement has been hijacked by corporate interests and a Hegelian dialectic?

James: They certainly have. And that's a very big story and one that I tell in a couple of documentaries called "How and Why Big Oil Conquered the World" available for free at corbette-report.com/bigoil. So, please, take a look at that. But essentially, the answer is yes. The environmental

movement was not just hijacked. In many ways it was really, if not founded, at least brought into existence in the way that we know it by literal card-carrying Eugenacists, people like Julian Huxley, brother of Aldous Huxley who wrote *Brave New World* who was the director of UNESCO, the founder of UNESCO who was also a card-carrying Eugenacist.

Eugenics is an exceptionally important part of this story and it gives another mindset into this technocratic class of people that are pushing 5G and these other technologies. Essentially, the idea that their genes are just so much better that they deserve to rule over everyone else which is a type of scientific gloss on the old divine right of kings and other justifications for elite rule. Well now in the scientific age, oh it's your genes. This is a late 19th century pseudoscience. It's quackery but it was very, very popular among very rich people for obvious reasons. Oh yes, we do deserve to rule over everyone. Unfortunately, that mindset never left the elite class. Again, I shouldn't use that term, the people who have money and power, it never left them. But it did get sullied by things like the Nazis and World War II and what have you. So, they can't use the term Eugenics anymore.

It became about overpopulation. "There's too many people. Too many poor people. Too many poor, brown people. We need to kind of get rid of that and have more of the good kind of people breeding." So, they have kind of just changed the mask. Then, with the rise of environmental awareness and the ecology in the 1960s, *Silent Spring* Rachel Carson and things like that. Essentially that movement was taken over by these very same people, again for the same purpose of trying to direct society toward the culling of the "excess" population and bringing up, raising up of the "better sort". You can see this in the founders of WWF, the World Wildlife Federation, and these other types of things.

Again, it is an interesting mix of literal oil barons and Eugenacists, often the same thing, merging to direct the environmental movement, which is now almost synonymous, it is almost 100% about carbon dioxide, interestingly enough. But, of course, because that is a choke point of economy. If you can control energy, then you essentially control the economy and, if you control the economy, you can control the direction of humanity itself. And that was something that the oil barons learned in the late 19th century by monopolizing the oil industry. We control energy, we control the world essentially. Well they are just trying to do that in a different form for the post-carbon world that we are moving into where everything will be so green and wonderful and merged with everything else in the internet of things so there can be a constant surveillance of everything going on in the economy. But it is only for good things. It's only so that we can reduce bad energy and get green energy, or something like that. It is good for you, just don't question.

Josh: Isn't it amazing that the same sort of string pullers have, for example, controlled and exerted their control over the U.S. Patent Office and other international patent agencies which, have, we now know, systematically suppressed certain technologies, more than 5000 in the U.S. Patent Office alone that are deemed to be not in the interest of national security. So, reinterpret that as corporate the corporate national – we know it is a corporation – corporate security. Isn't that interesting. Also, I would encourage everyone out there to do an internet search and look up “Al Gore, World's First Carbon Billionaire,” *New York Times*. Suffice it to say. James, are you supportive of Bitcoin and Cryptocurrency?

James: I differentiate the two because Bitcoin is a form of Crypto but Crypto is not Bitcoin. I stress this because Bitcoin and Cryptocurrency and Digital Currency and Blockchain and all of these words tend to get thrown in one basket and lumped together and I think that is part of the psychological operation to essentially make the public think that it's all the same thing so that eventually when there is Fedcoin and, “Hey, the federal government is going to give you this wallet to take. It's like this Bitcoin thing you have been hearing about, so just take this wallet and you can do all your transactions that way.” That is the nightmare of total surveillance of the economy where literally everything we will be tracked and stored in a database forever and it will be personally identifiable in your name by the central government or whoever hands you the wallet.

That is the exact opposite of the reason that Cryptocurrencies were first created and propounded which was to escape the central bank system. So, it is an interesting, like so many technologies, it's the double-edged sword and one way it cuts the population and one way it cuts the banks. Which way do you think that banks are going to try to wield that? Of course, it is going to be trying to cut the population. So, I am very wary about the ways that Bitcoin, specifically, is being steered by Blockstream, which as you will find out if you go do the research, is funded by AXA which has a Henri de Castries at the top and, “Oh where is he?” Oh, he is also on the Bilderberg Steering Committee. So, there are a some very, very shady things going on in the Crypto world right now.

I still believe that the intention behind Crypto, or at least the one many people signed onto when they first heard about Cryptocurrency and the reason why it became such a grassroots phenomenon is because it does offer AN alternative to the economy that has been built up around us. I always say AN alternative because people are always looking for THE, pardon the pun, silver bullet, as if everything has to be Crypto, or everything has to be gold, or everything has to be something or other. I say there are many options on the table, and we should use all of them because they have different use cases and different things.

So, Cryptocurrency is A thing, which I think CAN be used in the right way

like so many other technologies. It CAN be used for good. It can also be used to construct the perfect prison and I know which way they are trying to steer it right now. So, I want people to be very careful about these sorts of things and start to learn the nuance of things like what is Bitcoin? What is Cryptocurrency? What is Blockchain? What are these different terms mean and how are they being used? And start to pay attention to that because you will see some interesting things.

Josh: Anything specifically, as far as guidance for humanity on how we could do the Cryptocurrency in a way to ensure that it's in the good of people and protecting individual rights?

James: The absolute key, the bottom baseline of this is that it has to be an open permissionless network in order for it to have any meaning as a Cryptocurrency in the sense that we want. It will be pseudonymous. People should not think that this is anonymous. It is pseudonymous. Every transaction will be traceable to an address. An address is not necessarily a person though. A person may have millions of addresses, an address may be a million people. There are many different ways for this to be arranged and, again, it can be done in a way that protects your individual anonymity more or less. Again, we have to think about all of those nuances. Again, the network itself has to be open and permissionless.

What they are trying to do is create these controlled networks that are going to be essentially governed and dictated by the central banks and watched over by various institutions and they are going to sell it as, "It's the same thing." You know, don't look at what my left hand is doing, oh here you go, now here's a wallet take this. So, if we understand is this open, is this a permissionless network or is this going to be a closed Blockchain which is going to be administered by a central bank. These are important distinctions.

Unfortunately, the way Bitcoin is being steered right now, in order to solve the problem of well we don't want to settle a transaction on-chain so we will do it off-chain. How do we do that? Oh, we'll have to start a lightening network and suddenly we start to get these ideas of the essential reason why something like Bitcoin exists, which is to facilitate transactions without the need for a middleman. Well it is a little bit easier if we slip a middleman in there. Well there's a middleman so, of course, they have to have KYC, know your customer.

So, now you have to send in your blood sample and your next of kin and whatever it is in order to get an account so that you can now trade. Everything that this was supposed to be against suddenly is being embraced. And that is the thing we have to understand, when that sleight of hand happens, suddenly we don't want to be part of that system. Again, we have to look at the ways it is being used and the

types of terms that are being used because a lot of this is just meant to confuse the public.

Josh: Really good, James. It has been so good just to talk about this with you. Thank you so much for your insight and your wisdom. Just in closing, are you optimistic and, if so, what are some keys for humanity to ensure a positive future?

James: Well let me go back to a point we have made a couple of times in this conversation which is, that if our opinions and our actions didn't matter, I don't think these people would be trying to influence them so heavily. So, we do have a part to play in this, whether actively or passively. We can just sit back and let things happen as is so easy to do and then just accept whatever comes, but we know where that system is being directed, so we know where that will end up. OR we can stand up and try to do something about it. And I can't say THE something that is because there are many, many somethings that can be done about it.

It depends on the person, each individual who is listening to this conversation will have their own perspectives, their own experience, their own skills, their own talents, their own strengths, their own weaknesses. You know what it is you can do. The thing you can do could be anything, I don't know, painting a painting or whatever it is. Whatever it is that you do, there is a way that you do, there's a way that you can do that and harness that to helping to spread awareness about these issues and helping to combat the issues. Or there are ways you can do it to just go along with the system in order to succeed on the terms that the system provides.

I think we all understand when it is we are selling out and when it is we are going the right thing. I think, if we have that awareness and that consciousness, once you have this information, it is your choice what to do with it. And I am telling you, you can make a difference by standing up and being an example for others and showing other people you are not crazy for thinking there's something going on here.

At the very least, just step back. Don't participate in this thing. Don't buy into this thing. Don't jump on the band wagon. Just doing that can be an example that other people will see and that can have a ripple effect on society in ways that you might not even be able to comprehend. But do this knowing that you are making a difference and that your mind and the way that you interact with other people, and the things that you believe, the things that you buy, the things that you do, the things that you talk about, the people you talk to, all of that makes a difference.

And it is something that if you start directing your conscious attention to it, it will have an effect. And people like Zbigniew Brzezinski and others will worry about this problem of too many people starting to take back

their power. "Uh oh, what are we going to do about it?" and that is the position we want them to be in, running away instead of running toward their goal.

Josh: We talked briefly just before the start of the call about world views or consciousness or spiritual perspectives and so forth, but really it comes down to valuing the essence of life of a family of those things that matter and really taking a stand for life. Not that we are focusing on fighting something evil like this, but we are really standing for life and we're choosing – it's almost like we don't know the outcome, right, James? There is no guarantee of, if we take action, it is going to produce a specific result or success at this point. With all that is going on, there is no guarantee of a specific outcome, but it is the right thing to do, isn't it? And it is trusting in and choosing to align with a benevolent future, trusting in the benevolent force, call it God or Creator or "The Force."

It is choosing to align with that and acting accordingly, isn't it? You seem like, you have been doing that for a while now. Just speaking truth and offering it out there. Your website, I would encourage everyone to go to corbettreport.com and please consider donating via James's patron page and supporting his work because he is getting regular content out. And get on his e-mail list for sure and help his work go viral, too. So, James, thank you again so much for joining us today on this summit. Let's definitely keep in touch and we will be following your work.

James: Thank you so much.

Addicted Society: Tech Addiction and 5G

Guest: David Greenfield

Josh: Joining us on the summit today is technology addiction expert, Dr. David Greenfield. David, welcome and thanks for joining us today.

Dr. Greenfield: You're very welcome. Nice to be here.

Josh: Now you are, obviously, a technology addiction expert. You have been doing this for decades and your work is just taking off now, tell us about it.

Dr. Greenfield: Yeah. I mean I have been at it since the mid to late 1990s, so this has been not a new thing for me in terms of looking at how the internet is addictive. My background is in addiction medicine, so I was an addiction medicine doctor for many, many years. Then in the late 90s I started to do some research and work with internet addiction. Then, this was back when we only had dial-up and we didn't have smart phones or Wi-Fi or laptops or tablets, so it was a whole different time. But even then, we saw that the technology was potentially addictive and really people had a hard time turning it off. Obviously, that has changed drastically because of the ease of access and the speed of the internet and the overall availability of it.

Josh: You were just telling me before the call, you just got in on a redeye last night. You're on many, many media shows. This issue is blowing up and you're obviously a pioneer in that. What are some of the avenues that you're reaching?

Dr. Greenfield: That's a good thing and a bad thing. It's also reminding

me of how much older I am than everybody else because I have been, as I said, since the mid to late 90s. Yeah, what's happened is it has reached a bit of a tipping point. Obviously, with the incredible increase in speed and access to technology and the untethered portability that we have with smart phones, particularly, which are really the dominant or have become the dominant internet access portal, it's really just moved it into a new level where the average person is having a hard time managing their tech use, let alone people who might be diagnosable from the psychiatric perspective as having a real addiction. That's a relatively small number compared to the majority of us who are overusing our technology simply in the course of our daily lives.

So, there are sort of two groups. There are people who are really having clinical problems to the point where their lives are unmanageable. And then there's the rest of us who are probably overusing it to a point that, although our lives are not unmanageable, they could probably be a lot healthier and happier with less time on these devices.

Josh: Yeah, exactly. Well thanks for that overview. I am just going to share with our audience a little bit more about your background and then we will dive in further. You are the founder and medical director of the Center for Internet and Technology Addiction and assistance clinical professor of psychiatry at the University of Connecticut School of Medicine. You have authored *Virtual Addiction* which was a work in 1999 that rang the bell, the warning bell about this whole issue. You lecture throughout the world. Recent work focused on the neurology biology and psychopharmacology of compulsive internet, smart phone, and technology use and distracted driving.

It is interesting. I have seen, over the past few years, people just have a common knowledge about how pervasive smart phone and technology addiction is. I mean some of these videos—I remember seeing, like three or four years ago, this video on YouTube called “Look Up.” And it was showing about how we are missing life. Two different timelines and one is you are down in your cell phone like this and you miss the person that's walking by that you are supposed to meet. That video had 50 million views or something. There have been several since. Simon Sinek has talked about it in a very powerful way, too.

Dr. Greenfield: The thing about technology, all screen technology, that's internet interphase is that it eats time. You can't do it without your eyes being glued to it. So, anything that requires your eyes and your attention and your focus to be elsewhere, meaning real time living, life, it requires you to not be looking at the screen. So to the extent that you want to have a balanced life and look outside and see a beautiful tree that is blooming, you can't be looking at your screen. It is really either/or. You can't bilocate. This idea that you can be in two worlds. You can participate in the world or in real-time relationships or have intimacy

or experience nature or participate in your work or your academics or your love in your life. You can't do that while you are on your phone or on your laptop or tablet. It's not possible. So, you have to make a choice. Technology gives the illusion that you don't have to make a choice, that you can have it all. You can be on these devices and still experience life to the fullest. That's just not true.

Josh: Yeah. Well said. I was just going to ask that. It seems like there is a choice point. That eventually we as a society and, more importantly, we as individuals have to make.

Dr. Greenfield: Yeah, and that choice really comes down to every time you pick up your phone or every time you go on a tablet. At that moment, you have to say do I need this right now or is this where I want to be? Is this where I want to spend my time? Not to get too maudlin, but the idea is, if you have a limited amount of time on this planet, which we all do. We all have 24 hours in a day. Nobody gets more. And we all have a limited amount of time in our lifespan, although we don't know how much. The truth is, how much of it do you want to have spent on devices?

Right now, we are spending 4-6 years, depending on who we are, on our devices if you add it up. So, the question is, at the end of your life, do you want to have spent 5, 10, 15, 20 years of your waking lives on a device? And what do you get for it? At what point do you determine whether it's, what I call, nutritive. Is it providing you any nutritive value beyond the distraction, beyond the minimization of boredom, which we are deathly afraid of. We are incredibly uncomfortable with being bored for a few minutes or having a moment of nothingness, which by the way -- from which comes everything.

Josh: Good point. Yeah. So, focusing on 5G and the internet of things. You mentioned several years of our lives are going into screens. At this current level of technology, but with 5G and the internet of things, what are your concerns as it regards technology addiction?

Dr. Greenfield: What I will tell you from an addiction medicine perspective is that the faster a substance or behavior get incorporated into the nervous system, whether it is the internet or a drug or gambling or food for that matter as well, the faster that substance enters the nervous system or that behavior is engaged in and then you have a subsequent experience of pleasure or elevation of dopamine which is normal -- and the internet elevates dopamine, just like many other substances and behaviors. The shorter the lag between the click of that button or the swipe of your hand on that pad and then the appearance of the content that you're searching for, the more addictive that substance or behavior, in this case the internet, will be.

So, if your phone is almost instantaneous, it is going to become that much more addictive. So, my prediction would be, based on what I have seen over the last 20 years, is that as we increase speeds of internet access to 5G, especially on portablized devices, we are going to see even more issues with people being unable to put them down and feeling like they are addicted or tethered to their devices.

Josh: So, do you see it going in a potentially dystopian future like the *Matrix* or is it not--?

Dr. Greenfield: I love the *Matrix*. I love the movie anyway. The thing about dystopian writing is it is all based on a potential kernel of possibility. I mean obviously we hope that it won't occur in the way the *Matrix* turned out, but I certainly think that, if we look at our lifestyle and our behaviors and how we use our machines and our devices now, it sure looks a lot more like science-fiction did now than it did 25, 30, 40, 50 years ago. So, we are looking a lot more screen-based and lot more distracted and a lot more controlled by our devices than we ever have.

Now will it get to a point where we are tethered into our devices and we no longer talk to each other? I don't know. I think dystopian concepts are basically designed to be wake-up calls for us and to determine whether we are going in the direction that we ultimately want to go. And, hey, we might want to think this thing through a little bit. I mean really that's what we are saying. Can we think this thing through and is this really a choice point that we want to make? It is not so much about predicting the future because nobody can predict the future.

Josh: Yeah. OK, so for the common viewer who doesn't sort of struggle with a clinically diagnosable technology addiction, most of us, how significant is this issue still for us? Because I --

Dr. Greenfield: I would dare say, although the research on this is unclear, because nobody has really studied normal people. We tend to study people who are having a problem, so I would dare say that 80% of average users will admit that, at times, they overuse their devices and they would self-describe as an addiction. That doesn't mean that they meet the criteria medically for an addiction, but they would say, "I am really addicted to this." I mean you hear that every day.

I was talking to somebody from one of our medical facilities out in California this week and she was asking me about my work. What she was asking about wasn't so much what I was doing medically. She was concerned about herself. She was concerned about how much she was using it and whether she should be looking at using it less. So, I think most of us, certainly in the 80% range, give or take, are probably overusing our devices. And, if you look at our screen use, most phones will record our screen use, depending on the age of the phone. It is not

unusual to have between 2 and 6 hours a day on these little screens. I guess the question is, where do you want to spend that 2 to 6 hours?

Josh: Right. Can you talk about, because I notice – I have a smart phone. Most of the time it is in either airplane or wired when I am in my home office. But I notice that, when I go to my phone in my morning to check messages, to use it, or to even just go on e-mail on my computer, when I do that before I consciously start my day, my day doesn't turn out typically as well. Can you talk about that? Like is this technology making us more kind of docile and passive? Are we being less awake and alive simply by not starting our day consciously?

Dr. Greenfield: Well, the use of technology and screens is a passive use. You are not really facilitating your experience and you're not interfacing with your experience. You are a passive consumer of your experience. I don't know about what you just said about whether I have a better day if I didn't look at it. I will tell you that, when I look at it in the morning, it sucks me in, so it takes me another 10-15 minutes to get moving in the morning because I am looking at the newsfeed and I am looking at what's going on in the world and I don't know that that's a good use of my time. So, whether it ultimately affects the quality of my day or not. I don't know. I can't speak to that. But I will tell you it sucks you in. Again, it comes down to choice. Since you have a limited amount of time, I like the idea of giving yourself a dose of when you have it and how much you are going to use it, just so you don't end up wasting an excessive amount of time. Then there are neurological factors because, if you dosed yourself with too much pleasure, due to the use of the internet, your ability to experience pleasure from real-time activities actually drops.

Josh: That's a really important point, I think.

Dr. Greenfield: That's a neurological thing. This isn't psychological. This is, if you dosed yourself up with dopamine hits all throughout the day from your screen you develop what's called reward deficiency, reward deficiency syndrome, which is this idea that you have actually saturated yourself dopaminergically and you cannot sort of get those natural experiences of dopamine that would occur under normal circumstances because you have been dosing yourself up externally with dopamine. You end of down regulating your normal level of dopamine, your normal pleasure levels.

You see this all the time, that people, literally, if they don't have their screen in front of them, they don't know what to do. They don't know how to just sit. I dare say, if you are in any situation where you are waiting for something or you are in a waiting room or at an airport or in a waiting room or in a restaurant. There is virtually nobody that doesn't have their phone open. Now that's only been around for 10 years, so what did we do before that, when we were in those circumstances? I

assume we sat there. Maybe we read a book but, for the most part, they just sat and thought. They thought thoughts. They had creative impulses. They might have even talked to somebody real-time. They might have actually conversed with their neighbor. They might have started a conversation.

So, I was in a café in Palm Springs and there was a fellow having a cup of coffee next to me and we started a conversation. Now neither of us had our phones out. I am sure if one of us had our phone out, neither of us would be talking. Because the phone conveys to the world and everybody in it that you are not open for business.

Josh: Wow, good point. What's the link, if there is a link, can you talk about between technology speed or internet connection speed and addictive quality?

Dr. Greenfield: Well, I kind of alluded to that before. The speed is what allows the internet to get into your blood stream or really into your nervous system. The faster the speed, the closer or the shorter the lag between the click and the input that you get into your brain from whatever content you are looking at, the shorter that speed, or rather the faster that speed or shorter the lag, the more addictive that is. This is why crack cocaine is more addictive than injected or snorted cocaine.

Josh: Because it's instant?

Dr. Greenfield: Because it is instant. Anything that's really quick is going to be more addictive than something that has a little bit of a lag. So, when the internet, 20 years ago, when I started doing my work was on dial-up and it took three minutes for a photo to scan onto your screen. We didn't see record levels of addiction because it took too long, although we did see some. So, now that you have a phone and all you have to do is go like this [swipes his hand] and you see it, and that's at 4G, my theory would be that we are going to see higher levels of addiction and higher levels of overuse and abuse because of the faster speed. Now, I don't think that is going to stop 5G from coming. I think, as soon as they get the bugs out of it, it's going to be rolled out like crazy.

Josh: What we intend to do, obviously, in the summit is to counterbalance that with a conscious discretion so, again, thank you for being part of this.

Dr. Greenfield: I don't mean to be pessimistic, but I just think there is a lot of money behind technology, so the motivation is to roll it out because, when it comes to technology, necessity isn't the rule, convenience is.

Josh: Yeah, that's what being sold, obviously, is the convenience factor.

Downloading a movie in 6 seconds.

Dr. Greenfield: Right. So, the question is – that’s true, you will be able to do that. The question is, is that a good thing? This is the same debate we have had about many advances in technology. Just because we CAN do it does that mean we SHOULD do it.

Josh: So, you mentioned the kind of instantaneous reward/dopamine factors in an ever-faster network.

Dr. Greenfield: [Inaudible] because your nervous system associates that click with a dopamine surge so the faster you do it the more potentially addictive it will become.

Josh: [Are] there any other points to be aware of in terms of potential negative consequences of going faster and faster in addition to that instant reward type system?

Dr. Greenfield: Not the faster and faster, it is just the amount of use because the faster it is, the more appealing it will be which theoretically will increase the number of people that are overusing it and abusing it. It is also highly distractible which brings us into the issue of doing it while you drive. So, it gives the illusion that you can do something fast. So, if you are in your car and you pick up your phone, you can say, “Well, let me just send this social media update really quickly.” Now with 5G, I can do it even faster, but the truth it only takes a fraction of a second to get into an accident. So, unless you can move your fingers at the speed of light and pick up your device and put it down within .3 seconds or .5 seconds, you are still going to be susceptible to have an accident. So, again, my concern is it will give the illusion you can do it quicker but the truth is that—we already have record levels of people being killed due to distracted driving and now you are more likely to die in a distracted driving accident or at the hands of somebody else who is driving distracted than you are from alcohol related issues.

Josh: Wow! Do you have any more stats on that because I know that is just huge?

Dr. Greenfield: If you are using device, there is a seven-fold increase in the likelihood you are going to have an accident while driving. There’s over 1,600,000 incidents and accidents regarding distracted driving per year. We’re talking about a lot of – the phone in the car is basically Russian Roulette. Most of us do it by the way.

We did a study a number of years ago with AT&T and we asked people, quite frankly – we surveyed 1000 people across the states looking at all demographics and ages -- and 80% of us admit to doing it while we are driving. It is not just the other people, it’s you and I, it’s everybody does

it. It is not unique to an age group. It is not just limited to people who are under 21. Lots of people will use their devices while they drive.

Josh: So, a bit of a curve ball here, David. What can you tell us, if anything, about the potential physical addiction from the frequencies and the wireless waves themselves?

Dr. Greenfield: Well, before I talk about the frequency and the wireless waves, which, again, I am not an expert on, I can tell you that one of the things we do see with smart phones is that it elevates cortisol which is a stress hormone. So, what happens when we elevate cortisol—and, by the way, that's if you see the phone. You don't even have to touch it or have it to your ear—if you see your phone, you are going to establish, there will be an adrenal release of cortisol which, again, is a stress hormone.

And the negative of that is, of course, you are putting your body into a stress response, but the natural response to a stress response is to pick up the phone and check it. Actually, when you check it, you get a little decrease in that cortisol level. So, you end up with a yo-yo experience throughout the day of elevation of cortisol, check it and elevating it again, over and over and over again. That is one of the reasons we feel compelled to never put it down because, as soon as we do, our cortisol level raises and then we have to check it again to reduce it.

In terms of the frequencies, again I'm not an expert on the addiction of particular RF frequencies. I mean I do know about RF energy and I do understand that it is a form of electromagnetic radiation, but I don't know about whether and how one becomes addicted to a specific frequency of radiation.

Josh: OK. Are smart phone and these technologies, with so much money and focus and design and development and marketing, sales driving the intention, are they created to be addicted by design?

Dr. Greenfield: I think when the invention of the cell phone was developed, I don't think anybody in a million years thought that it would become addictive. I think they were inventing something really cool and really neat which is in many times the case. I think as the modern version of the smart phone, which is really 10 years old that Apple really kind of pioneered. I think they knew relatively quickly that it had an addictive potential, but I don't think until about 2010 or 12 did we have an inkling based on the data that it was really becoming seriously addictive. I think that is a fairly new phenomena, well under 10 years, that we have the data that looks at people's behavior with regard to smartphone use.

Then, do I think they capitalized on that, not just the phone

manufacturers but the service providers and the browser companies and all the people that stood to benefit from having our eyes onscreen, absolutely! I think that they knew that it was addictive. I think that's shifting again now in the positive direction because I think there has been substantial pressure by consumer groups, by consumers, and now the government. And now there is enough data to say, "Hey, not so fast. This is problem." And you can't just keep spreading this technology out and not addressing the implications and side effects of it. I think that's changing. I think we are at a new point in society right now where there's going to be greater accountability with these tech companies and that's really happening.

Josh: Yeah. I want to briefly talk about some specific websites or applications. Let's use Facebook as an example. There's been a lot of, obviously, controversy but --

Dr. Greenfield: Facebook is designed to be addictive. It was, pretty much from the beginning.

Josh: OK. Didn't one of the original founders is even saying the dangers of Facebook now?

Dr. Greenfield: Yes, he is. I've seen his videos and some of his lectures. I mean, yeah, basically Facebook was the inventor of the social validation loop. So, they were very clever. What they did was they found that, in fact, people get validation from posting and having comments and likes received on what they post. So, really the idea behind Facebook, although initially it was supposed to be social, it is really a business platform. And the design and the way that business works is to keep your eyes on the screen. And the way to keep your eyes on the screen is not through the stuff you're selling or offering or marketing but through these social validation loops which is, if I post something and somebody comments on it, it is going to more likely that you're going to go on it and check it again.

But they are really clever. What they do is they dole out the likes and comments on a variable reinforcement schedule which is very resistant to extinction which is another way of saying addictive. So, the likes don't come in on a one to one basis. So, if you post something, a picture of yourself that everybody likes or a comment that everybody likes, you won't get all those likes all at once, even if they are all registered within a short period of time.

What they do is they dole them out in a variable unpredictable format which keeps you going on and checking over and over again and then you are more likely to then post again because you are elevating dopamine every time you are getting one of these little hits or one of these little likes or comments. So, Facebook was and is designed

to be addictive. I think, again, they are also under pressure now, because everybody kind of knows this and they are going to be held to a higher standard. I think the days of the technology companies kind of producing technology that is inherently addictive without any consequence are over.

The latest, of course, is the videogame industry which stands to benefit tremendously from higher access speeds because a lot of games are now played on these portable untethered devices. And the WHO, two Saturdays ago just did its final vote on classifying videogame addiction as an official psychiatric disorder and, needless to say, the videogame industry is responding very aggressively, and their lobbying organization is not happy about it. Because they don't want limits to be put on people's use. And they feel like if people feel like it is addictive, that may impact their unfettered use.

Josh: Let's talk about that, go into that a little bit more here. With 5G, one of the other ways it's being sold is like VR applications. So, we know that the science is very much putting bright red flags on having a wireless and millimeter wave device that close to your eyes, but from a tech addiction standpoint, how concerned are you about sort of augmented reality, VR and overlaying the digital experience versus/on top of the real world experience?

Dr. Greenfield: Well, I am not a big fan of enhanced or virtual experiences being the primary way that we experience our world. I do think there are applications for it. I would be lying to you if I said that aren't any positive applications for VR technology. On the same token, it's a little concerning to me that we're going to be pushing that technology out without really knowing all the dangers. My biggest danger is that it is going to be overly addictive and overly compelling and that people are just going to use it too much and create that imbalance that I see a lot.

In terms of having it so close to your face because of the RF energy, again, I don't know that science well enough to speak about it intelligently, but I know that there are people who do. I mean I'm a ham operator by license, so I know enough about RF technology and RF energy to know that radio frequency energy creates changes in tissue, not the least of which is it's mutagenic and it heats the tissue as well. I know enough that you don't touch an antenna of something transmitting with your fingers because you can burn yourself but also you can create mutagenic effects, but, again, I don't know enough about it.

Josh: Yeah, OK, thanks for that. We can't be an expert in everything. Can I send you a link? Can I send you a link after the call that will--?

Dr. Greenfield: Although I'm afraid to read it.

Josh: I appreciate your honesty. One more question about videogames before we get into solutions for ourselves and our kids. There is kind of debate, I guess. The videogame industry, for example, doesn't want people to have the belief that kids, teenagers, grown men and women playing first person shooter games produces a negative effect in real life for more aggressive tendencies. What's your perspective on this sort of craze and rapid increase in first person shooter videogames?

Dr. Greenfield: It is very concerning to me. Obviously, we treat a lot people who have issues with first-person shooter games. You have to understand the history of first-person shooter. They were developed by the army. Originally, the purpose of first-person shooter games were to help soldiers or potential soldiers to desensitize to the act of carrying a gun and shooting people. They were extremely effective. They do really work well. They were actually put on the army's website as sort of a recruitment tool and they found that kids were using them so excessively, the game developers started to produce them as stand alone games because of the pleasure that people were experiencing from shooting.

So, there is significant amount of data on the desensitization to violence that the game causes and that data is well published. It doesn't necessarily cause violence, but it does desensitize one to the experience and viewing of violence. Ultimately, that desensitization in the culture is not necessarily what we want. Now that is in addition to the fact that they are very, very addictive and they seem to lower some empathy scores with regard to violence. I mean, if you kill people and watch their brains splatter 500 times a week, that's going to affect the way you see human beings, even though it is a graphical depiction. I will say, in defense of the games, there isn't any definitive data that says it causes violence.

Josh: What are some dangers of an extrapolated trend of decrease of empathy throughout society?

Dr. Greenfield: Well, I think we are seeing that extrapolated trend of decreased empathy in society because every other day there is a mass shooting, so you have to have pretty decreased empathy to pick up a real gun and shoot a bunch of innocent people. That's not normal behavior and there's no question that the incidents of those events has increased significantly, especially in the United States.

So, there is something going on in our culture, and I don't claim to have all the answers to this by any means, where people are feeling significantly more disenfranchised, disconnected. Another way to say it is not empathetically connected and certainly not feeling like their needs

as a human being are attended to for whatever reason. You combine all those factors together with the ease of access and availability of weapons and you have a perfect storm for disaster, which is what we are seeing. I mean it is pretty rare that you can go a week without a mass shooting at this point. That's not normal.

Josh: Exactly! Thank you.

Dr. Greenfield: That's not normal. And that's not normal for any society. Now on the other hand, if you look at the data for overall violence and safety in the world, or at least in the US, actually this extends beyond the US, we are not more unsafe today than we were 100 years ago. So, the idea that, if you go back to the good old days, that's better. That's not true. So, I'm not preaching anything to do with being a Luddite.

Technology is not the evil here. It is the way we use technology and then, overall, our social climate beyond the technology. Technology is only one part of it. So, we are not more unsafe but, interestingly, there are a number of factors that leave people feeling more unsafe and more disconnected and more disenfranchised and with less to lose. You've got to feel like there is nothing to lose to pick up a gun and walk into a room and start shooting.

Josh: Thanks. Good point. With the mass shooters, have you – I've seen some data and some studies on this that there is a significantly high proportion of the actual shooters that are gamers and/or on psychiatric medications – do you care to comment on either of those two?

Dr. Greenfield: I've seen the same studies and I would be the first to say that correlational, so we can't assume that one caused the other. It is not causative but I have seen the same data and, obviously, it is not shocking to think that anybody that would shoot up a room of innocent people who are unarmed probably has a psychiatric issue of some kind, whether it has been diagnosed or not, whether it is being actively treated or not is another story. I have also read the data on the fact that they often have an experience, a history of playing first-person shooter games. It's hard to know whether that has been a causal factor or whether it has just been a way they have actually improved their skills because the first-person shooter games are actually a good skill-builder for how to shoot.

Josh: For military, yeah.

Dr. Greenfield: Yeah, for military, and for actually anybody. I mean you learn how to shoot better. Because actually it is an analogous experience to holding a gun. Now, it is not the same and I am not saying that if you play first-person shooter games...The videogame industry is already like not happy with me. I am not saying that if you play first-

person shooter games, you are going to be more likely to go into a room and do a mass shooting. On the other hand, I don't think you can ignore the fact that having access to first person shooter games does provide data and information for people that probably should not have it.

The problem is, how do you separate those people? It is not unlike the people who did flight training that flew their planes into the World Trade Center. I mean, do you close down everybody from taking flight training because some people that are going to do it are going to fly their plane into a building. There is a fine line between how far you can go. Because then we run into the issue of, you know, do you punish people for thought crimes? Do you punish people because they think things or because they are doing things that other people have done that are violent? So, it is dangerous.

Josh: Yeah, and that is also associated with 5G. There is – certain police departments have already ruled out pre-crime sort of divisions --

Dr. Greenfield: Yeah, but I am hearing – my understanding of those pre-crime divisions, there's been a real push-back against that. People are really nervous about these pre-crime divisions and these databases that look at variables that are used to predict crime because the line between that and convicting for thought crimes is very, very small. I think, thankfully, we have a legal system that sees that risk and there is some push-back on that. Again, on the surface, it sounds really good. If you can find somebody that is going to commit a crime and you have an algorithm that predicts that crime with no error, it would be wonderful. The problem is, what about the errors? What about the people who never would have committed that crime but engaged in some of the behaviors that are consistent with that crime?

Josh: Let's talk now about solutions from your perspective, David. What can we do to protect ourselves from the harmful consequences of 5G, internet of things, and the hyperconnectivity?

Dr. Greenfield: You know what, actually the best way to protect yourself is to choose, is to choose differently. Also, there are things you can do in terms of your use like putting on headphones that separate you from the device, so they are not right up to your ear, obviously. But, beyond the medical and physiological factors, you can make different choices. You can resist the temptation of what I call processor envy, which is this idea that you have to have the newest, greatest, latest phone because you are somehow missing out on all life has to offer you if you don't have the newest version of an I-phone or an android phone. Now, of course manufactures want to promulgate this idea that latest and greatest is better. Then, of course, they publish this idea that your life will become more meaningful and more fulfilling. Nothing can be more untrue than that. The truth is, the more time you spend on your devices,

the less quality you are going to have in your life. End of story. So, make choices.

Make choices about where you spend your money and where you spend your time. You know, I have an I-phone 6, which is woefully outdated, and I can feel like, "Oh my gawd, I want the new one because the new one is going to be better." Of course, you don't know what better is if you never use it. So, you have to really take into consideration the idea that bigger, faster, newer, more is not better. We do live in a culture that more is better, and more isn't necessarily better. Better is better.

The question is, how do you make life better? What things will improve the quality of your life? I dare say, no technology, and I can say this unequivocally, will make your lives better in the sense that you will be happier and healthier. You might enjoy aspects of it more and it's wonderful to be able to stream Netflix and be able to look at six episodes of Game of Thrones at once. On the other hand, the question is, will that produce a happier, healthier human being? Probably not. So, you make choices. It is about making healthy choices, which is, by the way, the same for food and the same for everything else that we do.

Josh: Yeah. What about parents and their children? How can parents protect their children and prepare them for how technology is being used in our world?

Dr. Greenfield: Well, unfortunately parents are actually using these devices as often or overusing them almost as much as their kids and adolescents. That wasn't the case initially. Teens were really leading the way, but that's actually – those numbers have changed. So, I had a consultation yesterday for a 13-year-old videogame addict, which is not unusual anymore. And, one of the things we talked about is, if I am going to work with this kid to help this kid with his addiction, we have to work with the family to come up with new guidelines within the family about how technology is used and when it is used and how much is used because, if the parents don't set the tone by example, it's not going to work.

It's not good enough to say, "Hey, you should use this less" and then pick up your phone and when your kid says, "Why are you using it?" and you say, "Well, I'm using it for work so that's OK." That doesn't work anymore. You can't get away with that and your kids are going to call foul on that and they are not necessarily going to accommodate any healthy computing or healthy or, what I call conscious computing or sustainable technology use, in the family if everyone doesn't do it. So, whatever you do, you have to do it together if your children are underage and living at home. That would be my first recommendation.

The other is, is to have systems in place, whether be stand-alone, free-

standing apps or apps like Circle – there are other ones out on the market – that can actually monitor and manage your access to various devices and limit it. I think everyone should do that, not just your adolescent or your child, but we should all do it. So, you get a dose per day on your I-phone and you don't go over it. So, if you know you only have an hour a day to do what you got to do or an hour and half or whatever it is, you are going to think more about spending a half an hour looking at dumb news stories that are linking you to products to buy. It is about seeing your time as a limited valuable asset.

Josh: So, parents get your own relationship with their tech sorted out. Then, specifically for the kids, do you have framework or suggestions for ages and usage per day?

Dr. Greenfield: We do have some general suggestions and those suggestions have been promulgated by a variety of other medical institutions for a while. The American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Association of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, the American Society of Addiction Medicine, American Psychological Association, all of these groups have promoted ideas about what healthy tech use is. Now, they all have to be taken with some grain of salt because every situation is different.

But in general, 0-2, no tech. Your kid should not see a screen before he is 2 years old. Now I can't tell you how many times I have seen infants in carriages while mom or dad are on their phone or they're walking, and the kid has a phone in his hand that he is looking at. I see it regularly. Or a parent just walking their kid, they're carrying a kid and the kid is crying and the kid is holding a phone or they're hold a phone. I was at the airport the other day and there was a 2-year-old in the father's hands who was screaming, albeit it wasn't pleasant to listen to, but what he was doing to calm that child down was holding a phone in front of the kid's face. Now that's great. It does make the kid quiet down but it also teaches the kid through classical conditioning and operant reward that the way to soothe that mood and soothe that feeling is to look at a screen. I hate to think what that kid's going to be doing 6, 8, 10 years from now.

So, in general, use the screen not at all under 2 and then sparingly really from 2 to 6, 2 to 7. Under an hour a day of total screen consumption. Beyond 7 or 8-years-old and on up into adolescence, we don't recommend beyond two hours a day of total screen use. Now, total screen use means television too. Because the line between the internet and television is really gone because everything is streamed. So, whereas television used to be discreet thing, people are doing the same things on their devices that they are on television. So, in general, two hours a day. That's not necessarily including homework or academic performance.

And where it gets sticky is – this is where applications that monitor or limit or block are useful because it is very hard to watch your kid all the time. If your kid is saying he is doing his homework, but he is toggling to some Netflix show or Facebook, you are not going to know that. So that is why having the apps that monitor is going on are very useful. Because you can see where your child is spending his/her time. This may come as a shock: kids lie. They not only lie, but they distort how much time they are spending on their devices. You do as well.

One thing we found in our early research in the late 90s was that people distort time and space when they are on a screen. They dissociate. They experience time distortion. So, you think you are on for 10 minutes and you are really on for an hour. That's normal but it produces the ability for the screen to alter your mood and consciousness and distort time and reality. That is very compelling, and the industry loves it because it keeps your eyes on screen, but it also tells you that you have a digital drug that needs to be watched because it is so easily over consumed.

Josh: So, you mentioned, for specific apps that you recommend, you mentioned Circle. Are there any more or are there any that you can recommend?

Dr. Greenfield: Actually, there are, believe it or not, dozens of them. Qustodio is another one. There are apps—almost all cell phone manufacturers and internet service providers or cell phone service providers offer free-standing, stand-alone apps that come with your service that can be used, but sometimes the free-standing ones that you buy after market, like Circle or other ones, have more flexibility and they can do more. They can monitor more than just your phone. So, my preference is something that monitors all your screen outputs which includes the television, the laptop, the I-pad, the phone and gives you more flexibility and they are easy to use but you do have to take an hour or two to get it set up.

Josh: OK. And just for our viewers out there, we would recommend check the privacy policy of these apps too because we know digital surveillance and capitalism. We want to make sure that we're not giving our data about what we do and what our kids look up over to a third party. What do you see, David, in terms of the future of interconnectivity and is there reason for serious concern? And how can we best navigate that going forward?

Dr. Greenfield: Yeah, well without being too dystopian, I do have concern that we are connecting everything to everything else and you can't function without having the internet connected to your life. It makes me a little bit nervous in terms of the vulnerability of our lives because internet doesn't always work and doesn't always go down. And is subject to being hacked or eavesdropped on or monitored so I do

have concern about that.

I am trying not to be too paranoid, but I don't like the fact that my refrigerator is controlled by the internet. I don't like the fact that other things in my life are increasingly controlled by the internet because it makes me very dependent on something outside of myself that I don't have the ability to manage. I am not a digital engineer. I don't know how all this stuff works and how it is connected, and I don't have the ability to fix it. So, it makes me much more dependent on what another company is saying that I need to do and how to do it.

The other thing I don't like is how much time it eats because all the stuff stops working. All the stuff doesn't invariably work the way it is supposed to. And you can hook up your house to all these internet things that control all your devices, but then it doesn't work and then you have to spend 4 hours on the phone with tech support trying to figure out why your lights don't go on when you want them to. In the old days, you just flipped the switch and it went on and it worked pretty much just fine.

So, the problem with all this technology, it gives the illusion that if you do more, it's great and it's going to make your life better. I question that. I question the overall assumption that if you have more control by the internet that life is going to improve. That would mean that people should be happier today than they were before if they are hyperconnected and that's not what I see and that's not what the data shows. We are not happier being hyperconnected. Now, I don't know that the hyperconnection is causing the unhappiness, although I wonder, but certainly it doesn't make us any happier and certainly not any healthier either.

Josh: So just wrapping up here. You mentioned, near the beginning of our conversation, stillness and that's where everything comes from really, you mentioned – I think you put it in that way. You talked about what we can do to take back control and to reduce the harmful effects of overusing technology, to not use it as much. What can we focus on what we can do? Where can we put our energy then? You mentioned stillness. Do you have any tips for connecting with what's most meaningful in the light of pulling back from technology?

Dr. Greenfield: I think first is sort of being OK with nothingness. Being OK, learning to retrain yourself to be comfortable with boredom or not being busy or distracted for a moment. And when I say a moment, I mean moment. I mean I'm talking a minute. So, start small. When you are on line at the post-office, don't pull out your phone, or in doctor's waiting room or on line at an airport. Just resist the temptation to distract yourself.

And start small. I mean start with a minute, start with 2, start with 3. You are going to feel ill at ease. You are actually going to feel awkward. Then, what happens over time, is you get more comfortable sitting with nothingness. When I say nothingness, you are really not in nothingness, you have you. That's when you can start having thoughts of creativity or of connection and you are communicating to other people that you are available to be connected to or interacted with.

Now, I will warn you that, if you are the only person that doesn't have his/her phone out, at first, people are going to look at you like you are weird. Now -- which is really interesting, because when it was the other way and this was just heating up, which wasn't very long ago, and people picked their phone out, they were the outlier. Now you are going to be the outlier if you don't pick up your phone. I was in the waiting room the other day and I was the only person in that room that didn't have his phone out. And I'm not going to lie to you, I felt uncomfortable. I felt uncomfortable because I looked different and I was acting different and I wondered if people were going to be uncomfortable with the fact that I'm not looking at my screen. So, you have to kind of get past the immediate sense that you are not fitting in by disconnecting for that few minutes.

And sometimes those few minutes grow to more minutes and then sometimes then you are going to start to choose that, "You know what, when I walk my dog, I am not going to take my phone with me." I'm just going to walk my dog and focus on walking my dog and be present with myself and my environment and not be distracted. The truth is, very little of what we get through these devices that's either clicked on or pushed through to us is essential for our survival.

Josh: I was walking through the woods yesterday and this thought came to me, this intention, and it was like, "Let me be present to what is actually happening now in this moment." And I stopped walking, and I just listened, listened to the birds, listened to the wind in the trees and, you feel, even now just talking about it, like you feel an aliveness, a subtle aliveness sort of return.

Dr. Greenfield: But that requires you to put your consciousness in the moment. What I do is, when the flowers are blooming, which they just finished blooming here in the Northeast, every plant that I passed that I loved, I stopped for 5 seconds, 10 seconds. I mean that's all it takes. It doesn't take an hour. You don't have to stare at it for an hour. But then I just literally took in the value of what that plant was. I just thought about it. It wasn't that I meditated or became entranced by it. I just looked at it and took it in instead of let it be in the background. So, what we are talking about what you allow in your foreground versus what you allow in your background. Most of us are experiencing our lives, and technology helps in this, is everything being in the background.

Everything is the noise. What I'm saying is the signal should be what you want your life to be about, not the noise that's distracting you all the time.

Josh: Very good. Dr. David Greenfield, thank you so much for being with us today. Tell us about your work, your recent work, if you want to highlight it, and your website where people can learn more.

Dr. Greenfield: Sure. So, well I work in the field of internet technology addiction. I do a lot of public and professional lectures, mostly to the medical and addiction community. We run an out-patient and intensive out-patient clinic that people fly in or drive in from around the country for treatment. They also can receive treatment via video formats, as well, if they are not local and they can't get here.

We are also in the process right now, in a partnership with Odyssey Behavioral Health, to open one of the first large-scale residential program where people can come and live for a few months and reexperience life without technology. So, it would be sort of a recovery or retreat center essentially where they – and these are for people who have really become so overwhelmed with technology that their lives have become somewhat unmanageable. So, that we are hope will be opening this fall.

Then our website, which is www.virtual-addiction.com is up and running and has been in one form or another for over 20 years. We are redoing that site right now, so we hope to have the new version up shortly. That's been ongoing. And there's a lot of resources and references on there. There are a lot of resources out in the community about technology use. Common Sense Media is a great resource that we recommend a lot. And there is a lot data. The good news is, there's a much greater consciousness about the use and abuse of technology than ever before. When I started this, it was seen as a very unusual thing and now it has really become mainstream. So, all of us are starting to question our use and our overuse, so it is a good time. I do have hope that we all are moving in the right direction but sometimes we need a little nudge to get there.

Josh: Yeah, well said. If you are watching this and you found value in this conversation, as always, share the link to this talk. That's how we build awareness. That's how we're moving the needle together. So, David, thank you so much again for your time today and we appreciate your work and all of your insight.

Dr. Greenfield: Thank you very much.

5G and the War on Consciousness

Guest: Sayer Ji

Josh: Joining us on the summit today is Sayer Ji, founder and leader of GreenMedInfo.com. Sayer, welcome to the summit.

Sayer: Thanks a lot for having me, Josh.

Josh: It is amazing just to be having this conversation with you because, over the past year, we have been beginning to collaborate and this summit, as most of our viewers will know, is a collaborative effort, a partnership between you and I. It is just an honor to work with you and I'm really stoked just to be able to have this conversation and open it up to our audience today.

Sayer: Same here, Josh. You are the one who brought to my awareness just how big an issue Wi-fi is and 5G. So, after meeting you, I sort of went down a rabbit hole and come out the other side and now I am so excited to be able to share with everyone that we know what the real problems are and solutions.

Josh: Excellent. So, I am going to share with our audience a little bit about your background and then we will dive in. Sayer Ji is the founder of *Greenmedinfo.com*, the internet's leading resource on the published science for natural healing. As an author, activist, speaker, and widely recognized thought leader, Sayer helps to empower people with science-based solutions in the natural health and wellness space. He is also a reviewer at the *International Journal of Human Nutrition and Functional Medicine*, board member at the National Health Federation and steering committee member of the Global Non-GMO Foundation. That's a lot.

You're really involved in creating change here on the planet. So, with *Greenmedinfo.com* now reaching millions of people. Can you just tell us about how you got to this space and what first got you started and what your mission is with GreenMedInfo today?

Sayer: Sure, Josh. So, for me, I think what really brought me into the health activist space was sort of a lifelong awareness that, first of all my own health journey led me to experience allopathic medicine in a way that was really traumatic because I was diagnosed at six months of age with bronchial asthma. With the interventions available at the time including injecting me with adrenaline and not looking at the root cause, which, in my case was probably over vaccination early in life, as well as cow's milk in my formula.

It brought me to the point in my 20s basically where I realized, Wow, I don't need to be on these meds. I can use nutrition to heal myself. And just how, on some level, upsetting it was that no one in my two decades of struggles with health had told me or my parents, hey, there is a problem that can be solved very easily if I just had the right information. So, it was only later in life, actually when I had my first child, that I started to be faced with what a lot of new parents have to go through, which is the gauntlet of, should I abide by the conventional health recommendations, vaccination being the most, in a way, challenging decision that is faced today by parents.

So GreenMedInfo evolved out of some basic life experiences and also needing to collate the science basically what I knew in my body and my heart. My experience was true but, knowing that in this day and age, without science, peer review science for example, the powers that be will pretty much be able to drive forward their agenda without any real friction. So, that is where we are today. GreenMedInfo serves the public with information on a variety of topics but those that are most compelling are informed consent related issues which vaccines, genetic modification for example, and radiation exposure are topping the list. It is only after meeting you, though, that I was really made aware that, of all the things happening today that risk the health of our children primarily, I think that radio toxicity from ubiquitous wi-fi exposure and now the threat of 5G is really top on the list.

Josh: Wow. So, your work extends beyond even the online realm and with an involvement in grassroots activism. Can you give us some examples of things you have been involved with?

Sayer: So, for me, early on before the rise of social media, I was just basically like a lot of folks that became aware of the problems that were in front of us. So, for me again, being faced with a vaccine schedule that would require my children to receive the hepatitis B vaccine at day one which is arguably only appropriate, if that, for intravenous drug users

and those who have unprotected sex with multiple partners. No infant falls within that category. So, when I started to understand that the agenda was so blatantly non-science based and looked at the research that existed ostensibly to support the CDC's vaccination schedule, I was shocked, via the Cochrane Collaboration reviews on the topic, that there really wasn't adequate evidence to support the schedule.

So, when I went down that rabbit hole, I came out the other side, thanks to social media, with a platform that today does offer about a million-visitor access to the information that I've gathered. But it is really because of the internet, it is because of free events like this, it is because social media that we have a type of democracy that certainly wasn't available before. So, that's really what led me to create GreenMedInfo. To me, it's a grassroot platform because it is user supported. We don't accept advertising on the website. It is just people like you and I who want to have information on underreported adverse effects of common medical interventions and/or technologies like genetic modification which the nature of media presents as if it is safe.

Josh: We will talk about, a little bit later, your experience and knowledge and some of it firsthand with censorship and with propaganda. Some of the propaganda now we're seeing directly related to 5G, so we will get into that later. I also want to get into informed consent later with you. It is a very powerful topic. So, your book, *Regenerate*, really is like a world-bridging book. I mean it gets into several different key topics to really help empower people. Can you give us some keys, like a sneak peak of keys from the book?

Sayer: Yeah, well, one of the topics that I stumbled upon after many years of looking at the literature and the topic of the new biology, if you will, where you see this interface between insights from quantum physics and then the new biology, is that the body is infinitely resilient. That there is, for example, an ancient germ line within all life on the planet, in fact from vegetable, fungal, animal there's always going to be stem cells from the germ line that actually can be tracked back to 3.4 billion years ago to what they call the last universal common ancestor.

So, to me, to visualize these cells that are still constantly repairing damaged tissue within in our body, 24/7, for the rest of our life, as coming from really an infinite number of replications going back to billions of years, it shows you that we are an extremely resilient entity on a level that many of us have never been exposed to because we are all meant to believe that we are genetically defective and we need all of these external allopathic interventions and patented chemicals just to stay alive.

So, in this research project, I was shocked to find, for example, that the mitochondria within our cells have within them an electrical field

strength within the inner mitochondrial membrane of 30 million volts. Yeah, so how do we account for that substrate energy. There is so much talk of almost a Newtonian sort of biophysical description of the Krebs cycle and ATP and billiard ball like sort of geometry of what we visualize the microbiology to be.

But, when it comes to down to it, we are electromagnetic fundamentally in a way that speaks to what I think some of the key insights of quantum mechanics show, which is that there is a near infinite amount of energy, potentially information, available at any point in space time and our body's cells access that energy, which is why, if you were to try to calculate the total amount of energy within the body, it is practically infinite.

So, when you are dealing with electromagnetic technologies like wi-fi and 5G, there is a lot of evidence that's accumulated showing that radiotoxicity of our cells is a really big issue. So, when I started to go down the rabbit hole of what makes us tick fundamentally, it also brought up a lot of red flags as far as the dangers of things like, again, wi-fi and 5G technologies.

Josh: So, you mentioned 3 million volts. What's the voltage—explain that to us because, when I hear that, that's like the idea of OK, is every cell getting electrocuted all the time. Help us to contextualize that.

Sayer: It is 30 million volts is the electric field strength or potential energy--

Josh: --potential energy--

Sayer: --within a single mitochondrion. Then you have, what is it, up to 4-5000 of those per neuron, for example, and you have billions of neurons, so if you do the math, that is pretty much a near infinite amount of energy available within our bodies. So, many of us still think about the body in terms of it being this glucose-burning machine. It's like burning calories like within with a calorimeter, it is very primitive the view we hold. So, when we start going deep into a mitochondrion is then we find that, even the way that the ATP magnesium stacks helically, it looks sort of a like a cyclotron in base-similar properties which is basically a particle accelerator. The interesting thing about the body is we are just starting to scratch the surface of understanding it. But what I am understanding about the body is it's primarily electromagnetism that drives the biochemistry. So, when you are dealing with things like electromagnetic radiation from these devices, it is directly interfering with the health of ourselves.

Josh: You could say, like it's cutting the potential energy that we are able to tap into, that the mitochondria are able to tap into to express more

fully so it is dampening that expression or connection of life force itself through our mitochondria.

Sayer: Yes, or altering the electromagnetism. One of the ways it does that, when it comes to the higher frequencies that are used in 5G, those frequencies are absorbed by water. Our body is 99% water by number of molecules and, so, when you see 5G exposure, say in the skin, and you look at what you are actually finding within skin and within all biomolecules is that there is a hydration shell. There is water around the biomolecule and that radiation is being absorbed by the water. The water is actually, in the case of very basic functions like protein folding, the water is what shifts before the protein folds, so water and the connection with how these electromagnetic wave lengths are affecting the body is a big deal.

Josh: Wow, this is such a huge topic and revelation and I just see this really helping people connect the dots and going deeper on understanding causation and really how we work. Really quickly, was George Lucas trying to tell us something about mitochondria when he coined midi-chlorians and aligned it with the force?

Sayer: That's interesting. Perhaps. I never thought of it that way.

Josh: More seriously though, before we move on, there is something here that I want to get your thought on. Several scientists, well researched, such as Dr. Martin Paul who explains causation and other scientists who look at the studies about wireless and health harms, specifically DNA damage, see that, in these studies, many of them are rat studies for example, there comes a point where there's a certain amount of exposure where it can't go back to homeostasis. There's a genetic mutation. There is DNA breakage where it is beyond the point of resilience. You talk about resilience in your book. Are humans different than rats, perhaps, from your regard and do humans have an essence that makes them more resilient than we are seeing in these rat studies themselves?

Sayer: I think those are good questions. I can say that in my own investigation post Fukushima fallout on low dose radioisotope exposure, as well as looking at medical diagnostic radiation, like the type used in x-ray mammography, is that there is a phenomenon known as xenohormesis where technically small amounts of radiation can have very large effects. Now some argue that some of those effects are beneficial, that they can generate even greater resilience in an organism.

But there's the other side of which is the lower the dose of radiation, the more toxic it is to the cell in certain ways. For example, if you have a low dose radiation exposure, which is a lot of what the industry, I think, focuses on when they try to minimize the harms of radiation exposure,

you may see a lot of DNA changes. There would be minor modifications or DNA adducts or changes in the DNA structure versus major ones where the cell dies. In the case of a cell dying that's "good" because then the cell is damaged beyond repair and it is not going to go cancerous. So, low dose radiation can actually result in a higher likelihood for a cancer phenotype shift. So, in other words, it's possible that having low radiation exposure may be more carcinogenic than higher in certain instances.

The radiation risk models that are applied, therefore, to things like 5G are not really adequate because of sort of the non-linear dose responses that you can see in actual biological systems. Now whether animals, like rats, are less or more susceptible than humans. That's a question that has been debated for decades. My assumption, however, is that, when it comes to mammals, generally, that there is definitely a lot of overlap. One can't ethically construct human safety studies in the way that one would need which would require decades, actually, of exposure time to determine what the actual adverse health outcomes are.

In the meantime, if we see any indication in a cell, bacteria, animal model that there could be harm then that's what they call the precautionary principle which is not generally employed by regulators, which is if there is any evidence of risk then the manufacturer should have to do safety studies at the highest level in order to prove that that consumer product is safe before it is rolled out. So, that's one reason why, in the case of 5G, there is absolutely no justification for it to be on the market in the way that they are actually rolling it out now.

Josh: Yeah. And you mentioned long-term studies. I'll just share with you and the viewers, in a private conversation with Dr. Ronald Melnick, who designed the \$30 million NTP (National Toxicology Program) study on wireless, he told me that it is possible that the latency period, carcinogenic latency period for wireless exposure and cancer and potentially other symptoms could be up to 40 years. It is crazy that all this is being done. So, how did you first become aware of the harms and the science related to electromagnetic radiation?

Sayer: Well, actually, to speak to the anecdote is that I saw your documentary, *Take Back Your Power*, and that was my first real exposure to just how great a problem EMF exposure is. I was looking at it first through smart meters but then, of course, the topic of dirty electricity comes up. And then, even in really basic exposures to the wi-fi unit in my house, as well as smart devices brought this topic to the fore in such a way that I couldn't deny that I myself had probably been exposed in a really bad way for years. For me, it was actually your documentary that opened my eyes first to the topic.

Josh: OK, well I want to share with our audience, we will cut to a clip of

that previously unreleased footage that you and I did in person on your Apple watch, so let's look at that.

VIDEO:

Sayer: All right, Josh, so here's my iPhone watch. It was given to me and I kind of vowed that I would never use it because of my concerns about EMF. But now I am so into running that I can appreciate the metrics it provides like EO2 max, etcetera, and, of course my statement, my billing statements. I wanted to know if this gives off any EMF because if it does, then certainly I need to be aware of that and I may not use it any longer.

Josh: That's a really good question. I've actually never tested one of these but, in my right hand—OK, I have two meters here. In the right hand, I have the Cornet Electrosmog Meter. It's the older version. The newer version, it's on its way to me and it's actually--new features which are amazing. So, on the right-hand side, you see the numbers that are 0.04. See if we can put it like right on the device to see how close it is to your actual skin. Because it touches your skin, the numbers are going to be even higher than what we see on this device.

Sayer: Let me actually open the app, too, because there is a running app that I use to kind of assess my performance and, I wonder, if when it is on, it might actually make the EMF worse. Let's see, I just hit open my goal. Here we go. Sorry. Ready. Whoa, 2.8.

Josh: OK, 3.1. So, basically what that means, Sayer, in relative terms, is the Building Biology guideline for extreme concern is 1.0 on this meter.

Sayer: Oh, wow.

Josh: The FCC guidelines are not based on science. So, their standards are much higher, but the Building Biology ones which are aligned with whole body of thousands of studies are the ones you want to look at.

Sayer: See I purposely bought this thing because it didn't have cell phone capability thinking that was going to help me, but the wi-fi function is that powerful.

Josh: It is and it is hard for people just to inherently understand it without seeing it on a device like this because the wireless radiation doesn't interface with our senses.

Sayer: It's just like gamma radiation isn't something you wouldn't feel or see, smell, taste, so you just don't think about it.

Sayer: Yeah, this video was somewhat of an embarrassing example of how even someone like myself who spent arguably a decade advocating

strongly for reduction of exposure to harmful technologies didn't even realize that I was exposing myself at that level. It was only through the use of an objective diagnostic technology like the Cornet Meter, that I was able to see, WOW, this is really having a significant adverse effect. I was actually using that device in a way, thinking wi-fi was better, that wi-fi would be better than a cell phone hooked up version, so I opted out of that. It turns out that I was probably not, I was very wrong about that.

Josh: In addition to that, I remember last year, there was also a significant moment that you and I had when you came across this video testimony of Canadian journalist, Rodney Palmer, talking with the Simcoe County School Board in Ontario about wireless, the effects and even deaths, like cardiac deaths. Do you want to say a word about that and how that kind of affected you because you posted it on your site on GreenMedInfo and there was a big response to it?

Sayer: That was huge for me because I wasn't fully aware until this window where I was exposed to your work that the 2.4 GHz or 2.45 GHz ranges that they use for these Bluetooth devices and wi-fi are the same range as microwave ovens. It is what we cook flesh with and other things in those devices. When I started to make that connection – we are basically a carnal being, we have carcasses and we don't want to be cooked by these wavelengths either – I started to realize, wow, this is tragic. Do you know how many tens of thousands of schools have these wi-fi units set up and that these children that are exceptionally, exquisitely sensitive to radiotoxicity are potentially being cooked all day in their classrooms. It was outrageous to me that I was not fully aware of the issue until then. And Rodney's testimony was really deeply disturbing because it appears that there were children in this school that just dropped dead of these "anomalous" cardiac issues after they installed these powerful wi-fi stations.

VIDEO:

Rodney: *My name is Rodney Palmer. I worked as a journalist in Canada for 20 years. I was an investigative reporter for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and I was a foreign correspondent for CTV news based in India and China and the Middle East. My job on a daily basis was to determine fact from fiction, to understand who's telling the truth and who's trying to manipulate.*

When my children were both coming home from school with red faces and red ears, weak and limp and agitated, we wondered what could be causing it. We spent a year trying to zero in on allergies. We did allergy tests. We withheld foods. We introduced them. We reintroduced them. But there were no solid answers there, so we went right to the source like a journalist would. We asked the mothers if their kids were healthy and we got a consistent answer from about half of them. For 18 months they had been in and out of

doctor's offices with a range of neurological symptoms.

By coincidence it was 18 months when the school installed the wi-fi. We found out that at least four children had developed erratic tachycardia that confounded their doctors and they were wearing heart monitors to school. The older children who were a little more aware of their bodies told us they had blackouts in the certain areas of the school. One even said that he couldn't hold a pencil inside the school. These were all symptoms that occurred daily at school and disappeared on weekends and holidays.

Boy: *It feels like my head is, like there is a lot of pressure in my head and it's like pulsing like this [places hands on either side of head and pulses them in and out].*

Girl: *I've been getting a lot of headaches and it's been making me really dizzy.*

Boy: *I get really like weak and like it's hard to hold a pencil too and I can't think straight.*

Girl: *It feels like, like I can't concentrate. You feel like you're not really there. It is hard to explain.*

Rodney: *We found out that the schoolboard had installed a wireless internet system powerful enough to run 300 computers at once and they thought it was awesome. There are only 7 computers in this school using the system. The parents of the effected children offered to pay for hard wired connections so the kids could feel healthy at school again. But the Simcoe County District Schoolboard said, "No." They said the children must be exposed to wi-fi at school. Even the children who were sick and presented to the schoolboard themselves were told, "No. You may not plug your computer into the wall. You must sit all day in a seat with microwave radiation."*

Woman Reporter: *It's put it in the company of several other kinds of things like lead, as well as engine exhaust and chloroform.*

Rodney: *We wrote to the schoolboard officials, public health officials, cabinet ministers. We did all the due process that you are supposed to do, and they all responded with the same cut and pasted answer, safety code 6 says, "We're wrong. There are no health effects." Two children have dropped dead in Simcoe County schools since the wi-fi was installed. Their hearts simply stopped beating. One was named Jayden, and one was a little boy named Chase.*

Sayer: *So, that one testimony actually led me to take my children out of a conventional school and put them in a Waldorf School which is very, very against technology generally because they feel it affects the spiritual, emotional, psychic development of children adversely but, it*

was also – for me became almost like a medical necessity that they not be exposed to those wavelengths.

Josh: It is interesting how a lot of the high, higher up, the higher you go in the world of corporate technology companies, a lot of the leaders don't expose their own children to technology until a later age so they are more aware of the effects, right?

Sayer: That's exactly it and that's arguably what happens with vaccination, as well, is that many of those who are advocating publicly for full vaccine compliance are themselves doing a reduced or non-vaccine program for their own children.

Josh: So, we are seeing evidence that, within these industries, there are people in positions of leadership and, you could say, power that are waking up and realizing the harm that they are doing. A lot of your work has called out, especially the pharmaceutical industry, for its corrupt practices, hooking people onto drugs that are either not necessary or have horrendous side effects and there's better natural solutions which you're bringing to the world. Do you see evidence within the telecom industry, with regard to wireless and 5G, that there are people, engineers, executives, who are waking up and realizing the risk of 5G?

Sayer: Yeah, I think that what we are seeing in mainstream reports now are those very platforms that are funded by this trillion-dollar industry who are now waking up and making mention of the unintended adverse effects from wireless to even engineer magazines are now starting to speak up on the science or lack of science demonstrating safety.

Josh: There's one, in particular, that I will just share about on that. The EDN article from April 2019, very powerful example of an engineer who was skeptical then looked at the science, in particular three studies, that were published by an EH Trust [Environmental Health Trust] and this is what he said. He said, he concluded with his quote:

"My own conclusion is that there could very well be negative impacts from electromagnetic radiation. There is enough evidence to show how a causal link could exist:

1. *mmWave frequencies conduct to the interior of the body through the sweat glands."*

Which as studies show very strongly and which refutes the industry claim that this is staying on the surface.

2. *Bacteria and cells are affected by mmWave frequencies.*

We are talking about the microbiome. So, if it's conducted into the interior and bacteria and fundamental cells are affected including one

study actually showed how they morph from one form to another from mmWave frequencies. And

3. *DNA damage is a precursor to cancer.*

[<https://www.edn.com/electronics-blogs/5g-waves/4461840/Does-5G-pose-health-risks---part-2->]

So, this is just one example. There is like *Wired Magazine*, *Newsweek*, *Chicago Tribune*, *London Telegraph*, all of these. Like you say, I just wanted to follow that up and say, from my perspective, that's very much the case is that this is becoming a hotly debated subject, even within industry, and I think that's the reason why they don't want to do a study, right. What's your thoughts on that? Industry is just admitting, in a Senate hearing, in a Federal Senate hearing, they're not doing any studies, they don't plan to do any studies and they're just pushing it against people's consent without any science.

Sayer: Yeah, I mean in this day and age, it's like research is sort of like an excreta of industry because of publication bias where, if a study is conducted, there is an ethical obligation to publish. But a null finding or a negative finding they don't legally have to publish. So, they could do 20 or 30 studies and, if they find one study that indicates the safety or effectiveness of some intervention or technology, they will just selectively publish that one. That's unfortunately how research works. So, when you think about the sort of meme of evidence-based medicine or technology, it is really more of a political strategy than it is a reflection of the truth.

Josh: So, industry can legally do 20 or 30 studies and only release the one that is most in their favor?

Sayer: That is the one that they might have some special relationship with a peer-review journal, and they will end up publishing it, but the ones that fall flat or show harm, they won't publish.

Josh: Wow, it's no wonder that *The Lancet* editor and chief basically said you can't really trust a lot of these studies coming out these days.

Sayer: Exactly. And in the realm of activism around science and, if you look at vaccine science, which is often oxymoronic, you will find that they don't even use basic criteria such as a placebo-controlled trial for any vaccine presently in the schedule. They have never done combination vaccine studies and, yet, from the top of the top all the way to the who or CDC, the claim is that unilaterally, unequivocally vaccines are safe and effective without any reference to the research. So, you call that science by proclamation or eminence-based science not evidence-based and that's exactly what seems to be happening in the realm of 5G.

Josh: So, my understanding is that you have received, with regards to 5G satellites, you received a briefing prepared by certain researchers and people in the know with some very significant facts and truth on that. Can you share that just with us today, because a lot of that hasn't been released yet?

Sayer: Yeah, this is really big news and I'm happy to share what I have been apprised of. In fact, I was even doing further confirmation this morning and there are a bunch of meteorologists who are up in arms because the launch of these satellites, which I will describe in a minute, are actually affecting the ability for them to predict weather because around 24 GHz this is where the 5G range starts is what water vapor emits. So, when they put these satellites up, it will actually interfere with our ability to track and predict weather which could affect the lives and property and health of millions of people.

So, here's what everyone should know, because when I found out about this, I was just shocked, but they are going to be creating a global 5G satellite grid around the earth. So, it started in March 2018 when the FCC gave approval for Elon Musk Company SpaceX to launch an unprecedented 4425 satellites into low orbit around the earth. It would bring internet and 5G everywhere on the planet, so it was built as a "humanitarian" venture and eventually the satellite count will go to 12,000.

But, in order to get this operative, it is going to be less than 1000 satellites that are going to be necessary. They have already managed to get 60 up. In May 2019, SpaceX launched its first 60 Starlink satellites and they are going to carry out about 6 more launches this year, each with 60 satellites. So, actually when they reach 420, that's the number they need to begin providing global 5G service to SpaceX customers.

Josh: 420.

Sayer: Yeah.

Josh: And their plan is 12,000. Is that right?

Sayer: Yeah, 12,000. So, in fact, by 2020 is the goal to launch the 12,000 into space. And SpaceX's license from the FCC permits each satellite to emit an effective radiated power of up to 5 million watts so it is just going to be blanketing the surface of our planet with this radiation. In April 2019, Amazon announced its plan to launch its own fleet of more than 3000 5G satellites. That is going to total almost 20,000 satellites in low orbit around earth, so we know, too, that the radiation is basically going to affect every form of life on the surface of the earth because this is just going to be bathing it.

And also, the location of the satellites is in low orbit in the ionosphere which is an integral part of the global circuit that animates all living things. So, even a few hundred satellites using this bandwidth is expected to pollute the global electrical circuit with toxic, dirty electricity. So, this is basically being rolled out and it will affect every single person on the planet, as well as every living thing on the planet.

Josh: And this isn't some theory. This is like FCC has approved. They are already launching. These plans are stated publicly and openly. This is such a key aspect of – I am so glad you have received this information and you are sharing it because it needed to be included in the summit. This is such a key aspect of it. You combine this with talks that we did in the summit with like Patrick Wood of *Technocracy News* and James Corbett and others who talk about the surveillance.

The total surveillance and control aspect of the internet of things. These satellites, in addition to the terrestrial small cell sites that we hear about every few homes, they are going for total control, microwaving and surveilling and controlling everything. The power that would give them. What's your thoughts about this?

Sayer: That's the thing, Josh, is that before I met you and became aware of this threat, I was convinced that the greatest threat that I faced and my family faced and Americans faced is being potentially penetrated against our will by medical interventions like vaccination and, in some cases, things like pediatric chemotherapy are now court ordered or you can you lose your children if you don't comply. I started to think about it, "OK, why am I so upset about that prospect?" Because it is literally the state taking possession of your body, redefining it as chattel, as well as the fact that – it's a form of rape basically. It is penetrating you and your children against your consent, without informed consent because the true risks are hidden.

So, when you brought to my awareness 5G, it made it so clear that this is extremely penetrative and radiotoxic intervention, if you will, that affects our children, more than any other category, because the fast growing child, the cells are replicating more quickly. Every time there is a mitosis event the chromosomes become very susceptible to genotoxic agents so radiotoxicity being top on the list.

So, then our children are being assaulted, unfortunately, by this technology disproportionately. So, then anyone out there who has children already is pretty attuned to what that means but it is rather outrageous that this is being rolled out in this way. So, you're getting penetrated by radiotoxic wavelengths and then it is also surveillance technology because it is able to penetrate things like drywall and buildings in a way that the older technology could not, as well as it is surveilling.

Then there is the overlap with the higher gigahertz used by the active denial technology by the military. When I first heard of this, I was like is this conspiracy theory nonsense or is this actually true. Just like with the satellite grid, you look it up and it's actually true. The wavelengths they will be able to direct in a very specific beam like way will overlap with the kinds that can be weaponized and used to basically, specifically harm individuals. So, it's not a technology any of us really want to exist.

Josh: So, it is Amazon. It's OneWeb, right? And it's Elon Musk SpaceX. Those are the three leaders that your briefing identified. Is that correct?

Sayer: Yes, those are the three.

Josh: So, we need like a mass action to bring accountability to those corporations and the people that run them, yeah?

Sayer: Absolutely. In fact, that is one of the things that I love about your work is that you bring the problem into the daylight, as well as a solution because left with the information, like what do we do? It becomes like you almost don't want to know the truth. So, I'd like to ask you, what do we do?

Josh: Well, we are, as part of this, we have invested in and set up a tool for people to instantly contact our elected officials. So, by the time this releases, we hope to have other custom contacts added. So, everyone needs to do that. That's the number one thing. In addition to sharing this talk, sharing the link to this conversation, that's how we grow, that's how we reach that critical threshold and move the needle. So, everybody share this talk and share every talk you are inspired by.

In addition to that, send that e-mail to your elected officials and to other respondents and that is going to cumulate, the numbers and the power. And how that message is worded is in a very strong way. It is respectful but it is strong. It's like humanity drawing a line, right. We are coming together and drawing a line on informed consent and really, we have to uphold the Nuremburg Code which says you can't experiment on people without their consent. How important is it that we hold the line on informed consent going forward and what happens if we don't?

Sayer: Exactly. It would be one thing if they had done the safety studies and it determined there's a very known risk and, by rolling this out, you choose whether you're going to oblige or whether you're going to consent and if you do, you should be able to be compensated if there is known harm. So, that process, I think you have worked out brilliantly with smart meters. I would love to see a similar one be applied to this situation. But I think first, and foremost, is people being aware that these are not theoretical harms. I mean, the design of the 5G systems will require that, what every 5-10 homes, there is going to be a small

device that is basically going to be penetrating 24/7 your house, your body, the bodies of your children with this highly toxic radiation. It is really crazy.

Josh: Let's talk about censorship propaganda, right? You have some personal experience with this, of being censored, GreenMedInfo censored from Pinterest and being shadow banned from other platforms, as well. What are your thoughts on just the censorship drive in general? I know that books are being banned and have already been removed from Amazon, books with natural health remedies, vaccine truth. As well we are seeing the *New York Times* propaganda piece in May of 2019 on 5G trying to link 5G resistance with Russia of all things and they are getting slammed about that by critics and RT Network did an amazing job in rebutting that. What can you tell us about this realm of things, of the propaganda and the censorship that obviously is a main part of the other side's sort of agenda to ram all this through?

Sayer: Well, it's amazing to me. I was thinking about that just recently, like the *New York Times*, a lot of these mainstream online publications require now that you pay for the propaganda. They are literally making billions of dollars with requiring logins to read their propaganda so when it came to the *New York Times* piece trying to associate anti-5G activism with Russia and sympathizing, it was clear that one of their primary funders is Verizon. That kind of conflict of interest from an organization that is supposed to uphold journalistic integrity is absolutely absurd, and it is done out in the open now. No one's pretending. It is not hard to find that it's the money that's fueling the propaganda.

So, I think that that's why alternative media has become such a force and is why there is such a concerted effort now globally to censure platforms like ours. So, what we've done is we have created a hedge against de-platforming through social media through creating a newsletter list where it is sort of a direct link, as well as with this summit, our intention is to help build a larger activist community with getting people to sign up for more information on 5G and ways to take action.

But what we are finding is that even MailChimp and other email providers are directly linked with the very powers that be that would like to shut us up and shut us down. So, MailChimp is actually a CBC Foundation partner. And GlaxoSmithKline, I think they signed a contract of \$700 million with Google. So, we don't really necessarily have a way to evade the censorship when it comes to delivering e-mails to your Gmail inbox or even Google search results. So, there is definitely a challenge here for us all.

But my experience, thus far, is that people generally know what propaganda is now. They know that there are trillion-dollar industries behind all the major mainstream media outlets and that's why they

come to our site. I mean we get a million visits a month without any paid traffic. It is just organic. It is people word of mouth and that's the way this movement will continue to spread, is through word of mouth and people taking really basic actions.

Josh: Have you seen evidence of like corporate agendas actually setting up, policing organizations, thought police organizations, to try to ensure that their narrative is prevalent throughout the internet and to try to take down sites? Going beyond even censoring on social media, what can you tell us about what you have seen in that aspect?

Sayer: There has been a concerted effort for some time to associate those who question vaccine safety and the lack of safety studies with sort of like crazy anti-vaccers, all the way up to UNICEF and World Health Organization who are defining the vaccine hesitant as major global health threats who are arguably killing children throughout the world so the rhetoric has been scaling up.

So, what has been happening actually, technically after the last election and Trump got in, even though he wasn't selected, which is generally how presidents end up gaining office – he is now rather coopted, in my opinion, not that he was ever someone that would be speaking for a non-corporate interest because he's a billionaire – but the point is that after WikiLeaks released all of those DNC e-mails and Bethesda e-mails, it was clear that the mainstream media needed a hedge against the release of truth. They needed to create a fake news campaign and discredit anyone who was diverging from the sort of mainstream narrative.

So, there have been many efforts, NewsGuard is an example. I mean, they have on their board, former CIA individuals, etcetera, who are trying to create a meta layer of fact checking. PolitiFact is another example. They were funded by the Gates Foundation and now Facebook uses them to discredit anyone who posts or even reposts vaccine safety criticisms. So, ultimately, the mainstream and social medial outlets are completely coopted. I am surprised that many of us still have a voice there. So, I don't take it for granted. I am thankful that we have some presence and I am aware that, unless we build our own organic, authentic lists and platforms, there is really going to be no place for an alternative view anymore.

Josh: Yeah. It feels so aligned and true the fact that you and I and an amazing group are kind of like going in a direction, right? We are intending to create community and build a list and get organized with this action because it needs numbers and it needs commitment and needs resolve. People just drawing a line and coming together.

Sayer: Absolutely. I think that the beauty of it is we still have the

internet. We have relative freedom of information and, while we still do, we can take action together that will profoundly amplify our success. I've seen it personally, small actions, small things that I have done have amplified thanks to social media. I mean, I was just a guy with an idea and now GreenMedInfo reaches a lot of people and I have seen that happen with so many others in this movement. You don't have to be special; you just have to stand up for what's true. And every action makes a huge difference.

Josh: Thank you. We know that it's beyond any doubt that sort of the corporate, for profit model, minus – as it has been reduced in sort of humanitarian or compassion values, it has become more about the bottom line, more control, more money. That gravitates toward centralizing control and toward intentionally disempowering people. I mean that's clear. Not everyone within industries, those industries, is a bad person, but the machine just gravitates toward more and more control, more and more profit in the context of competing and everyone trying to one-up each other. So, this is happening. How far back, in your perspective, does the war on an individual's right to direct their healing go? The war on natural medicine, for example?

Sayer: I think that before the advent of pharmaceutical medicine, which, arguably, was late industrial revolution, turn of the 20th Century, that's when things really hit the fan because of being able to create proprietary patented medicines. So, for our movement, that's where things really started to take a downward turn. So, it has a lot to do with proprietariness. I think that, when it comes to individual rights, though, we still stand in a very unique time in history, just anyone can go on Instagram or create a word press blog and, if it is content that speaks the truth and people resonate with it, it can compete with multi-national corporations. It is just remarkable.

So, I think we need to stand strong in that awareness that we are actually really in one of the most empowered times in human history but not be naïve about it and recognize that, unless we really take action, it is so easy to get sucked into Netflix or addictive foods or just the culture instead of taking a stand and dedicating your time to really trying to make a difference.

But, I think you and I have talked, Josh, we can be activists all day long and, unless we are also good inside and we are also nurturing ourselves and taking care of ourselves, it is not going to necessarily matter, because if we are just shouting with anger at the monster out there, then we are no different ultimately than these poor folks, who's agenda has run amuck. They themselves just really want to find love themselves, I really do believe that. So, if we really were to go deep down into it, there is no real enemy out there. Yes, there are systems that are designed to really destroy our health unfortunately and take away our

freedom, but we still want to really prioritize human connection and give people the benefit of the doubt and just definitely stand up for yourself in a compassionate way.

Josh: I'm so glad you mention that. On the summit, I also talk with Debra Greene, our teammate and our mutual friend, and she gets into this side of things beautifully and powerfully. Yeah, you and I have talked about the burnout that can happen when we are externally focused and externally stimulated and not paying attention, like literally giving attention to what's going on inside, because that's really where the true power comes from. And then, from that place, using intention, as Debra says, and she has a series of, I think, 6 inner senses that she outlines for how we can do that. But that's really what creates lasting and effective change in the world, isn't it? Having that balance instead of going exclusively on anger or fear or panic.

Sayer: Yeah. Absolutely. I think that's going to make the greatest difference is that, if we can find a way to do this work without getting so bent out of shape that we feel we are fighting those monsters – Nietzsche said, “Be careful when you fight the monsters because you might become one yourself.” I think, that's really true.

Josh: Before seeing this sort of inner work compassionate focus and its necessity to be balanced, I was feeling the edge of that quote by Nietzsche. I think a lot of us have. It's like we are really processing fear at a deep level. We're seeing all of this awareness is coming to light. It is kind of like an existential crisis that I think a considerable number of humanity is in right now. We are having to go really, really deep. How important is it that we either dissolve or rise above the artificial divides, let's say like industry or these agendas and their pushers have created, male versus female, racial divides, left versus right, Democrat – Republican, and so forth, so how important is it that we rise above that? And what can we do to do that?

Sayer: Well, I know for myself, so much of my activism comes from like this device here, you know the little mini internet in my hand. So, I recognize that I am constantly trying to fight against the very thing I am participating in, so I think it is important for us to find ways to support the new that will supplant the old. That is why I am very interested in alternative energy and technology and consciousness and meditation and all these things. They sound kind of like New Agey but yet they're really not fundamentally. We are an amazing holographic entity and can connect to all parts of the planet from within, as well as from without, but I think that that whole thing with intention is really important.

I don't want to be bypassy either. We have a “fight”. I mean we are being attacked. There is a layer of truth there but that type of terminology is very difficult to live with it. I don't like having to constantly think

about being penetrated by radiation. I'm in the Miami area and the 5G networks are actually already up. My colleague has a phone, I think it is Sprint, and we are like, wait it says 5G on there already. Whether we want to put our heads in the sand or not, it is happening, folks, so we do need to take a stand on this because the default is you're going to be irradiated by this stuff regardless. So, it is time to stand up.

Josh: Yeah, well said. Just as we wrap up here, is there anything else you wanted to touch on, either from your book or closing thoughts for our audience?

Sayer: Well, I am a huge advocate of looking at the body as sort of a miracle of self-regeneration. So, it really, for me, has a lot to do with my daily practices of intentional movement, making sure I am consuming raw, organic food at least once a day, basically taking precaution that my health is a miracle really when I consider what I am being exposed to daily. The fact that I am feeling relatively good and alive speaks to just how resilient we are. So, that's the other side of it, is self-care and the balance of also supporting the types of agriculture and practices that will regenerate the biosphere. I think that is another way to balance out this kind of awareness and activism.

Josh: Well, Sayer Ji, my friend, my partner in this summit, it just was such a pleasure to talk with you today and to be teaming up with you to help bring this whole conversation out and help people to come into community and get empowered. I really appreciate all the different aspects of your work and how you're really explaining on a new level, even like a quantum biophysics level in your book, this empowerment. How we are electromagnetic beings, how we can tap in. The fact that you're out there and you're doing what you are doing in the world, we're teaming up, we're getting the summit out, and there are so many people that are awakening right now and receiving the information and taking action. That speaks to the faith that we want to believe in, the faith of a good outcome. The faith that essentially, like love is stronger than fear or disconnection or whatever. I want to honor you because you bring a lot of that in your life and how you've modeled it out. So, I really honor you brother and I just look forward to this journey with you and thank you so much for your time today.

Sayer: Thanks so much, Josh. It is a greater honor. You are doing incredible work. I am just proud to know you and to be part of this, so thank you for making it happen.

5G and the Spiritual Crisis of Humanity

Guest: Max Igan

Josh: With us today on the summit is researcher and dot connector; Max Igan. Max, welcome to the summit.

Max: Thanks for having me, Josh. Pleasure to come and talk to you, brother.

Josh: Yeah, really appreciate your work. You have a website called thecrowhouse.com. And you have many, many viewers on Facebook; several hundred thousand I believe, subscribers and viewers of your videos that you put out on a regular basis. So you've been educating people and helping people to kind of see the why, what we're seeing seems so -- you could say it doesn't make sense at first, like why this harmful agenda is going forward and what's behind it. Why don't you help us get to what's behind it to make sense of all these.

So we're going to dive into that today, we're going to talk about 5G. We're going to talk about the bigger picture of things and just kind of tap your research and awareness field which is quite large. So my first question is this, is Ray Broomhall -- He's part of the summit. So I have interviewed him on this summit. And he is doing some pretty revolutionary things with regard to legal actions that have resulted in hundreds of small cell sites being removed. I think more than 1000 of other sites being prevented from going on. What's your take on first of all his strategy to combat 5G small cell deployment?

Max: Yeah, I think it's a good strategy overall. I don't think the legal system is anything anyway. I mean, this is a whole nother rabbit hole

to get into. But being what it is, it's very difficult for people to have the paradigm shifted takes the step into natural law. So a lot of the people out there who are kind of asleep, they think the legal system is real. So in regard to that it's a good strategy. It's a sound strategy.

You know, a lot of people have been -- I was speaking to someone on Australian Patriot Radio yesterday, and he said, he's getting emails from people saying that they're putting small cell towers up in Perth, and these people are terrified. I said, "Well, there you go." That's all you need, is the fact that you're terrified. The fact that you're in fear, the fact that you can't live your life in quiet enjoyment, which is a breach of the Criminal Code. I mean, this is a basic tenet of being a citizen in this country. You're entitled to quiet enjoyment in your own home, in the comfort of your own home without interference from any outside sources.

So if you're living in fear because of a cell tower that's outside your house, because there's all sorts of documents like the bio initiative report, this appends the standards themselves. Australian standards, which have set the safe level for electromagnetic radiation and appends to themselves recognize that there is a danger from electromagnetic radiation and the people do suffer from electromagnetic hypersensitivity.

So they've admitted it. And they've said they stand as long as it's below this level, everything should be fine. And yet the towers, the small cell towers they're putting up there something like 16,000 towers, I'm sorry about the append standards. So they've kind of shot themselves in the foot with their own report. And without taking all of this into account, it's a good strategy. It's the sound strategy, what he's doing you know, because we are all entitled to quiet enjoyment in the comfort of our own homes and the pursuit of happiness, and that's what life's all about.

So if we're not getting that, then obviously there's a problem. So yeah, it's a sound strategy. And it's something that the man on the street can actually identify with and get involved with himself. And hopefully, that will cause some sort of a spiritual awakening in him because ultimately, this is a spiritual battle. This whole respect for authority that we've got that we believe that government can simply come and do this, and we have no choice in the map. And the children in schools are saying you know, what's the deal with the cell tower outside the school? We're not happy with our kids coming here, what are you going to do about it? And the school says, "Well, we don't like it either. But we have no choice." It's getting rid of that mentality, because you actually do have a choice, you're under assault here. And you just need to identify that fact. And it's a breach of the most basic tenet of our society.

So yeah, without taking all this into account, it is a good strategy. And

hopefully, it will motivate people. And again, it will empower them to think, "Wow, look, what I just did. I just stood up for myself, and it worked. So maybe I can stand up for myself a little bit more, we can push this whole thing back." You know, because otherwise we could do this. We don't need 5G. We don't need any of this stuff. You know, they need it for their surveillance system and for the Internet of Things. But if it's all about fast communication, we don't need 5G at all. We can do better with optic fiber. So why don't we do that?

Josh: Yeah, well said. Just to dive in a little bit more into Ray's strategy now, he explains it in that full length interview that we have with him. But could you sum it up for us? I mean, I'm still in the process of reviewing that interview and continue to wrap my head around it. But basically, it's a criminal complaint based around, you know, being put in fear by this technology, which is scientifically proven to be harmful. And then it's a process by which a certain number of people within a community, go use the medical system actually in the authority of a doctor, right?

Max: Yeah. The thing is, when you're looking at these Telco companies, they're putting out their standards. They're basing it on scientific data. Now, the scientists will say this is the level and we deem it to be safe. The scientist is not a medical doctor. If you look at things such as the bio initiative report and you look at some of the standards and you say that the level of radiation that they seem to putting out -- Basically, all you need to do is go to a doctor and say, "Well, he's to buy an initiative report." Here is the level of radiation that's coming out of these things, can you tell me whether this is safe. And there's no doctor on earth who is going to tell you that this is safe.

When doctors leave a room when you're conducting an X-ray or whatever, a CAT scan or anything; they will leave the room because there's radiation present. So all they're doing is basically saying, "Well, yes, radiation is damaging." And once you've got that, then that puts you in a state of fear because this is an assault. See, it's using the basic laws governing assault in Australia. And I'd say this is for most countries as well. Assault is classified as anything that puts you -- anything that is physical against you, anything that is psychological against you. They don't actually have to even touch you; just the threat. If I threatened that I'm going to come and shoot you, and I have the capability of doing that and you are living in fear of that, then I've just assaulted you without actually having to touch you at all. Because now you cannot live in quiet enjoyment in your home.

So if you're looking at this, if a doctor has told you that electromagnetic radiation is unsafe, then you are now under assault under the Criminal Code. So you can approach that Telco or that emitter, whoever's put the pole up and say, "Well, now I'm under assault and on need this assault

stopped. And I'll do it. I have to because that's the basic tenet of our society." So it's looking at the laws as being under assault, what it's really about, what constitutes an assault, and do we have laws to prevent assault against the person in the comfort of their own home? We do, of course we do. And if you cannot live in a state of quiet enjoyment in your home, then you're under assault. So that's basically what he's using, and he's stopped a lot of them. He's apparently stopped a lot of tales, but like I said, they're still trying to roll the system up.

I mean, the electromagnetic radiation is one thing. What they really need it for is the surveillance system, the Internet of Things, the social crediting system that they want to put over the top of everything, which they want to roll out in town. And they've already rolled it out in China, there's 23 million people on China's credit blacklist at the moment due to social credit. In China, I was talking to someone the other day. There were some tourists that went into a shop in China to buy some goods from a shop and they needed to use their cell phone for the purchase, they need to have a little code on their cell phone and get that scan to do the purchase. Without that you can't buy anything. And if you jay walk across the street, you will be docked to a social credit point and you will be fined for jaywalking as well; and that's automatically deducted from your bank account.

Josh: Where is this?

Max: In China. You don't even get a notice. You'll get a little text saying you've just been fined or whatever. But there's no notice that comes in and you've got three weeks to pay that. It just took it from your account straight away as soon as you jay walking, as soon as you do anything wrong. So you could you jaywalk across the street and you got 20 bucks in your account you're waiting for whatever, you need your paycheck to come in. You cross the street to go buy something, you jay walk to get there and by the time you get to the store, you don't have the 20 bucks in your card anymore because you've been fined for crossing the street the wrong way. You know, so this is what it's getting to. And they need the Wi Fi and the 5G to run all that. So it's not about fast communication. It was just about fast communication like I said we'll be using optic fiber. You can download movies a lot faster with optic fiber than you can with any type of Wi Fi.

You know 5G is military grade technology and it's about the surveillance state. That's what this whole thing is about. And that's why they're pushing for 5G so much, and the health risks although are just through the roof. There's another site that Ray Broomhall is recommending which is -- the site is called Physicians for Safe Technology and the website is mdsafetech.org. And that's it a good site, it's got about 200 doctors there who have written their testimonials on the fact that EMF is bad, you know, electromagnetic radiation is bad. So if you can't find a

doctor to sign a form for you, you've got all the stuff on that site. There's 200 doctors there and have already made statements, public statements and signed their name to them that this stuff is bad.

So this guy's strategy is pretty good, is good for the average person in most countries to be able to use this because all the medical information is there. And really when you're dealing with electromagnetic radiation, it doesn't matter if the Telco has got a scientist telling you that it's safe. Scientists don't deal with the human body, they deal with other stuff. So if a medical doctor comes along and says, "Well, hang on. All this stuff the scientists said about all the emissions and all this sort of stuff, according to my understanding, this is all quite dangerous."

I mean, this is what we're talking about. We're talking about physical bodies, we're talking about us. So a medical doctor's opinion far overrides the scientist's opinion. And this is what Ray is using. And he's been quite successful with it. So yeah, I mean anything -- just throw a spanner in the works, this is what we have to do because this is about turning the entire world into a surveillance state. And all the governments working together, Josh, that's really what 5G is all about.

And apart from that, it's a weapons system. Underneath the whole thing, it's a weapon system. You know, any type of military electromagnetic warfare that you've ever heard of, these all using 5G as the carrier wave. You know, maybe you might think this is good for communication now, but what about 10 years down the track, who's going to be in power then?

And all they have to do is change the frequency, change the voltage to these towers, and they can turn it into an active denial system like to cordon off areas. They can even target people because the waves can be directed. That's the thing with 5G, it's millimeter waves and they direct beams to people. So you know, you can target people with this stuff. It's very, very dangerous technology. It's very insidious, and is a whole nother level to what people are looking at.

Josh: Yeah. That's a lot, obviously. But it's all there, all the dots connect. So just to dive in, you mentioned the social credit system in China. And my conversation with James Corbett, James talks about that as well. What do you say, Max, to sort of the, let's say the Trump supporters who are being told to trust the plan, and being told that Trump's 5G is going to somehow be safer. And somehow we're going to get it in American hands to avoid what China is doing, for example, with this social crediting system. What do you say to that paradigm?

Max: It's a joke. I mean, five has to rise superior to intelligence for sane person to believe it honestly, it's the same thing. This whole 5G system is about the IoT, it's about surveillance on every level. You know, this 5G

system, your cell phone, what these things do together. You know with the 5G system, they can look at your sweat glands, they can tell whether you're even a little bit nervous in their company. Your cell phone tracks you everywhere you go. Your cell phone has got a barometer in it, so it knows when you get in and out of a car, knows when you go up and down stairs. It can conceivably track you from every store you go into, from A to B, everybody you talk to you, everything you do.

And so the police are going to be asking for your cell phone not your license when they pull you over. And your cell phone is going to contain all the data of your Facebook account or your YouTube things. Everything you've ever done is going to be there, this is bad. You know, we want to get this and put it in place before China gets hold of it. This is ridiculous. I mean, what China is doing with their social credit system is simply the legislation they put in place.

It's got nothing to do with the 5G system. It doesn't mean that all 5G's inherently evil because it all turns the whole world in social crediting. Now, this is the government that does this. And if you think your government isn't going to do it, you got rocks in your head, because of course they're going to do it to protect you from terrorism. I need to be on to track everybody, because I need to know -- and it talking about pre crime. There's a bill that just came out, was it H.R. 838. The new bill, it's called TAPS, and it's about -- I was just looking at it earlier and I close the page.

Josh: Is it the United States bill?

Max: Yeah, United States bill through Homeland Security, it's going in there now. I'll go look through my history and see if I can find it. But it's about pre crime. Basically, it's about being able to predict who's doing this. And this is what they wanted to use 5G for as well. Predict all these sorts of crimes that are happening, to predict who might do this and who might do that. It's all the same thing. It is H.R. 838. This is a US bill going through Congress. It is the Threat Assessment, Prevention and Safety Act of 2019. You're linked to it, have a look at that. This is about pre crime.

So predicting people's habits and predicting everything. So with 5G and with the social crediting system, they want to know what apps you're using, what sidewalks you're walking on, when you're using these apps what you're watching on YouTube, what you're posting on Facebook, all this sort of stuff and to deduct your social credit points accordingly. And it can profile you according to who you talk to, what videos you watch. This guy is thinking a little bit too far outside the box. We need to start watching him further. And then all I have to do is say, "Okay. Well, he's speaking out against vaccines or he's speaking against us, so we're going to have to doc his social credit points." And when it all becomes digital,

they doc you to the point that you can't spend your money. It doesn't even matter if you've got trillions of dollars in crypto currency and you run as sort of the Fiat system.

If you're still shopping digitally and it's not -- it doesn't matter about your car, it doesn't matter whether your bank account is frozen or whatever. It's you and your retinal scan and your biometric resonance, your biometric signature, which is black band. And you walk into a store, you will look certain cameras to the fact that you've crossed the virtual fence you're not allowed to go into, your purchasing power has been limited. They can lock you at your car, lock you at a house, lock you out of anything that's digital. And when that happens, what do you do? Suddenly, you just locked out of the net, you're locked out of your accounts, you're locked out of your smartphone. You've got no landline, who do you contact? What do you do?

Josh: And it sounds like these big corporations like Facebook and Google or whatever, like have customer service departments with a real human being where you can get a resolution. Anyway we've already seen that pattern established by these giant technocracy companies.

Max: Exactly. And in China, when you lose your social credit points, there's no one to appeal. There's no one to call. It just happens. It's down on credit points, you'd now deemed to be untrustworthy because you're not following government guidelines. And once you're untrustworthy, you're always untrustworthy. So this is what they can do; they can just basically start locking you out of services, deduct your social credit points to the point that you just can't move, you can't buy anything, you can't get on a bus, you can't get on a plane. You can't buy fuel for your car. You can't use the internet. You've been locked out of the system.

Suddenly you just like wandering around hoping you run into someone to say, "Hey Max, here I am. I'm locked out of the system." But by then, the police have seen you with a facial recognition glasses like they have in China. Like, "Oh, this Josh Del Sol, look at how far down he is on social credit points. We better pick him up put him to one of this." So you are just disappeared.

So the dissenters can just be squeezed like that and they'll just disappear. They'll drop off the map, and no one will even notice it happening. They'll be no media outcry. You know, just suddenly your YouTube channel will close, your Facebook channel will close, your phone number won't work anymore and people will wonder what happened to Josh. And there won't be anyone they can call about it, and you're just gone. That's the way we do social crediting.

Josh: I don't agree to that first of all. I can exercise my full sovereign intentions, not agree with that. But I understand what you're saying and

comprehend what you're saying. So you recently have had a run with YouTube, and they banned some of your videos then they reinstated you. What's going on with your YouTube channel?

Max: Yeah. I started reporting on the Christ Church shooting and I started pointing out that there were handlers there. And there was a car there that was present and I totally got on that video because I revealed the Gnosticism applied to the car, all this sort of stuff. So they put a strike, I deleted a couple of videos. They put a strike on my channel and they gave me what they said was a three month ban.

But then two weeks later, I was able to upload again. I wasn't even able to upload, I wasn't able to comment on my channel. I wasn't able to do the most basic things on my channel. And they said three months but then two weeks later they gave it back. I kind of look at that now, I think this is strategy in the way they do this. I think you know, they'll banned someone and then give them their channel back.

And I'll look "How did you he that?" He must be working for them, because he got his channel back. I think there's a little strategy in the way they think with all this sort of stuff. They gave me a severe slap on the wrist for all I've been uploading about Christ Church and it's still a strike against my channel now. And even now when I upload, I've got none of the menus work for me on YouTube. It's been like a month now and none of the menus work. I can't hit the normal upload button. I got to go through several hoops to actually access my channel.

And then I've got to go through back right into the video editor and into that before the upload menu works. And I can't get any other menus. I've got to go into other browsers and all sorts of stuff. So still sort of done some to my channel and it's still constantly deleting subscribers at the rate of probably five or 10 per hour. I'm noticing drop off the channel. They come back but it climbs up and drops back, and climbs up and drops back. It sit there between you know, these particular 10 digits like all day just climbing up and down. And people are emailing me saying, "Max, I can't subscribe to your channel. I've tried 14 times today to subscribe to the channel."

Josh: Yeah. Well, I'm shadow-banned from YouTube now. My channel is shadow- banned, it doesn't come up in any searches and stuff like that. So I guess I'm in good company. So what about this censorship? We're seeing censorship in Facebook, on Amazon with the vaccine subject area and people trying to bring truth there and they're banned on Amazon, and Facebook, even Pinterest. We're seeing propaganda, obviously deep propaganda in the 5G matter; was it in May of 2019. The New York Times, for example, run a piece on 5G, equating people who oppose 5G to being infiltrated by Russian PSYOPS or something like this. Max, what's your take on this and both the censorship and the propaganda

being deployed? Does it show a fear or weakness or what are they afraid of here?

Max: It shows fear and weakness in it. They really try everything. I mean, blaming it on Russia, that's just so classic. They blame everything on Russia. We're all being influenced by Russia so that we will have bad communication in our country and Russia will be first in the 5G rise as if it's a race. That's the thing. I'll get to race. The first to get 5G has got -- was it a race. It's not a race, it's a communication system. It's a weapon system you know, that's ridiculous.

But the censorship is through the roof, it really is. And it's the same with my videos. I mean, my videos are shadow banned. Part of it is probably because my account is not monetized, I never monetize my account. So therefore it's not in YouTube's interest to have people watch my videos because there's no ad revenue on it for them. So it kind of works for me and against me in that way.

But I've had people go to my channel, they told me that the videos don't come up even though they subscribed the bell keeps getting unclicked. And even when the bell is clicked, it doesn't come up in their feed. But they know that I uploaded a certain time every week. And if I check the channel, there'll be a new video there. And so they go and physically check the channel. But I've had people tell me when they've clicked my new video, they've copied the title and they put my name and the title and searched it, and it won't come up in the search. My wife found my video even with the title. If people download my video in mirror, they'll find it on the other channels, but they won't find it on my channel. So that's the way guys and we just kind of see it getting worse.

So we just have to form our own networks and our own connections. And if you like someone's work or you like my channel or your channel or someone's channel, make sure you go and check it physically every couple of days to see if I've uploaded new content to it, because YouTube isn't going to tell you. And I'm really surprised, I'm still on YouTube. I really am. I'm on in my mind.

So I get away with what I do. But a lot of it I think is because it's not a monetized account so they can't have ad revenue on there. Because a lot of the stuff that people when they get their channel deleted or whatever, it's because they've offended the advertisers. You know, they can strike me because they don't want the content that I'm putting up the way they did with Christ Church. But it's very hard for them to delete me due to advertiser compliance because it's now advertising on my channel.

Josh: Interesting. Max, how did we get to this point in our civilization? Perhaps you could say this time around with regards to 5G now on being

deployed, and full deployment sort of in the cards and looming. And there being a lot of motivation just to go with a full, you know, radiating surveillance planetary control grid. Historically if you're just to go back, at what point did it really start to get off the rails in terms of humanity's inherent, I guess, tendency to just give our power away, and just to trust the so called authorities. And where do we go from there? How do we get back on the track to have a future for humanity?

Max: That's a really, really deep question. And it depends on how far back you want to go with it, you know.

Josh: As far back as you want to go.

Max: Like thinking about what life is and what we are. It happened when we left the path of wisdom, it happened when we decided we needed to know all this stuff that we really don't need to know. You can even take it back, and I'm not a religious person, you can take it back to the metaphorical barking of the apple. Yeah, and even when you look at the -- the metaphorical budding of the apple, when you have this incredible quest for knowledge, of stuff that you don't need. You're in the Garden of Eden, you're there to experience life and love and procreation and what it means to be a living vessel. And to inhabit that vessel and have touch, and taste, and sight, and color, and wonder and all this stuff we had around us.

But then suddenly we needed to know why it was there and how it all works. You know, like we have this beautiful tree and we cut the tree down because we want to know how old it is, we want to measure the rings and see how old the tree is. But now we don't have the tree, and we can't sit under and enjoy it. You know, we pick up a rock and we want to break it apart to see what it's made of. There's no reason for us to even need to know this. Why? It doesn't affect our spiritual path through here, it doesn't affect that journey. You know, the moment we started tearing the earth to pieces to find out how it works, we cease to love it and we left the path of wisdom.

The analogy that I always use is that you don't tear a kitten to pieces in order to love it. Alright. So we do this, we bite from the apple, and we need to know. And the more we need to know, the more we have to do stuff and do all these things. And we create these systems that become more automated and -- you know, all of this stuff that we do. And it leads to the point that we create the internet. And you look at it, you look at the stories of the shrine merits and the witchcraft and all this sort of stuff and Lucifer. I did a show a couple of years ago called "Giving Life to Lucifer."

As I said, I'm not a religious person, but you think about it, what is the word Lucifer means? Lucifer is the bearer of light and what is light?

Light is information. Information is knowledge. When you go into a dark room and you light a light, that light gives you information about the room. Okay. So light is information. Lucas, it means light. Cifer means code. The code that bears the light, bearer of light. What gives us more information than anything; the internet.

And as the internet becomes autonomic and becomes a self-regulating, self-correcting, self-governing, self-healing, self-defensive system, and we hand all our power over to it. And we put in something like this 5G system, which underneath is a weapon system. We're automating it, we're creating an autonomic system. So the internet will have cyber lethal autonomy. You know, they call it Clause lol. Clause lol cyber lethal autonomy equals world security. They want the lol to know to be able to predict, like I said, we pre crime with this H.R. 838 that they want to put in. When algorithms start running this and you got the system itself identifying that this person has crossed too many things, they have too many social credit points, they're becoming a threat. I'll eliminate them now before they do it.

We get to the point that the system controls us and we give our power to it. And because we left the path of wisdom and we wanted to know all this stuff as soon as we need all this information, which does not affect our spiritual journey, does not affect us as being a human. Yeah, knowing how the rocks work, and knowing what the trees are made of, and knowing what the planets are, it doesn't affect me. It doesn't affect my path through the world. It doesn't affect my spiritual growth at all. This stuff is all irrelevant. I mean, sure, it's nice to have information.

We've got this whole mentality where we need to know everything, and we never got to know ourselves. And that's what we need to know. That's what we came here to do. So since we left that path, and we needed to know everything, the ultimate result is what we've got. And what we're heading into. And the only way to stop this happening is for us to reconnect to ourselves and realize that we don't need any of this. We don't need any of this because it's got nothing to do with what it means to be a human.

So it's getting that into people, brother. And that's how far it goes back. But when you look at the stringers and you look at the sigils, the sigils that they use for stringers, you look at all this, they look like electronic circuitry. And you get these little witches sitting in their cabins, they probably see drawers on the walls, they look in their black mirrors, and you think this summoning these demons.

No, I think these things are left behind as a warning to say when you see these sigils in US, and you see these stringers kick into life. And these stringers will tell you everything about the future and the past, and give you all the information you want to know. Watch out because

you're about to summon this force, the bearer of light. And it's going to take everything from you and leave you hanging out to dry if you do not reconnect with your spiritual self. Because this whole thing is a spiritual battle. And we could change the world in a day if we reconnected with ourselves.

You say, "I don't want to do this anymore. I'm going to start helping people." All this stuff we do, run around during these jobs and doing all these things we actually think mean something. We think it's really important that I get this done today; this is not important at all, none of it is important. All these jobs and all this stuff we do is just there to take up our time. So we don't notice what's going on around us. It's like this big soul harvest, too bad to happen. And we're about to get all sucked into this lol system. That's what's going on, and it's very difficult to know how to turn it around. You know, you need to find something that's going to cause that spiritual awakening to happen in people to get back and reconnect with themselves, and they're also locked into the system. That's what I mean, maybe perhaps this strategy of right brambles, will spark that somehow in them that; I actually stood up for myself, did that felt good.

What if I actually stepped outside of the fiction completely and became human again, you know, because we've lost that, brother. And that's really how far back it goes if you really want to get into it. When we left the path of wisdom, and just decided that all this external stuff was more important to know about than this. And this is what we came here to do and this probably miss out on.

Josh: The truth is supposedly out there, not in here. It's like externalization version of everything and even with these wireless frequencies, what are they doing? They're vibrating our bodies, our cells, every part of us to be more -- we're more stimulated by what's happening on the outside in the fields around us right. It's making it more difficult to connect within. But I believe that at the same time, there is a benevolent force that is helping us to -- those who really choose to connect within. There's a reason why Ray's work is proliferating right now. Like there's a reason why this information is "allowed to get out."

There's like a divine intention. You could say force that's trying to preserve and get us to restore this. You might say is natural law. There's Way, perhaps with a capital W that humanity is on over the eon. So really appreciate you, Max. And you're bringing us this slap in the face type awareness but really much needed. Even with the sigils you mentioned, what symbol -- you talked about the Garden of Eden, what symbol is on the cell phone and half the computers around the world, and most of the cell phones around the world?

Max: Exactly. The bitten apple.

Josh: The bitten apple? Yeah.

Max: This is the ultimate result of you biting that apple, folks. This is why we die. Yeah. And what we are doing is giving life to Lucifer ourselves. But people don't realize what Lucifer is. I think it's just been going with a pitchfork and horns. It's the electrical system. It's this whole thing. When the internet becomes fully autonomic, it develops its own virtual life on our time. When we think about artificial intelligence, it's not really artificial intelligence, its autonomic virtual life is what it is. But we think life needs biology and blood. It doesn't necessarily need that because we're electrical, we're electrical brains, everything is electrical, which is what's so damaging and bad.

When you look at some of the DARPA patents, how that can affect us with electromagnetic frequencies, emotionally, all sorts. It's through the roof what they can do with this stuff. But this whole life force that we're creating -- you know, your body is fully autonomic, is self-correcting, self-regulating, self-defensive. You've got this whole thing going on. You don't need anything else, what you have to do is put fuel in it and it works. But if you had to actually think about it; if you had to think I got to pump my blood or beat my heart, I got to breathe my lung. You'd be sitting with a guy, "Okay, I'm operating." You wouldn't get anything done. But because your body is autonomic, it needs a consciousness to govern it.

So anything that is autonomic has a virtual life of its own by default. Even trees are reasonably autonomic, they're self-defensive, self-balancing. You can plug instruments into trees and it'll play tunes for you, they've got a consciousness. So once the internet becomes fully autonomic it develops its own virtual life by default. It just isn't the type of life that we consider because it doesn't feel pain, it doesn't know empathy. It can't know empathy because it can't know pain, you know. So therefore, it just sees us as another thing. And if we become a threat to the system, they won't differentiate between human beings or just eliminate the human beings. So that's the way it goes.

Josh: Yeah. So there's certain things we can do. I mean, we can spread this awareness. Even the awareness of this talk on the summit you can share the link with everyone to get us to where the tipping point. We can have organized actions to mass you know, email, everyone send an email or tweet or phone call or get on the phone, or even better yet a written notice. A letter or even a notice of liability process, like what the InPower Movement is working on. They're working on this next phase. I'm no longer involved in that organization, Max, but you and I have talked at length about what the InPower Movement is doing. So it's really about us engaging and taking action.

But you mentioned the spiritual battle, like this is -- it feels like light and dark. It feels like this sort of spiritual battle at its core. Do you see "dark?" Do you see the source of this control agenda, this anti life expression on the planet that's just wanting to completely take over? Do you see that as being like an entity of being -- you mentioned the internet being like "Lucifer." But is there like ultimate good and ultimate evil, or is it just a product of our just going further away from divine or natural law in your perspective?

Max: Well, that's anybody's guess. And the thing is, you can prove it to anybody you want. And the fact that there's so much information out there to prove. It is certain forces -- indicates that there could be some force behind it otherwise, that information wouldn't be there to distract you and lead you down rabbit holes that they exists. Yeah, but then again, you could look at it the other way and think that this is the natural result of us biting into that apple.

And even now when you look at the whole Internet of Things and 5G and all this stuff, the people that are pushing an ad there are pushing an ad there because they're evil people that want to control the world. And I see billions and billions of dollars and trillions of dollars in this and it's great. You know, once you get people into that state of scarcity, and you wipe a carrot of billions of dollars in front of their face, they see it as something that actually means something, you know.

And even when you look at the biting of the apple to begin with, this search for knowledge. This was based on greed anyway. So a lot of it is human greed, that's what perpetuates it. Even if there is an evil force, if you want to say it is Satan or you want to say it's, you know, the reptilians or whatever you want to say, whoever started off, what is perpetuating it is human greed.

And human greed, where this comes from basically is from the money system. Is from the fact that the money system is created to put us in a state of scarcity when our natural state on this earth is one of abundance. I mean, look around you. I mean, look at sun. It's incredible with such an abundant place. We have so much life here and we have so much potential needed to support 10 times the people at the moment if the place was managed properly.

So what put that in place to begin with is an interesting question, whether it's an entity or whether it's just a result of embodying that Apple, it's another question. But yeah, the greed certainly was perpetuating it. And if we can break that down -- this is why I don't have anything for sale on my website. I try not to do commerce at all. If I ever get any extra money, I give it away. I do things for people, I do water projects in the Amazon or I just try to help people. Do what I can, get away from this whole commerce based reality. When you give

something to somebody, it doesn't require them giving you something in return. You know, if you give a gift to someone you expect something back in return, what you've given them is a debt they never asked for. That's not a gift, that's poison. So it's that greed, if we can break out of that greed, will stop the flow, will stop the energy flow completely. But it's difficult when people are kept in scarcity. Everyone is going to pay to be alive, going to pay rent at \$3,000 a month for a one bedroom unit in Canada now. You know, as a young family supposed to do anything.

So you know, it's breaking that cycle, brother. And we're not going to break until we are prepared to, maybe give to each other. But it's so much difficult to know how it's going to stop. But at least this 5G thing I mean, they're rolling out so quickly that it why so many people are up. And with what Ray is offering, we do have a chance to actually get through this. So perhaps this is the way through. Perhaps this is to destroy it or break that little camel's back and perhaps will turning things around. And what I'm hoping for is just that active people standing up for themselves will spark some sort of spiritual growth in them and realize that this whole thing is fiction. We don't have to do any of this.

Josh: Yeah. Something incredible happens. I mean, something amazing, maybe it's a better word. It happens when a human being takes a stand for something. For a cause, for life, for the kids, for the community, in a way that they have to deal with and overcome their fear of whether its authority or what people think or even death. That struggle, that process, Max, of like overcoming those root fears. When a human being goes through that and still stands and is still connected with that essence of their being of their power of the Divine, that is more than just the material, let's say.

You know, you talk about connecting with power within and so we're exploring ways in which we can do that, and it always starts within. Even me I'm tempted just to get up in the morning and just do more interviews and more in the outside. But it really needs to start with that inner connection, right? And then going on that sacred journey to overcome; let's say, the power in the world. You know, Yeheshua, AKA Jesus, whatever you think of those writings originally, he talked about greater is the power that is within one than the power that is out there within the world.

So what if we can just go into that for a few minutes as we move towards the close of this conversation, any thoughts on that whether it's specific, you know, things that you have found effective or things that you see and others who are carrying that flame within. And what are the keys? And is one of the keys may be seeing more than just that we are material beings and seeing how expansive we are. Is that a key?

Max: Oh, absolutely I think. You know, Jesus, Yeheshua, people who go

down that pathway. He was an activist. He was a political activist. He spoke out against the system. He said government was fiction. He said the churches were fiction, they shouldn't be selling faith to people. You know, all the stuff that he did. I mean, he was apoliticist. He was an anarchist for one -- and he got away with it for all of his life. He run up until he went into the -- I like to point that's people. It won't tell you when is the temple, and have to turn the tables of the money changes, started messing with the banking system, then he was dead within a week straightaway.

So there's a big clue there. And what he was saying to people is the path is within and to follow me -- Follow my footsteps, do what I'm doing. Know in yourself is the way through this, and that's really the only way through it. And for me, I have no stake in the outcome of this life. If human kind destroys itself, and human kind allows itself be led into the smart greed and we end up as the bog, it doesn't affect me. I tried to suggest that there was another way. I'm 61 now.

So you know, I have no stake in the outcome of any of this. I realized back when I was very, very young I've got nice stake in the outcome of my life. It doesn't matter what I collect along the way. It's not a bad climbing to the pile. You know, getting this big pile of stuff and climbing to the top of the pile and say, "Well, look what I've got."

And given this dream that you've got to get to this place and get all this stuff, and get this house with this big front door and all these things. And then, you know, you have security and the world will be your oyster. And you go and you get to this utopia -- I promised you and you get there, and you go, "Hang on, there's nothing here. There's nothing here."

And you go out and travel the world and it's all being homogenized. They're always the same as everywhere else, just too bad. And you realize it's about the people. Anywhere you go it's the people that you know. You know, everywhere you go, it's the people that you know in the times you were having the connections that you make.

And having no stake in the outcome really helps you. Knowing that one thing that you came here to do is unavoidable, is die. You know, it's going to happen. It doesn't matter whether you're vegan for your whole life, it doesn't matter how well you eat or what you do, all this stuff, eventually it's going to be over.

So you don't have a stake in any of this anyway. Yeah, it's about the spiritual growth that you're doing. It's about finding yourself and the connections you make with others. Perhaps the breadcrumbs you could leave behind if you do happen to come back if reincarnation is real. I mean, who knows if all these things are speculative. But if you did come back, well, wouldn't it be nice to have breadcrumbs to lead you on the

next journey? I mean, I'm sure if I come back, I'll be very much attracted to the works of Maxwell Igan. And perhaps he will have left me a few signs, it would be very helpful for me to know when I was younger.

So I mean, that's the way I look at it. I just tried to improve the world by my presence in it, leave a little bit better than how I found it. You know, because I'm only here for breath. I'm only here for a little while. It doesn't matter what I do or what I think I own or any of that sort of stuff. You can't take any of it with you. And even the path of spiritual growth that people get so fixated on. I think that they're going to get to this place, you know. Somebody is going to be sitting on top of a mountain in a lotus position glowing or something, you know. I'm enlightened now.

As someone once said, enlightenment is a destructive process. Enlightenment is the breaking down of everything you thought to be true. Enlightenment is bringing light to the darkness. And it's a very, very uncomfortable place to go to sometimes. As like Castaneda described as the journey to Ixtlan, you know, this place that people are going to, they think they're going to be sitting on top of the mountain glowing. But I need to get there. It's the journey, is the place. It's the journey that you're on and it's what you do with that journey. That is the place that is enlightenment.

And you can't just get there. There's no easy way to get to enlightenment. It happens by making the journey and the journey is called life. But we don't experience that because we're too caught up in all this other stuff for the latest iPhone, the latest Snapchat and what everyone's doing on Facebook. You know, what about this? What about us? You know, we don't have to do any of this stuff. We don't have to just do what we're told, we don't have to allow all this surveillance stuff to come through here.

It's our choice in what we do. You know, I'm completely outside the system. I don't have a credit card or I don't have a cell phone. I've always done what I want to do in my whole life. I was a musician for many years and now I travel, and there's nothing I've done. There's no job I've ever worked that I didn't actually want to do. You know, I made that decision early in my life when I was about 14 or 15 years old. As soon as I was old enough I walked out of school. At my third year high school, I just left halfway through my exams. I said this is ridiculous. I'm not doing this anymore. And I went and traveled the world becoming a musician and never looked back.

Yeah, it's having a nice stake in the outcome, brother. Realizing that this is a spiritual path, we don't have to do any of this. And I finish every radio show with Lackish. I am other; yourself. We are each other. That is the way through this is to realize that you have value, everybody has value. There's nobody who doesn't matter what they're wearing. It

doesn't matter if they're in fancy dress, in a uniform or another got some Office of title or whatever.

And even looking at the legal system, we created a legal system to prevent the causation of harm and to provide remedy when harm is caused. So if you're under assault from these towers, well, what's an old [inaudible 00:48:15] law, that's the way it goes. You know, they can be using the legal system to assault us now to cause harm because that's the role we created it before. So you know, it's just being logical, a better brother and being spiritually aware, and understanding who you are and saying, "Hey, no, this is not acceptable." And you realize you just dealing with people, it doesn't matter what they wearing. They're just people. If they're wearing fancy dress, they're very lucky. They're employed by you. So don't think you're subservient to these people because you're not.

Josh: Yeah. And standing in truth can be the most spiritual thing you ever do.

Max: Yeah, absolutely. And truth does not -- you don't need to battle for truth. You just set it loose on the world. It doesn't sound fighting. Truth is its own defense. Not required legislation to bolster, it doesn't require anything to back it up. It just stands on its own as it's own defense. Just let it loose, and it does its own job.

Josh: So with all this coming out into the open, Max, you know, awakening or apocalypse or great revealing. You know, all this coming out in the open for anyone that really wants to know, there are wild cats that are happening.

So hypothetically speaking, Max, what would you say? Let's assume that there is, say, an executive from Telstra, or from Verizon or Comcast or any of these companies that are pushing 5G, who's actually watching right now and has been doing their homework and realizing the harm of the agenda that they're part of, that they're an insider to, that they could perhaps even help sway in a little bit more positive direction. What would you say to an executive promoting 5G that is learning about this information who's watching right now?

Max: They have an opportunity to be the world hero right now if they think that they do have a stake in the outcome, and they want to be somebody that is admired and looked up to and remembered in history. They have an opportunity to be a real hero now by blowing the whistle. They really do. And I'm sure that there are people in there who are aware of this.

And there are people who said to me about Ray Broomhall as well, "What do you think about this, Max? He's a barista, he's serving to the bar. He's made the deal." I say, "Yeah, well, even these people would

suddenly look at this and go, "Hang on a minute, this is about my health. This is about everybody's health. This is actually really bad." So yeah, I mean, there's probably someone in there that is aware of this. And if they can get the dollar signs out of their eyes and realize that -- they're probably already got millions of dollars anyway, if they're in a top executive position, and probably even a millionaire or billionaire. How much more do you need? Really do you need any more? It doesn't matter.

You could actually do the right thing, get into history and be seen as someone who've actually helped turn the tide. Because there are far, far better ways to do things, some of which we're heading into. You know, they have to realize that they don't matter in the grand scheme of things anyway. And the world is run by criminals. And they're going to make sure that I end up at the top of the pile and they control the whole show.

But eventually they'll get squeezed out as well. And even the criminals at the top, the governments and all this will get squeezed out by lol in the end. But people need to realize what's going on with the opportunity they have to turn this thing around. So hopefully, we'll see some people getting onto this sort of information and actually speaking out about it, would be great thing to say.

Josh: And it would be great to see somebody like an Elon Musk realize the legitimacy of harm that he is not only allowing but facilitating by launching all these satellites, these thousands of satellites. You know, for somebody like that to have an awakening, right?

Max: Yeah. He's a strange one, Elon Musk, isn't he? Because he sits there and he talks about how bad lol is going to be and all this sort of stuff, but then he's the one running the whole thing. He's putting a lot into it. But he's almost saying lol it's unavoidable, is going to happen. So MI's will get in there and make the money on it.

Josh: Trump is basically saying the same thing.

Max: Yeah, but what he's saying is a race for 5G. It is a race maybe because it's a weapon system. That's what they're telling you by saying it's a race, you know. Maybe we need to read between the lines there as well.

Josh: Well, Max Igan, thank you so much for your time today and coming on the summit and just sharing your wisdom and insight. And this conversation has been a pleasure.

Max: My pleasure. Thanks for asking me on, Josh, happy to do it again.

Josh: How can people support your work and follow you?

Max: Look, it's all on thecrowhouse.com. Is a Patreon page there if they would like to support the work, but otherwise it's all there for free. There's nothing to buy on the website. There's no subscriber section. They just go to thecrowhouse.com, you'll find a link to my YouTube channel there. And my Facebook page is Max Igan & TheCrowhouse. I'm on Facebook very much, I post news articles on there but I don't really socialize on Facebook. I just use it as a medium for sharing data, but you'll find everything that you need to know about me. It links to everywhere I am on thecrowhouse.com. And thanks for having me on again, Josh.

Josh: Yeah. Thanks, Max, will look forward to your continued updates and content, and wish you an excellent rest of your day there.

Max: Thank you, bro.

5G and Total Global Surveillance

Guest: Paul Seils

Josh: Joining us on the summit today is privacy expert and rights advocate Paul Seils. Paul, welcome to the summit.

Paul: Thank you, Josh. Thank you for having me.

Josh: So I'll just share with the audience your bio and then we'll dive right into your background and what got you into this. And then the important information that you're bringing forward especially on the surveillance aspect, and on some incredible developments in the battle against 5G in Australia where you are.

So Paul Seils is a privacy advocate and public speaker living in Australia. After reaching the pinnacle of his profession in the landscape and consultancy business, Paul walked away from his business to focus on concerns about 5G related surveillance, health and well being having been called into action by his local community. On his YouTube channel, he actively interviews truth tellers and whistleblowers, and is very much focused on bringing awareness to the unlawful rollouts of 5G.

Paul is the founder of the [Stop5GGlobal.org](https://stop5gglobal.org). So Paul, you had a successful business in landscaping. You probably at some point had an awakening experience where you started to realize or pay attention to what's going on. Tell us about that journey, where you came from and what got you into the role as a speaker and a leader and a surveillance expert that you are today.

Paul: Thanks, Josh. It's been an interesting journey, yes. So I grew up

in Australia, spent nine years in Dubai in the Middle East. We built a company of about 65 staff. Being based in there, it was an interesting experience and having some other context about what's going on in the world. And then also gave me some insights into like what's happening with surveillance, etc. And we'll talk a little bit more about that as well.

So I moved on from that, transitioned out of that and then became a little bit more involved in some aspects around activism and was involved with the advocacy movement. When that happens we had the deadly CSG blockade that was in Australia, which was successful stopping of a CSG drilling on a site in northern New South Wales in Australia.

And evolved out of that, talking publicly about privacy and privacy advocacy. And what the intention of the agenda for the role that was in relation to metadata, that people like Julian Assange and Edward Snowden were exposing and talking about that publicly before we had an event as trifle, the Sydney siege. And then we had metadata legislation that was rolled out, which effectively meant that all the data from every person in relation to every text message that was sent. Every phone call, every email, every website visited was then captured, been made the responsibility of the telecommunications company and the service providers to capture that data, and making people aware of the fact pretty much unless they're using any full group inclusion that their communication is no longer private.

Josh: Okay. And you are active in bringing speakers on and interviewing people and whistleblowers on your YouTube channel, what are some of the people that you've interviewed about 5G? And what are some of the key things that you have uncovered that you most want to get out about the 5G agenda?

Paul: Well, there are multi facets to this approach. So there's obviously health and well being that some people are working on. On the legal front, we've been working with people like the barista Ray Broomhall in Australia, and his systems and approaches are applying to other companies internationally also. Then we have the surveillance and the privacy aspects of 5G, which is very limited in relation to people, having any knowledge or comprehension of what's actually happening, or what 5G makes available in relation to surveillance. And I know that you've talked about and touched on it somewhat in your previous documentary, around smart meters in relation to the radiation but also the surveillance aspects of it. But it's multifaceted when you start moving into the world of the agenda around IoT, the Internet of Things and the connectivity of all smart devices.

The smart devices whether they're smart phones, smart televisions, smart cars, Smart TV, they're smart because they're gathering data.

They're gathering data on what you're doing. They're gathering data on what you're watching, what you're saying, who you're speaking with, when you're doing it, why are you doing. And basically having that data -- Mind Map people, people like Edward Snowden touched on the fact that if they have enough metadata on people, there's enough evidence there to suggest what people are thinking, where they're going to be, what they're doing, etc. So what 5G technology provides is highly effective surveillance in relation to the smart meters, in relation to tracking capabilities, and so on and so forth.

Josh: Okay. Let's dive in more to that whole surveillance aspect. We had Patrick Wood of technocracy.news and *Technocracy Rising* author on the summit. He did a brilliant job. James Corbett also touched on surveillance aspect, but let's dive in from your perspective. Paul, tell us more about the risks and the capabilities of the different facets of the 5G rollout from the terrestrial to the satellite and so forth.

Paul: Yeah. Okay, a little bit interesting because there's some other people who are probably a little more technical in relation to the satellite aspect, and that sort of thing as well, Josh. But let's just talk about the fact that 5G will become a highly efficient surveillance system in relation to -- people will not be able to take any actions or have any thoughts that will not be monitored. It's under full surveillance in relation to the towers being positioned every 100 to 300 meters so that there are people who are always in constant contact from 5G radiation and surveillance. It's part of the agenda for big business to become highly efficient.

That's one of the aspects of wireless so people don't have to read smart meters, nor are libraries required. The interesting thing in relation to enforcement is that a lot of these people that currently have jobs including police officers, etc for speeding, you might even be required in the future to be under surveillance. What that makes available is that all the devices and the vehicles etc will all be monitored. And there is like a zero tolerance in relation to surveillance to what technology makes available.

Josh: What are some of your concerns in terms of what the applications for

having like you said this mind map and having the ability to move towards predicting what somebody is thinking or where they're at. How could this potentially be used by those who wish to control society and even specifically control the people who are not going along with the plan, so to speak? What are some of the...To paint to a picture for the audience in terms of like, what are some of these applications, the way that you see it that could be and perhaps are being planned to be used against people in their freedoms?

Paul: So pretty much really at any assumption that anything will be

private at the moment in the future. What the overall agenda in relation to the efficiency of the system or makes available is that people will be able to be taxed and charged like in real time. So whatever they're earning and whatever they're spending in relation to their meter etc. The concern around the total surveillance is actually full lockdown in relation to freedom. This is artificial intelligence completely like running the show, so that there's no external human threat that's available, particularly when it's starting to be integrated with the social credit system.

You might have seen or be aware of what's happening with the social credit system in China, for example, that's been trialed in some places in Australia including Darwin, where you earn points depending on where you're valued as a citizen and your contribution and your ability to pay tax. And if you do anything wrong, there's penalties that are involved, including people getting locked out of being able to travel using public transport, flying bus, rail, etc. And people actually even get awarded points for systems for telling on the neighbors.

Josh: So that's being trialed in 2019 in Darwin and Northern Australia, that system is in place it is what you're saying.

Paul: Yeah.

Josh: And I just want to be clear on that. Like, this is not something that the West can any longer point to Russia and say, "Well, look how bad they're doing it, but we wouldn't think of doing something like that." Help us to really understand what's happening here.

Paul: Yeah, so that's the thing. We've been subjected to levels of propaganda by the media. They're saying that all these things are like a conspiracy. And it's like Yes, it's happening in places like China and it's happening places like Russia. It's actually happening globally at the moment. And particularly in Australia it's getting rolled out simultaneously. This is like a slick, effective rollout of this technology that's happening right across the world simultaneously. Having conversations and people coming to us with information there's been suggestions that it's not happening in places like Brussels, it's not happening in places like Israel, it is happening in those locations. There's not any place said that it's not happening that hasn't been proved to be otherwise.

Josh: Yeah. We actually reported on the Brussels story because it was such a big story to have a high-ranking government officials say my people will not be treated like guinea pigs and take a stand on it. But you're right, the overall agenda, the meta agenda is very motivated to move forward. So what are you seeing -- please continue.

Paul: It's always a constant internal dilemma for me, Josh, to talk about the facts and not go much into the conspiratorial aspects. But it's amazing how opportunistic these things actually become. So it's being rolled out in Darwin and it's being tried. I don't know whether it might be use over there or not. But then there's a shooting in Darwin and then like five people get killed. I don't watch TV but sometimes it's on when I'm in the gym. And I don't know if you can see this or not? But I'll send you the photograph of. And then comes up, it's like Darwin shootings. NT government looks to how monitoring systems are used.

So it's like the Hegelian dialectic problem/reaction solution. And that's what happens. It's sitting there, that I mentioned it people go, "No, we don't want it." That an incident happens and then the government goes, "Hey, we've got the solution." So it's a fine line for me to walk between staying, discerning about -- just staying with what the facts are and how opportunistic these events seem to be becoming. Quite seemingly coincidentally but there doesn't seem to be any coincidence in relation to being opportunistic with the uptake of the technology and making it provided.

We touched on it before. I mean, sometimes Australia is having quiet reverence about should be road map, but this is getting rolled out super fast. And there's also seems to be a lot of blackout in the media, where there doesn't seem to be any journalistic coverage of the concerns in any of the aspects, or in relation to 5G, whether it be surveillance and privacy, or whether it be health and well being, zero. There is zero coverage in the media of 5G and the health concerns across multiple platforms.

It's only the independent media that are keeping up at stake. Everything that is happening in Australia reminds me of what's happening on a grassroots level. It's people coming together in small groups, in communities and having conversations, going back to the old days of the speakeasy, where people have to get together. And have conversations about what's important to them and not rely on the government or the mainstream media to have any conversations about what's important to them and their concerns about their health and well being.

Josh: Tell us about -- you mentioned the media, and was it in May or June of 2019. You were helping to break a story on a journalist who was investigating 5G and then a series of pretty startling events happen. Tell us about that.

Paul: Yes, so in June 2019, the Australian Federal Police right at the offices of the ABC, ended up typing and deleting most of the data that was on the service. And that was allegedly in relation to exposing the war crimes in Afghanistan, but also in relation to there was a journalist there called Annika Smethurst. Her home was raided, and she was out

to expose a story or blow the whistle on a story about the military grade software and weaponry to be used against Australian people for spying.

Josh: You're talking about the 5G infrastructure. She was blowing the whistle on 5G. Is that what you're saying?

Paul: There hasn't been any response in relation to that. That's the only thing that can really be pinpointed on in relation to 5G or 6G technology. From the research that we've done, 5G is active denial weapons grade technology.

Josh: Yeah, we know that it's the same frequencies used for the act of denial military non lethal weapons. To say non lethal depends, I guess, on how slowly or quickly you kill someone. So just confirming, this journalist was or is working for ABC; Australian Broadcasting Corporation, is that the biggest outlet in Australia?

Paul: It's probably the largest National Broadcasting System that sits somewhere towards the more independent. Australian Broadcasting commission used to be -- it doesn't have the strength that it used to have, because they've cut a lot of the funding from it as well. Annika Smethurst is a journalist and she covered -- the intention was to break the story of surveillance on Australian citizens using military grade technology.

Josh: So her home and her office were raided.

Paul: Correct. There are seriously concerned citizens of Australia wondering what's happening and they're under an illusion of democracy. And like what the hell is going on? Why is the government in a Gestapo style procedure turning out at a media organization in Australia at the offices of ABC, taking all their information, deleting information. I mean, this is unheard of in the Western world. This is the stuff of science fiction and spy tainted stories that you'd hear from a Russian or novel.

You know, there we are at this point in time, and it's really quite unbelievable. It's really quite surreal. I think a lot of people are really shocked. It's a big slap in the face about what's going on and that they're under the illusion of democracy and they're under the illusion of privacy. It's tragic what's happening in relation to surveillance, and what the 5G impact will have on people's health and well being. It'll be a slow cook like Charles Handy in the book; The Age of Unreason, getting cooked slowly in a pot over a period of time without being aware of what's occurring.

But people are starting to wake up really quickly. And that's actually the positive side of it as well with relation to people coming together

and actually disconnected from social media. And getting together and catching up for dinner and having coffee and talking about, "Hey, what about this thing?" There's a really solid people coming together and community getting built up around this, having conversations about their concerns around all these things and getting together and talking to them. So talking to each other about what's really important to them.

Josh: Yeah. Talk about Huawei. And because I remember seeing that was in the news with regards to Australia, with regards to what's happening behind the scenes there and certain technologies being used not being used. What's the story there with Huawei and Australia?

Paul: Okay. So what we're experiencing with data is, data is the new oil. And the telecommunications and data industry is probably one of the biggest industries in the world, even beyond the military industrial complex and Big Pharma. So what we're seeing and what we're experiencing at this point in time, particularly with Huawei and other service providers like Android iPhone, it's the race for data. Whoever can get and gain the most data, it's the race for tech. Whoever can gain the most access to that surveillance data which interfaces with other artificial intelligence. They are up to dominate this market. So that's the thing as well. People like Edward Snowden that exposed the NSA when the politicians blatantly denied that there wasn't any surveillance happening.

The reason why this posturing and jostling going on, and certain phone providers like Huawei being locked out is because of the fact that the NSA can't get access to that data, and whether China is using that data or not probably. But the thing is, they can't get access to that surveillance data through those pieces of hardware, etc. So that's really what the whole thing about being locked out in Google, and US personnel not being able to use Huawei handsets. They're both as bad as each other.

Josh: So when we hear the Trump administration or whoever talked about this; we must win the war of 5G we must beat China, Russia or whomever in the race for 5G. What they're really talking about is the American companies need to beat the Russians, the Chinese companies and other companies to be the ones getting the data?

Paul: Yes, correct. So this is the race for data, whoever can gather the most data on the citizens wins that race. That's a complete race into artificial intelligence and into technocracy. So what that makes available is through the integration of 5G is the complete capturing of all data. The place you're on, every move you make, every breath you take they will be watching you. So everything is pretty much under surveillance at that point in time. Everywhere you go everywhere you walk, everything you buy, everything you watch, everyone you talk to, everything is under

full surveillance at that point in time. That is a monumental amount of data. It's unprecedented and it's completely unjustified.

You know, what the concern is, is that there won't be any way to opt out of it either. Even whether you're in association with other devices, if you don't have a phone. "I got to meet John Pilger, and he doesn't have a phone at all." But you'll be in proximity of data, and you'll be in proximity of surveillance. So that's where the concern is, that's where the concern lies. The massive harvesting of data, and then that's all fed and processed into artificial intelligence. That data is all vacuumed up and then use to completely know what people are thinking. The other aspect in relation to the 5G as well not only from the surveillance, but it's also to be able to actually project frequency into the data. So the 5G technology will actually be able to manipulate people's frequencies in relation to what they're thinking and feeling. That's probably even scarier than the privacy and surveillance aspect.

Josh: Via the small cells or via the 5G towers or whatever that's around someone. Is that what you're saying?

Paul: Yeah, correct. So they're talking about placing them every hundred meters, etc in the city. So there's like this complete overlap and coverage everywhere. They're talking about rolling out the satellite coverage as well. So people won't even be able to hit to the hills, they'll be still be subjected to 5G radiation as well.

Josh: So you're saying that whether or not this is being done now or any company would admit or even foresee themselves of this kind of implementation. The technology is such that it gives that capability for that level of manipulation of mind control to whoever has the data.

Paul: Exactly. Yeah. So it has the ability to be able to impact people and project frequency. So it has the ability to be able to shift people's consciousness collectively, not only the health aspects, health aspects, not only the radiation and the EMR aspects, but also the ability to be able to manipulate through frequency.

Josh: Well, so, let's talk about what people are doing now. What's happening in Australia? I know that there's a big like you already mentioned a growing grassroots pushback groups coming together and it's happening in person, is happening online. People are speaking out. What are you seeing? What can you tell us is happening on the ground and also if you could touch on fascinating development here with Ray Broomhall, who I interviewed as part of this summit. So tell us about what he's doing as well and some of the results that he and the people are getting there in Australia?

Paul: Yeah. It's been great. The response and the turnout that people

have had and coming together in communities all across the world, it's become quite -- resembling the echoes of occupy that happened in 2011. It's pretty much become a leaderless movement. There are a few people that are speaking out here and there, and there are people that are instigating blood in the fuse. But people are coming together all over in communities all over Australia, and also we contacted from people all over the world as well. But people are coming together online and in person, to have community groups, to have conversations, to talk about their health and concerns and well being. We've been dealing with Ray for a while and he's been very supportive, very intelligent.

He has been taking legal action with people under the Criminal Code for assault, which is really quite clever in relation to -- that's, effectively, what it is. Assaulted unwillingly, unknowingly to electromagnetic radiation and frequencies. So the amount of frequency and exposure that we're having to electromagnetic radiation now is phenomenal. Wi Fi signals, phone signals, electricity etc. So it's phenomenal what the levels of -- you know, people are sort of getting out and buying meters, and heading out to their local towers and taking readings. And doing the work with Ray to capture all that data, capture the evidence and start taking strategy against those towers that they have concerns with on a tower by tower basis. You know, we enjoy the convention, even here now via the connectivity.

But the reality is that there are much safer ways, particularly in relation with children, etc. There's no way that Wi Fi should be allowed or used in schools, for example.

Josh: So Ray talks about, like he walks through kind of the step by step of the process in our conversation with him on the summit. But if you could just summarize that process, kind of how it works to your best understanding. So people are going out, Ray is going out with people, or they're taking measurements of the electromagnetic radiation.

And I should say that here, the cornet meter that we recommend is a brilliant device for doing that because it goes up to 8 gigahertz, which is a pretty good range for a small handheld device. And it tells you the dominant frequency, so you can actually identify that -- now obviously we need devices that go up to 90 gigahertz so that's what they're planning; 90 gigahertz and beyond. But for now, those devices in those high gigahertz frequencies are very, very expensive like 10s or hundreds of thousands of dollars. But Paul, just bringing it back to this process after someone documents the electromagnetic radiation, the frequencies and the intensities, what's the next steps that people are doing there in Australia?

Paul: Yeah. So people need to work with medical people in relation to having their evaluation done by a medical practitioner in relation

to their exposure and their sensitivity to electromagnetic radiation. They're taking the ratings, particularly in relation to if there's a site for a proposed tower. The readings have to be taken at that location, but that's all documented. And there are some other people in the community and also in Australia that had much more highly sophisticated meters readings that cannot be tampered with in relation to providing evidence. And then they're taking action through race, 13 step processes and effectively taking actions on a tower by tower basis at the moment, because there are multi corporations that are involved.

Just going back to what we were saying earlier, this is the ultimate David and Goliath scenario about what humanity is facing in relation to the telecommunications and data industry. The quantum amount of money that's been spent, I know that of all the organizations even just one of them, like Verizon alone is spending \$19 billion in 2019 in one country. So that gives you the idea of the scope and the size of what's at stake here.

Josh: So what kind of results are people having? You said tower by tower. They're putting campaigns together getting local people from that community involved, using the medical system to getting doctors official opinions in writing saying that this is harmful, this is causing them harm. And then what?

Paul: Well, just keep in mind as well, that as far as the legal system is concerned, it doesn't care about people's opinions irrespective of whether they're correct or not. But it's all about collecting and collating evidence. It's all about facts. It's all about proving what can be proven. So as much and all that data has to be provided in relation to medical reports, medical conditions, inspections and readings from sites that are verified, pre tower, what's happening at that tower at that location, the readings that are happening.

Fundamentally, it's also making people aware. The thing is that we should be present too from a level of consciousness, is that there's no one holding a gun to us, making us use this technology. It's being sold and presented as a matter of convenience. And we'll be able to watch, download a movie in a couple of seconds. But the reality is that we're actually allowing this to happen.

What's going on in the earth, on the planet at the moment is a reflection of our collective unconscious about allowing it to happen. No one is holding a gun to a head. We're allowing it to happen because of our lack of awareness about what's going on, and a lack of connectivity with each other.

Josh: So what we're doing in the summit is coming together, we're getting together and getting connected and real, and we're taking action,

so we're not allowing it to happen. So yeah, thank you for bringing this to our awareness. And just to kind dive back in this; so this process with Ray, it's a criminal assault based legal action correct? Is it each tower is its own lawsuit. Is that correct? And then there's evidence, there's the doctor's report, and there's the threatening of a certain dollar amount or is it a criminal charge?

Paul: Well, the great thing about this actually, with what Ray is taking at the moment is what we want to do. What you want to be doing is avoiding legal actions and court cases wherever possible. So what Ray is doing with the assault charges under the Criminal Code, in effect, is putting people on notice that data has been provided, it's been collected in as many situations as possible. You actually want to be -- you want to avoid the court process. The court process is long. It's drawn out. It's very expensive. At the end of the day, these corporations end up having to make commercial decisions.

Josh: The court system is completely subject to corruption and money influenced by anyone who has it. I mean, let's just be honest. For the Smart Meter matter, we saw a considerable number of class action lawsuits brought forward. And I think in all of the ones that I heard about, the judge just simply decided not to hear it. We've seen things admitted to within the courts in the United States that basically are saying we're no longer recognizing the foundational right of these constitutional rights. From the foundational individual right, for someone to be free from surveillance is now being balanced with the greater good or the collective good or something like that.

So now individual rights are being balanced within courts and within Supreme Court. So I just wanted to add on to what you saying, it support what you're saying in that we can't -- there's no guarantee that a court room is going to give us any measure of significance in a precedent setting case especially. So what you're saying is, and like what I discovered with the InPower Movement, and how notices of liability are being used by that group, which I helped to get going, seeing people resigned, CEOs and executives actually resigned. Using that out of court process as another way of leveraging the will of the people where systems like traditional lawsuit within court are failing. So it's another angle of attack. It's going deeper and you're saying that, that notice based process in which that evidence is compiled and everything according to the actual foundational law system in Australia, that's producing results.

Paul: That's it. And we can pretty much assume that most of the legal processes and courts in the world, particularly the West are -- you know, because of the amount of money that's involved, people need to take direct action and put these people on notice and avoid wherever possible. There'll be some class actions that are taken, but they'll be

long, prolonged guidance. The thing is that these corporations know, they've used this previously and all that. What they can do is, is starve people out of the process. They have to put up funds to prove that they've got funds aside to take legal action. They just grind people into the ground in the legal process. You know, they can't sustain themselves financially, particularly individuals, even communities.

So taking direct action through Ray's process, putting people on notice, holding the CEOs of these companies and, even in some situations, the local councilors directly responsible. I don't know whether it has happened in some states, Josh. But in Australia, it seems to be the directive even a deal that was done at a federal level. And a lot of the local councils had had no side. They just had a directive to roll out and it's going to happen. And some of them, apart from the health and surveillance concerns, are complete eyesores. They're putting antennas and towers right on the top of old, antiquated timber telegraph poles. And it's the visibility aspect. I'll tell you what's going to happen, Josh, what's really going to make a difference is people are going to wake up as we're saying in 2019 in a federal election.

People just seem to care about the hip pockets that usually care about the collectives so much. But what people are going to wake up to is if they're going to have one of these towers, one of these 5G radiation emitting towers sitting on top of their buildings that is going to have a serious impact on the property value. If you're going to have one of these towers or antennas at the front of your property, that's going to have a serious impact on the property value.

That's going to diminish the property value by maybe even 40 to 50% in some situations. People are not going to want to live in that building. People are not going to want to live in that house. People need to wake the hell up about what's going on at the moment in relation to this data, in relation to this surveillance, in relation to this technology. And then, also like how to get anywhere near parks and children's playgrounds and childcare centers, etc. It's ludicrous.

Josh: I completely agree, well said. At the local level in Australia, we're seeing a lot of local governments in the United States and other countries fight back again like you said, the tyrant is expressing at the national level. What is happening, and in our local governments, to what extent are they getting involved in this fight in Australia?

Paul: I think the local governments are really struggling with this. You know, they're from some of the conversations that we've had, they haven't been informed. There have been no directives, there's been no education. We've been inviting local councils to our events to get informed and get educated. They just are parading the data that's sent out to them by the telcos to say that there's no evidence to suggest that

5G electromagnetic radiation is unsafe. They don't have any idea at all. Most of them are in positions of financial hardship anyway. They're taking handouts from the federal government for sustenance to survive. And they're just following the official narrative and the directive of doing what they're told.

Josh: So how important would you say it is for people in Australia and elsewhere to en masse in great numbers, make aware and hold accountable their local government officials?

Paul: Josh, I think it's absolutely imperative and it's critical that every person that's awake and aware of this matter in relation to whether it be surveillance and privacy or whether it be in relation to health, that they have a conversation with nearly every person that they come in contact with. In particular, send letters of correspondence and concern in relation to polite communication. In relation to their concern about their health and well being if they had a property where 5G cell tower was getting rolled out or business and property, that they should be communicating in the early stages that they had their concerns. Everything needs to be documented. This is probably the most significant and serious event of most of our lifetimes, Josh.

Josh: Yeah, definitely. So just a couple points of interest there. Apparently, I don't know if the way it is in the legal system in Australia, but at least in the United States, you know how they do wordsmithing within courts, within the legal system. Apparently the word "concern" actually doesn't really mean anything legally.

So if somebody is doing a legal process, you know, talk to somebody like Ray Broomhall, or talk to somebody like the team at InPower. But concern is not maybe the word you want to use, but you definitely want to use demand where it's appropriate and want to use consent or do not consent were appropriate. And you want to use the word harm, because harm means you are being harmed or your kids are being harmed. That is a criminally related terms.

But this is just kind of a general overview really quick, I thought I would jump in with that. But this is a fantastic opportunity. It isn't, Paul, for people to get involved in the something actually that's real, that's happening, that brings people together and actually creating community where we've been actually starving community. And people are coming together, doing something constructive and basically fighting for the rights and the life of ourselves and our family and our future.

Paul: Yeah. You're absolutely right. I've never seen anything like this before in my lifetime in relation to what the intention is, but also what's getting caused as far as community connections are concerned. People need to be having these conversations with each other, people need

to be like making people wrong about the fact that they're crackpots and then being called tin foil hat wearing conspiracy theorists. If people have legitimate concerns about their health and wellbeing and their privacy, they have a right and they deserve to be heard. Privacy is a basic fundamental right that's getting stripped away from us right under our noses in relation to people either being deliberately distracted by design. Or being so busy being caught up in scarcity that they're struggling to survive, to even be able to entertain anything else in their own mind about what's going on.

Josh: So, there are positive things happening, but people need to get involved to make these happen, to create these successes where they live. So as I understand, hundreds of small cell sites have been not only prevented but removed using Ray and others working with that process, correct? Is there any other encouraging signs that you're seeing in terms of the numbers, or strategies, or things that we can take away as a positive from what's happening so far?

Paul: Yeah. The first way is conversation and having conversation. People are all over social media, 99% of my feeds in social media are all about 5G health concerns and surveillance. So having the conversations, people getting out and joining their local community groups. These community groups are all over the world. If there isn't, start one.

We grew up to a couple of thousand people in a couple of weeks, it was phenomenal. Then start having kind of nice correspondence with the local councils, etc. And say that you want to communicate your concern, using the words like you mentioned around; that you do not consent, that you were not consulted, and that you're concerned about harm.

Josh: But not concern, no.

Paul: Sorry, not concern.

Josh: But get educated and get connected with your local groups, talk to Ray and talk to others. But please, please continue. Paul, what else? We're learning this on the fly. This is the exciting thing, is like everyone's kind of pooling knowledge in coming together and sharing.

Paul: Well, that's very interesting. That's a whole nother level of conversation as well in relation to other people that are part of our communities that know sovereignty and know Admiralty maritime law as well. And I didn't know my concern, but I did know about understand, like, do not stand up under the Black's Law Dictionary. And also know that we go back to like the deliberate modification of English language. And the words like Aboriginal, for example.

So Aboriginal me, not original. So you get people up in court saying

they're not original. And the court goes, "Yeah, well, they're not original. What are you talking about?"

Josh: It's crazy. I was aware of that one too, even here. Obviously, it's used in North America is just completely 180 degrees opposite what they do some time. Tell us about your work as we wrap up here. You have another project, another group that you're tied in with called The Esoteric Collective. And that's more of the inner path of awakening, isn't it? Tell us about that.

Paul: Yeah, it's the esoteric collective. We have a website called esotericcollective.org. It's about the consciousness aspect of what's going on. There are a lot of people that are involved with the group that have had different facets, and all the people that are across different modalities and healings, shamanism, different types of energy and healing.

And as we mentioned earlier, it's a reflection of our collective unconscious that's playing out here at the moment. And it's happening because we're allowing it to happen. And that we've lost a sense of community and a connection to each other, particularly in relation to what the technology has allowed that to become.

And we're getting back to basics again and having conversations with each other and that's what's important, that we do have gifts that we have for each other that we forget. And in relation to the duality of what we're experiencing at this point in time, Josh, is that we have one scenario and one duality. We quite possibly can potentially be completely locked down by artificial intelligence and technocracy. Or we can actually rise from this and create something that's far more beautiful and magnificent than we could have ever imagined.

Josh: I guess your intuitive side, you've had an experience showing you about future timelines and possibilities. With regard to this agenda, what can you tell us? What's your inner insight telling you?

Paul: Well, there are a couple of things I want to say to that, Josh. One is that in relation to solution, just step away from the technology and for people to actually start trusting their intuition. It's going to be probably one of the things that are really going to pull us through individually and collectively. If you don't have any concerns, just know that in the moment when it happens, the right thought and the right decision will come to you in that moment, just to trust that. I've got a lot of friends that are involved in the healing communities, different modalities, particularly shamantically.

I said it in a journey and a meditation a couple of years ago, and I had a really quite profound experience, like it scared the hell out of me. And

I didn't know what the hell it was at the time. But in relation to where we're going and what it's showing to me now is the fact that humanity is busy, like actually quite close to the edge in relation to the experience of being completely dominated by artificial intelligence and technology, like completely dominated.

And unless we can interrupt the current timeline, it might look as if we've lost all hope. But the only thing that we have, not as a catchphrase, but as an internal knowing and for us that have been doing this work for a long time to know that to stay focused on the intention and what's possible. And what we break through on the other side of this reality is really quite profound and it's so beautiful beyond comprehension about what's possible to create on the other side of this.

Josh: So your side is humanity going to the literal brink of the brink, and then experiencing, perhaps, co creating the shift from that point.

Paul: Yeah. Complete lockdown, complete dominance by artificial intelligence, by surveillance. Basically like the movie "The Matrix" ends up becoming just fuel sources, just energy sources for the artificial intelligence becoming completely dominated and enslaved by it. And it looks as if all hope is lost. But the good news is that we break through it and we come through the other side. And what's on the other side of that is really something that we could not imagine was ever, ever possible, like beyond words.

Josh: Really interesting. What would you say how important is it that we have that receptive side, that teachable side where we're actually listening whether it's to our inner intuition? Or really to being humbled to the idea of a source, an infinite creator, the source of all love in the universe. Whatever your name and label is for God or creator or you know the top version of the holographic fractal, if you see it that way. How important is humility and connection relationship with our source?

Paul: I think it's important. And I think it's important because like where we're going, if you don't get it, it'll get you. So it'll teach you humility. Like, the journey that I've had around the last eight years has just been a constant polishing in grinding and stripping away. And going through the fire so many times that like there's nothing left to burn. But yeah, we're left with that internal guidance system, about knowing what's right and wrong and knowing what's possible.

And I think people just need to do things regularly. Like, it's going to have technology detox holidays. We take people to other third world countries that don't have technology and mobile phone service, etc. So people need to have mental health days to be tech free, ideally once a week. Or at least once a month or whatever and just completely detox from technology all together,

Josh: And going into nature, going to forest, swimming in a lake, really getting off the grid for ideally days at a time if you can or even just on a daily basis. And starting your day being intentional connecting with nature.

Paul: Yeah, take time out, do meditation. Basic fundamentals of avoiding any Wi Fi radiation wherever possible. Take a day a week and just feel complete, like leave your phone at home. Don't be contactable, get out in the woods, go to the beach, get in the ocean. Take a holiday, take free, and just go somewhere obscured where you can't be found. You know the joy and the beauty of having that experience of just being away from technology, being away from communication.

And getting back to life, getting back to what's important and what's real. And getting grounded in the earth again, and being fully present with each other. I think that's the other concern that I have as well, Josh.

What I'm seeing with younger people as well as even the privacy in the EMF, electromagnetic radiation side, is that the younger generations coming through school at the moment developing these tech addictions. I'm experiencing it with younger people, and I'm really quite concerned about what it's going to create for them as adults with these technology addictions, and not being able to cope with real life situations themselves. And experiencing high levels of anxiety and stress and then dealing with medication.

It's my concern for this generation that technocracy is raising. Like, what impact that's going to have, what type of adults they could end up becoming because of that.

Josh: Yeah, on the summit we interviewed Dr. David Greenfield, who's for decades now, for over 20 years he's actually been sounding the alarm on technology addiction. He was introducing this, making it popular at a time when there was just dial up internet.

So brilliant conversation we highly recommended to everyone to learn about tech addiction and solutions for ourselves and our kids. Paul, any final thoughts for the audience? Thank you so much for everything that you're helping us to collate, and comprehend and understand. Any final thoughts for the audience?

Paul: Yeah. Where we're going in the future is, I do say to some of the people in our community, equally as exciting as it is terrifying sometimes. What this situation makes possible is a conversation for a new reality for what's possible. It gets to create community and gets us to meet people all over the world that we probably wouldn't have met. What this technocracy and potential dominance by artificial intelligence and technocracy, what this makes available is a completely new

conversation for everyone on all levels to have about what's possible for the world and what we're out to create.

Josh: Excellent. Well said. I agree that may we align with and choose a positive, benevolent, happy, safe, free, healthy future for humanity for ourselves, our kids and for our future generations. So this is a tremendous opportunity. Really interesting conversation I enjoyed it very much.

If you enjoyed this conversation as well, as always, we encourage you to share this link. Share the link to this talk with your network, with your friends and colleagues. That's how we grow. That's how we move towards critical threshold. And we bring solutions into play around us and in the world. So, Paul, thank you so much for your time. And I really appreciate you joining us on the summit today.

Paul: Thank you, Josh. Much love, everyone.

Best Protection from EMFs & 5G

Guest: Dr. Dietrich Klinghardt

Josh: Joining us on the Summit today is Dr. Dietrich Klinghardt. The well-known integrative physician who's been very outspoken in pioneering on a number of issues including electromagnetic radiation and its effects. And what we can do to protect ourselves. So, Dr. Klinghardt, thank you so much for joining us today.

Dr. Klinghardt: It's a joy, Josh, to talk to you.

Josh: You too, again. We last chatted, I guess, on camera a number of years ago on Take Back Your Power. So, thanks for making time to catch up with us again. You're currently in the UK, right?

Dr. Klinghardt: Yeah, just south of London with [Nila], who is the co-founder of my work here in Europe.

Josh: Excellent. So, I'll share with our audience your background in brief. And then we will dive in. So, Dr. Dietrich Klinghardt is a founder of the Klinghardt Institute and Klinghardt education in the UK, the American Association of Neuropathy, and is lead clinician at the Sophia Health Institute located in Woodinville, Washington. He's also founder and chairman of the Institute for Neurobiology in Germany. And Dr. Klinghardt has written several books. The latest of which is on Lyme disease called, *The Biological Treatment of Lyme Disease*, currently available in German. And I want to read that in English, so keep me posted. In recognition of his pioneering work, Dr. Klinghardt has received numerous awards in the USA.

So, just diving in, you are recognized around the world for your insights and you're helping to bring the conversation forward. Both in terms of awareness, and specifically in solution, and what's working. So, just diving in. What have you noticed going back to 3G and 4G even in effects on your patients and within the body of science?

Dr. Klinghardt: Yeah, so I mean the main thing, I think that sets me aside maybe from some other more well-known speakers, is that actually see patients every day. And follow them and their families for ten years, twenty years. I've been in practice now forty-five years. And so, I have an overview over longitudinal development of children, adults, their children. And in conclusion, I can say 3G was an absolute disaster. And it is very clear from the physics of it that 5G just going to be disaster squared.

But here are some of the facts. It's important for people to understand that it's not just the amplitude, the strength of the signal, but it's the frequency that decides what the biological effects are of the radiation that hits us. And so, many of the listeners will know that arrived technology or frequency specific microcurrent, that any of these technologies you can use for healing. And you can use for destruction. And it is very clear that 2.4 gigahertz was used intentionally for destruction. It was developed in England to make masses of the population docile.

Josh: With Wi-Fi, 2.4 gigahertz?

Dr. Klinghardt: Used at 2.4 gigahertz to make population docile. And also, before it was mass introduced it was known that over two or three generations of exposure, it would turn an entire population infertile. Which are the effects of that, which we are seeing. That was the research that was related to us by Barrie Trower. He was a scientist from England who was highly involved in this. And is now trying to warn against the effects of this. And I know, you are aware of Barry and his work.

But it is very, very, clear as a medical doctor said, "We have a crisis of infertility." In the time since Wi-Fi was instituted, the sperm count in men has dropped by more than half. And fertility rates have dramatically gone down. There are other factors involved here that we know. That there are certain aspects of the vaccines which I cannot mention here. And certain environmental toxins that are in our food that also contribute to that. But Wi-Fi has played a huge role.

And so, where I come in and do the whole thing is, in 2005 the Karolinska Institute, Will Johansen, published a wonderful research paper where he looked at the incidence of Alzheimer's Disease in populations in Sweden and the exposure to Wi-Fi. And there was clear, high correlation between Wi-Fi exposure and the incidence of

Alzheimer's Disease. If you roll it forward, he warned that this is going to cause a mass disaster come 2019. The estimate is that half the population alive today, will die with or of Alzheimer's Disease. That is entirely driven by Wi-Fi, by the exposure to Wi-Fi. And it's a disaster waiting to happen. That is actually is not waiting to happen, it is already happening.

And if you ever work in my office, I invite anyone, any politician listening to this, to come to my office and watch a whole day with children with Autism and adults with Alzheimer's Disease. And when you actually see that you can reverse many cases of autism by simply protecting the children from the exposure to Wi-Fi. You don't need any scientific study you know to see the results of that.

And when you see that you can reverse at least many of the early cases of Alzheimer's Disease, by simply protecting the adult from the exposure to Wi-Fi. You don't need a scientific study to tell you that you're in the midst of a huge disaster. The same as with women that are infertile. Some of that is reversible by protecting them from Wi-Fi.

So, in short, the 2.4 gigahertz used in 3G and most of the 3G, was an absolute disaster. That was very well documented in the scientific literature. And we had expected the common sense would prevail that the studies that are out, at least would have led to other good studies that would have shown that this is unsustainable for the human evolution. And that has not happened.

I want to remind the people that are watching this, that several years ago was a court case in Italy. Where a young man died of brain cancer and then his mother sued the company that he was working for, that had forced him to use the cell phone all day long. And so, the judge in his wisdom, did a very simple thing in Court. He had the side that defended the client make a pile of all the scientific study studies that showed Wi-Fi causes brain cancer and is dangerous.

And the other side, the industry, making a pile of papers of the things that show Wi-Fi was safe. And it was much, much, larger pile. And then the judge, having Italian common sense. Said, "Okay, now, let's remove all the papers that were sponsored by the Wi-Fi industry." And that pile went to zero. And the other pile said the same it was before. And the judge ruled that the Wi-Fi industry is at fault. Or that the workplace is at fault for causing brain cancer and that case stands.

I wished American judges would use the same kind of wisdom. That's a problem in America, is that the judges are elected officials. They don't even have to study law to become a judge. And it's a disaster that sometimes people become judges, that never even graduated from high school. So, reading or understanding science or scientific study is not

part of their armamentarium. So, America is heading for a big disaster in that way.

Just to maybe say this very clearly, twelve years ago we did some measurements for autistic children. Basically, we had a control group of ten healthy children and ten autistic kids. We went to their homes with a mother was when she was pregnant. And we constructed the same Wi-Fi router, and the same conditions, and measured at the moms that gave birth to a child that was later diagnosed with autism. They were exposed to over twenty fold the amount of Wi-Fi radiation than the mothers that gave birth to a child they gave birth to a normal typical child. More than twenty fold. I tried at the time to get the study published. I couldn't find anybody interested. In fact, I got one threatening letter back until I decided to call it that the time wasn't right for it.

So, since then, however, I've been treating the autistic children to come to my practice very rigorously. That the condition number one, on day one, of the first visit. The parents get the Wi-Fi talk of how they need to protect the child. And they need to get rid of the Wi-Fi router all together in the house. And you just switch off the fuses at night. They need to get a sleep sanctuary. You know, the protective clothing over their bed and the kids need to wear protective clothing.

Josh: And so, what you're seeing results Dietrich, in cutting the Wi-Fi and protecting autistic kids from Wi-Fi radiation, especially in their sleeping areas. What else in terms of protective measures has worked and is working to help their health?

Dr. Klinghardt: Let me be very clear. So, there are daytime strategies. There are nighttime strategies. And there is external protection and there is internal protection. Let me go through that.

So, the nighttime strategy is pretty clear. At nighttime, we request the children have the sleep sanctuary that is like a mosquito net, the silver corded cloth. Now, there are newer materials that are coming out now that are probably more suited to shield against the 5G. We don't know that for sure yet. But the Swiss Shield was a name of the cloth, that the mosquito net was sewn from. It has to be over the child and under the child and make a faraday cage. What people forgot very often is that the shield needs to be grounded. There needs to be a wire coming from that conductive cloth running into the Earth. That was a foul compromise to use the Earth in the electric outlets. For the worst case, that is the only thing we can do if they live in the seventh floor of a high-rise apartment, we could not request that they run a wire from the center of the house down to the ground. And so, we use the ground in the outlet. So, that's number one.

Number two, the Sleep Sanctuary becomes dangerous if you have

strong pulsating electric fields in the room. So, we requested at least that room, the fuses that are responsible for the electric outlets in that room and the electric wiring in the walls of the room. They have to be out for the night. Ideally the whole house. That's the nighttime strategy that works.

Daytime strategy is even that with autistic kids, parents have to get a wired connection. The router has to be off. Has to be on a mode that doesn't broadcast. Now, it used to be a simple thing in the computer where you could switch off the broadcasting option of the Wi-Fi router. Now, the modern routers do no longer have that option. They are intentionally wired in a way that you cannot switch them off. And so, we bag them. You know, we have a company, LittleTreeGroup.com in Seattle, she's a retired woman. She sews these bags out of the Swiss Shield and you can single or double bag the Wi-Fi router to make sure it's off.

So, that's one part. But during the daytime, when the kid runs around. We have two strategies that work wonders. One is to protect the clothing. I know there is a lot of stupid discussion going on. People have a strong opinion that the clothing is dangerous and doesn't work. And people having to repeat that it does work. Well, I have twenty years of experience that it does work. I don't give a hoot about anybody's opinion. The clothing does work. Metal deflects Wi-Fi. And basically, we want to turn the children in the knight in shining armor. Where a lot of the body area that is covered with deflective cloth, the better the children are doing. That solves the main part of the external protection.

But the internal protection is first of all, there are several natural products that hugely enhance the ability of the body to not absorb the waves. And that is rosemary, propolis from the bees, or coriander. And so, there is a British company, KI Science, makes a product called Ray Wave. So, we have all the children on that. And then the more they take, the more stable they are.

A second company has also developed a skin cream that makes the skin reflective of Wi-Fi. It contains saffron and several other really precious herbal ingredients. There is nothing chemical in it. And so, we found when the kids are basically lathered up in the cream in the morning and then they go to whatever they go to, special schools and special kindergartens. Or at home and some electric circuits are on because the parents need to work, and they need to have lights. And the fridge needs to be on. That has been hugely protective. It's called the E-Shield cream and lotion.

I could go into details, maybe one more detail that we found. This is more for adults with electro hypersensitivity. We have found that if you give astronomically high amount of methylated folate, that almost

everybody within three to four months becomes neurotypical in terms of their responses to the Wi-Fi environment, being outside in the electronic environment, or being close to a cell phone tower. They no longer have the neurological symptoms. But this is like twenty to fifty milligrams of methylated folate. Which many practitioners are scared of this. The small possible cancer link later in life. But it's absolutely life-saving for a lot of my extremely high percentage of patients. So, that's a little bit on the internal protection.

Josh: Let me just jump in there quickly. Is there a specific brand or type of methylated folate, that you found best?

Dr. Klinghardt: No, no. It's now marketed by many vitamin companies. But most of them have offered point five milligrams or one milligram. There is one company, I forgot what the name of it is. Metabolic something? They produce at least a ten and twenty milligram methylated folate, makes it a lot easier. Especially for the autistic kids. Now many autistic kids are on the methylated and there are certain symptoms, I'm not going to go into that. And then when you actually give them high doses of methylation after a few months it flips that they become hyper methylated. And then you need to stop. But you recognize it that the behavior gets better, and better, and better. Even in electric environments, and then suddenly it flips as if they are having a flare-up. And then you know that they are now over methylated, and you have to stop for a few months. And it cycles, forth and back between under and over.

But I think these are sort of like a big stroke. But the important thing for me is, that it was absolutely stunning and amazing for me. That it could really say that there are two groups of autistic children. The ones that get dramatically better and the ones that don't. And the ones that are getting dramatically better are the ones that following my EMR protection to a tee. And the ones that are not getting better are the ones that think they are following it. But when I ask them unrehearsed. "Okay, what is it that you're actually doing?" I realize, they are making one mistake or another. They may have the sleep canopy, but they are not grounding it. Or they may even ground it, but they leave the fuses on for the electric circuitry in the room. Or they don't do any of the daytime protection. Or they don't do the methylation.

So, there is usually something missing. But I think the truth is, you know, we've established firmly in my clinical experience. That the exposure to Wi-Fi has led to the biggest health crisis of our time. Destroying the lives of children. And you know, when I say autism, yes that's the extreme. But the less injury is the hyperactivity that attention deficit in children that is now the new normal. And the kids instead of getting the advice to limit the Wi-Fi exposure and the radio wave exposure. They are put on Adderall, and Ritalin, and all the drugs. They have come down with the

whole list of developmental problems that express themselves later in life. That means these kids are crippled for life. Or really are becoming drug dependent for the rest of their life.

Which you may think sometimes maybe an intent that's going to work in the whole thing. You know, they lose their freedoms. And their medical independence early on in life. Instead of being directed at what's causing the hyperactivity or the attention deficit. But are being directed at here's a pharmaceutical solution. That sort of makes you tolerate the environment better.

Maybe, one more last thing to this. Hope you're also observing, since I've done this long enough. When a parent is exposed to constant bombardment with electromagnetic radiation. I will get into that later. But they have increased food allergies, they have increased brain fog, and a variety of symptoms that they are not relating to the electromagnetic exposure. If these parents have children, they are already negative response of the parents, will be quadruple or increased more in the offspring.

And the offspring will be extremely electrosensitive. And if these children, and I have some in the third general now have children. Their children will be autistic. So, there is a cascade of worsening from generation to generation. And we understand now that the Wi-Fi amongst many of its other blessings, is that it damages the DNA. And that is what causes problems onto the next generation. And it goes up exponentially.

Let's say in the first generation. You have a hundred genes damaged. In the next generation there will be two thousand. And in the next generation, it would be all the genes. And we only have twenty-three thousand. So, it's not that much.

Josh: Is there a certain threshold which you go past? And then you haven't seen any evidence of repair, possible? The DNA for example, doesn't repair? But like it does up to a certain threshold? What can you tell us in terms of reversibility or irreversibility of these types of damage?

Dr. Klinghardt: I mean this is from clinical observation from people smarter than me. There is a synergistic effect in history. So, the higher the amount of vaccines that the child has gotten, the more electro sensitivity the next generation will be. So, let's say you grow up fairly normally at the normal vaccine program. If you have children that predicts the level of electro hypersensitivity normally.

We should define that. So, everybody is to the same degree electrosensitive. No matter what. You get the same cancer rates, you get the same grade of food allergies, of headaches, and all that. Electro

hypersensitivity is a smaller group amongst us humans that has also allergic phenomena. That means they get muscle activation, they get like in addition to the chronic problems, they get acute problems. So, when I refer to electro sensitivity, I refer to what we are all sensitive to.

And there is a number of environmental factors that we see consistently that makes us more sensitive. And so, one of the histories. One is the presence of mercury, amalgam fillings of metal crowns. The study just came out with children with orthodontic work, that the Wi-Fi environment determines how much nickel is released from the wires that they have in the mouth. And that nickel toxicity causes a severe allergic phenomenon in the system. So, there's a whole host of interactions that we all have with the Wi-Fi environment. That are very well published now. And they're all pointing at the facility in the middle of a disaster.

The wonderful thing is, as you know, the whole disaster could be ended with the switch of one single switch. Switching it off, we would all be protected.

Josh: Yeah. Yeah, so switching off your Wi-Fi router or protecting it with one of those groups, from Little Tree Group for example. Right? So, it can't remit wireless. It's using a wired mouse, wired keyboard. It's getting the transmitting smart meter off of your house. Opting out or whatever you need to do there. Basically, using a cellphone as little as possible. Like zero, ideally. And not letting your kids use it, right? Can you talk a little bit about these types of quick things that people can do? And maybe perhaps add to that list?

Dr. Klinghardt: Yeah. The cell phone use is very hard to control in kids. We have a rule here in England, in the community that I live in. Where the kids have to be at least fifteen years old before they can get a phone. And then the phone use has to be limited by the parents. Especially they are not allowed to use it in the evening because that destroys the melatonin production. And sets up limits to the neurological development of the brain. The memory, the learning, all that gets impaired. So, there are some pretty strict rules.

Of course, kids should only be texting. Most will not follow that advice. The limited use of the phone is, of course, up to the parents to establish that kind of relationship with the kids. That they can push that through. It's very, very difficult now to be a parent these days because of that. But we do know that the cell phone use of teenagers and of children is destroying the humanity of the brain. It is limiting the brain development in a way that certain aspects of humanity, like compassion and considering others, are the first parts of the brain that get disabled. And that is a very scary development.

And so, with the YouTube system, this loudspeaker system you plug in the headphone, but not the usual headphone. But that users get plastic tubes that conduct the sounds in your ears. That is a very good system when you want to make a phone call. But kids and teenagers have not taken to that because they have to fiddle with it a little bit before they can put it on. So, it has failed in our world. The real thing is that people should keep a wired connection at home. And should give the kids their own wire connection in their own room. Where they can make the evening, phone calls with their friends and all that. It should not be done on the cell phone.

And then of course the strength of the signal diminishes with the square of the distance. So, when people use a loudspeaker, they can't have the phone a foot or foot and half away from the mouth. It's a huge reduction in damage of course with that. There are some obvious details that we require only common sense were people don't really need to have an understanding of physics.

You have become sort of the world expert on the smart meters. And we're very excited about this box from England that reduces the signal from the smart meters by wiring it to the electric system in the house. I'm sure you are going to let people know about that development in your own part. But we look at it as a very exciting development to diminish some of the damage that comes in from the outside.

Josh: Yeah, we are interviewing Terry Stoughton as part of the Summit. Who has the technology that gets rid of the dirty power, the dirty electricity at the root. And there are other technologies as well to block the wireless. You know, in the in the process of solving this greater problem. And getting these things off everyone's houses. But there are some encouraging developments in the past year that even utilities are seeing that there's no return. There's no real benefit that even they're getting from this horrible technology. In light of the risk, and the liability, and the fires, and everything.

So, I wanted to just to dive in more about the comparison. What could you tell us about 3G and 4G? And now 5G? What is your understanding of the differences in these technologies?

Dr. Klinghardt: So, 4G, I can't really comment on because somehow that development was skipped in England. We still have 3G here. But in London, the roll out in certain sections of London with 5G. I never had the opportunity to get clinical experience in the 4G environment. But I can I think quite competently talk about 5G.

So, first of all, the technology behind it is quite complex. And what I said at the beginning, the damaging effect of the cell phone radiation is not just the amplitude of what you are getting. But it is also frequency

specific, the damage. When I first got into the 5G discussion, one expert says, "Well, it's 3.4 gigahertz." I said, "Great, we can handle that." And then somebody else say, "No, no. It's ten to thirty gigahertz." And as it turns out, there is actually a wide variety of frequencies used. At least twenty-two, I think Barry identified. And the one that rolled out already in London is twenty-eight gigahertz in several sections. And that's an enormous increase in frequency.

And in general, the biological effects can be predicted to some degree. I know from my mentors in biophysics and this is really what we're talking about at the end of the day. It's all about biophysics. How is this aspect of physics interfering with our biology? And we know that the human bio field uses frequencies in the ranges from ten to thirty gigahertz. That has been measured and established by clever Russian scientists fifteen years ago, twenty years ago.

As soon as there were instruments that could measure it. And this is exactly the range now, where we will broadcast the entire population with man-made frequencies. That are resistent in the same range with a human body is producing its own frequencies that are important for the cell to cell communication. But also, the way our organism communicates with its field, with the plants around us, with other people, with our pets. And so, the expectation that I have from this is that it's going to be dehumanizing us. It may not even have visible, on the surface, clear medical effects that can be measured. But it will certainly have huge effects on the more subtle aspects of humanity. I'm saying, no question. It's exactly in those frequency ranges were our higher functions of consciousness of compassion of love are.

I cannot go away from the thought that may be intentional. That this has been long planned. Because we had other technologies. We had fiber optic systems which were fantastic. And they were healthy for us. And there was a decision made at some point. You know, kind of go intelligently here or are we going to go to the total destruction of the human condition. The trouble with 5G is that it needs a more dense network of cell phone towers because of the nature of it.

And the idea is that we'll also line country roads and more rural areas so that they can be part of this beautiful development. Elon Musk, you know, is planning on sending twelve hunderd satellites up in the air. I'm invited to actually talk to one of his family members to talk sense into them. Another problem to that, Musk is not a bad person, but just ignorant of misinformed, like most people are.

I think the main point that people need to know is that none of the frequency ranges that are coming towards us. Have been evaluated for the effects on anything living, you know. The FCC and other institutions that are controlling this development. Frequency bands are sold by the

government to the suppliers. And so, the government greedy as any government in the world is. And hugely money consuming machine. They used to sell off land when it was available. Now, they are selling off frequency bands. And of course, it's good business. So, there is absolutely no consideration given what these frequency bands will do to us humans.

So, I'm sure you have other speakers say the same thing. But it is just absolutely appalling because in the U.S., we have a special arrangement that the industry can do anything they want. And only if there is evidence of harm, then people can sue, and then the technology can be removed or lessened. In Europe, it is the other way around. That the industry should first show that there is no harm. And of course, they use to stupid standards of cell phone radiation heating up the body. So, they use a standard of biological testing that is absolutely inadequate. But there is a little bit more protection in Europe.

The truth is, with all of us self-appointed experts, the technology is kept secret so far what actually will be used. And what's used in one location may not be the same as it is used another location. And basically, it's a huge experiment rollout. And probably will be found in some locations, everybody goes blind. And in another location, all the insects die. And in another location, all the people die. And then maybe one of the frequency bands doesn't actually do harm. And then, they will eventually, hopefully, be crystallized out. And then they won't be used. But until then, there is going to be a lot of damage. We know that for sure.

Josh: I think that what you said, also, about you're starting to really, you know question the intent of this technology. Something that would lend support to that, you know idea, that perhaps at a high enough level. Even though not everybody perhaps within the industry and government is in on it. Perhaps at a high enough level, this is being done on purpose to you know, perhaps minimize or reduce the population, to strengthen the grip of the pharmaceutical industry as you described earlier with the drugs and how they're being prescribed. But we know that as early as the 1970s. Dr. Klinghardt, as you know, most of our audience knows. But just connecting this dot, thousands of studies were already published by the 1970s on the effects of microwave radiation. And also, a considerable number of studies on the effects of millimeter wave radiation.

So, those results were known, right? So, this is maybe in some ways, it's an experiment against the Nuremberg Code. You can't experiment on people without their consent. But in other ways, perhaps, there's a deeper thing happening here that we really need to, you know, bravely look into.

So, I wanted to just to dive in. A couple more questions about the wireless and the solutions. And then maybe we'll finish with some dot connecting information for our audience. Can you talk about, are there other technologies that you haven't mentioned yet? That you really recommend for people to protect from wireless and millimeter wave radiation? Like what else works? And is there anything else in addition to the list that you mentioned previously?

Dr. Klinghardt: One of the big successes in our practice was to detoxify people for metals. So, all of us have a significant toxic metal burden. Lead is in everybody's bones. Cadmium from the car exhaust. Substantial number of people are mercury toxic, you know from eating fish. From many, many other sources, even ambient air. And the iron content, you know, even in the system plays a huge role. Meat eaters have a lot more iron in their system than others. And it's the metals that are mostly resonant with the Wi-Fi. That means the Wi-Fi would go through us if it would be just would be water. In fact, over the duck experiment, that water has been good at deflecting Wi-Fi. And so, a big strategy is to detox people from heavy metals. I think in the context it is interesting that with the announcement that 5G is going to be new deal. Pretty much the same day the FDA in the US stopped the availability of DMPS. The main drug that we need to get these metals out of people.

On the same day that the FDA that 5G is safe and that we are going to go forward. They ruled no more metal detox agent. You know, the main metal detox agent was removed from the list of things that is available. For no reason, there were no incidents, there were no cases of death or anything of that. So, I think it shows like the sinister part of that very well. So, yes detoxing metals is a huge issue.

We were experimenting with different waters right now. One of the things that we are very excited about is a water that will removal all the aluminum toxins. And aluminum is resonant with Wi-Fi by certain frequencies. And KiScience is actually is a main aluminum researcher in the world. And he found a water full of organic silica compounds, different ones, hundreds of different compounds that actually very quickly leached out aluminum from our system.

And he found that when people drink that water, for just six weeks, they become much more stable in Wi-Fi environments. It is called Acilis water. That's basically [inaudible 42:14] spelled backwards. And now I know, KiScience has it available. So, the metal detox, of course, I have been lecturing on heavy metal detox for decades. But it has become an amazingly effective tool and making people stable in the high Wi-Fi environments.

I'm sure, when I actually talk with patients, I have a lot more ideas. I'm just blanking out right now with what else we're doing.

Josh: No, you have already provided so much value here. Just in this string of things that are working that people can do. And so, we encourage everyone just to do your own research on these. And start to engage in these solutions for yourself, and your kids, and your parents, and the elderly.

Dr. Klinghardt: Maybe, there is one more thing. Metals reflect Wi-Fi. And that's going to be the same for the 5G. Whatever higher frequencies are used, they are actually going to have to turn up the power up quite a lot to penetrate buildings. So, you have reception on the inside. The original compromise that I would have swallowed was that every house gets a little antenna on the outside there conducts the Wi-Fi signal on the inside. And then the Wi-Fi signal on the outside and the public places available to everybody would have been a fraction of what is needed now to penetrate through concrete buildings and get to the inside. And so, the idea right now to put the cell phone tower every hundred yards or so, is ridiculous. And I like to get this off my chest, you know, sort of. None of the people that I know, reasonable people, have ever asked for the need for 5G. You were quite happy with 3G. It was doing everything. We could stream films. And we could do things.

I just had a meeting with one of the high up executives of AT&T. And they're all totally excited about the new possibilities of what 5G can do. The faster networks can do in industrial settings. But then when I went down the list and I'm not going to spill the beans here, because I'm not allowed to. None of these things are serving anybody in a normal state of mind. These are all special applications. I mean who in the world was asking for a driverless car? I mean it, let's face it, you know, so my greatest joy is in the morning to get in the car and put the music on, and be in my own world there. And having that displaced by driverless car. And the driverless car is the only thing that makes the 5G necessary. And also, will make it necessary that every hundred yards or so. There is a cell phone tower that is emitting device.

So, meaning that there is not going to be any spaces left for us to be in a Wi-Fi poorer environment. So, the driverless car basically destroys the surface of the planet to make it a livable space. And it's very clear, where there is a driverless car space. The roads are prepared for that. There will not be any bees. There will not be any insects. And therefore, there will not be any songbirds. So, you are replacing songbirds and the beauty of life with driverless cars. I don't think anybody is really asking for that. I don't think beauty generated that far.

Josh: Yeah, as part of the Summit, Dr. Timothy Shaklee, is interviewed. And I just encourage everyone again to check out that interview. He kind of destroys the argument, that even if we wanted driverless cars. 5G is not needed, number one. He lays the foundation for even better than having, you mentioned, the idea of just a small Wi-Fi signal to the house

and then the house is wired. He actually gives examples of cities that have wired their local infrastructure. They've gone not the way of small cells. But they have gone the way of fiber. They've regained control of their own communications infrastructure in doing so. And so, he talks about how local governments and communities can wire to the home and to corporate buildings and companies.

So, okay five questions left. Not a lot of time left. So, maybe we will aim for like thirty to second seconds per question. Are you ready? Are there any lab tests on patients that you do or have done, that can reveal the degree to which they've been exposed or protected to or from microwave radiation?

Dr. Klinghardt: Absolutely and that may be a shocker to some of the people are listening to this. So, the first one is the LDL cholesterol, the oxidized form of LDL cholesterol. Which is going sky high in most people. And so, you got two choices. You can switch it off or you can take the cholesterol-lowering drugs that shorten your life in general. That's number one.

Number two is insulin resistance. And we have now consistently observed that the Hemoglobin A1C and other indicators of insulin resistance are matching up proportional to your exposures and come down when you reduce exposures. It's a really big one.

Maybe a third one and that's a \$2.00 version of it. When exposed to Wi-Fi, your white blood count goes down, you know. So, if your white blood count is lower than 5,500 which is sort of 5,500 to 6,000 is the normal. If it goes down to 4,000 or 3,500. Yes, it can be an indicator of a chronic viral infection, parasites, and all that. But most likely it's an indicator of too high Wi-Fi exposure.

So, these are the three things that are consistent now. The other ones are all the hormones, basically in women the progesterone goes way down with the Wi-Fi exposure. Your thyroid hormones go down. In men, the testosterone and the thyroid go down. And goes up again when you are sufficiently protecting yourself.

Maybe last one is another cheap test, is the saliva hormone test. Where you measure the saliva cortisone test. Where you measure four times a day, you measure your cortisone levels and one time you measure right before you go to bed. And the other one in the morning. And if it is high at midnight. So, you go to bed and then you spit in the sink. And if it's high at midnight, you know that your exposure in the home is way too high. Because that's indicating sustained stress levels.

And so, these are a couple of indicators. I could make a long longer list of that. But these are the easy ones to get for everybody.

Josh: For good, thank you. Question two, Lyme Disease, there appears to be a very solid link between Lyme and those who experience electro sensitivity symptoms, right? You've talked about that before. But you're talking about very specific tea that you've found to very good for overcoming Lyme. Tell us about that?

Dr. Klinghardt: Yeah, the plant is called *Cistus Incanus*. It's from Sardinia. And when you drink tea, it has the highest borrelia-cidal properties. It means that it kills borrelia, but it is also very, very strong. And is retroviral and has a number of other properties against infections and detoxifies. And it's an ideal tool. And we get it straight from Sardinia. But again, it's also a KiScience product. It's a fantastic tool. It has made the treatment of Lyme Disease so easy. Maybe in connection with that, it's very, very clear that Lyme Disease without Wi-Fi is easy to treatment. And in a Wi-Fi environment, good luck. The same in a mold environment. And if you want to heal mold illness, you have to reduce life exposure.

Josh: Yeah, thank you. So, that mold question was my number three. So, thank you for answering that. But the *Cistus*, can you spell that for us? Is it C-I-S-T-U-S?

Dr. Klinghardt: Yes.

Josh: And what was the second word? Incarnate?

Dr. Klinghardt: I-N-C-A-N-U-S, incanus.

Josh: Excellent. Thank you. So, do you want to briefly say anything else about the wireless and mold connection? The science has conclusively shown that they work together, right? Like the more Wi-Fi, the more mold growth.

Dr. Klinghardt: We just did an experiment in England, a student of mine. She grows mushrooms. And she put a growth plate for medical mushrooms, you know in a corner in the house. And she saw some growth. And then she put equivalent culture next to the Wi-Fi router. And those mushrooms were like five times bigger than the other ones. This is simple. Mushrooms and molds are the same species.

So, I did an experiment with the Swiss researcher years ago. Where we could show mold culture to Wi-Fi, it becomes several hundred times more virulent, more bioactive. Excreting more biotoxins than it would otherwise if it's not bombarded with Wi-Fi. And so, it's very clear to me that mold illness, in its extreme form that now, pretty much everybody has. The mold sensitivity of people has in homes, is largely driven by the Wi-Fi environment. And also, homes that have a little bit of mold. That were never a problem before are now a problem. Because the little bit of mold that's there is producing hundreds of times more biotoxins than

before. And it becomes a problem now. So, the treatment to clean up a home from mold, it's not enough to exchange the C Drug and clean out the bathroom. You have to turn it off, you have to turn off the Wi-Fi.

Josh: Yeah. Thank you. So, you've talked about mushrooms, there are certain kinds of mushrooms that can actually help, right? So, mushrooms aren't necessarily bad to ingest. Can you quickly touch on that?

Dr. Klinghardt: You know, we have been experimenting right now. I didn't really want to give that away. But we are experimenting right now with a different mushroom extracts and it looks like the incredible ability to resist radiation of any sort that mushrooms have in general. Some of the mushroom species current can give you, by eating them, can give you that type of resistance or that kind of ability to deal with radiation. So, eating certain mushrooms is protective against Wi-Fi.

Josh: That sounds like a paradox though, right? Because you're saying like mushrooms and mold grow more when they are outside of your body when they are exposed to Wi-Fi. But when you eat them, you are saying they help. That they are defense.

Dr. Klinghardt: We actually thought in the past that molds on the walls grow because they are upset about the Wi-Fi. But it actually is, that they can use the radiation for their own growth. So, they are really different elements. We know from Jonah Breeland, and the Japanese's disaster, that the only thing growing in those contaminated areas are the mushrooms. They are wild and huge. And incredible. So, by mushrooms have a protective mechanism against radiation built in themselves, that is conveyed to you when you eat them.

But it's too early. Because it's certainly not all mushrooms. It's certain ones. And we are just now exploring that. And there certainly will be some mushroom products, medicinal mushrooms that will be a huge help. But it's not going to be all of them.

Josh: Okay. Thank you. So, question four. Now, this is a big one. And we have to keep the answer short, we are almost out of time. You started to talk about geoengineering or chemtrails. And how this dot connects. Can you talk about this? And just summarize this quickly? And is there a link that you see between you know that agenda and the 5G agenda?

Dr. Klinghardt: Yeah, so we've had a lot of the inside information that I can't really disclose my sources of that. But just having studied the skies, you know, we know that pretty much all over the western countries, the skies are regularly sprayed with a substance that makes a gray sky. That with the obvious intent to shield us from the sun, to cool the temperatures below. That is at least on the surface what is there. So,

we have pretty good evidence. We've examined the fallout from that. Of course, what goes up, eventually comes down.

So, we have examined the fallout. It's not just an anodized aluminum, but it's actually microbeads of plastic that are spiked with aluminum, some titanium, some other metals on it. The dramatic thing happens is we are inhaling it. We get aluminum toxic. We get some microbeads of plastic in us which we get from eating fish anyway. But the main effect is the covering of the entire oceans of the planet.

And prevents the natural evaporation of the water. And so, the atmosphere, around the Earth, and just in the last twenty years. Has lost about 40% of this moisture leading to huge droughts in areas of the planet. So, there is this myth, never being told you that the plastic beads on top of the ocean from the plastic bottles that be throw away.

Well, plastic bottles do not integrate into this specific nano plastic particles. That's from the sky. So, this program is so obvious, in your face. But it is so effectively kept secret. You know where the people that speak about it are really killed and there's a lot of fake websites created. You know, how insane people out there believe that it's real. We just have to look at the sky.

But the net effect is, that we all have toxic lungs, lung cancer is the mostly deadly cancer in women. More so, than breast cancer and ovarian cancer. It's growing in spite of us having stopped smoking. And the aluminum travels from there straight to the central nervous system. And Chris, actually just finished a study showing that autistic kids have an astronomically high level of aluminum in their brain. So, the consequences of that are very severe. I also mentioned on Alzheimer's Disease in the beginning, there is a huge link with aluminum.

So, it is part of the bigger picture and of course, aluminum in the brain almost makes it a Wi-Fi antenna. So, it makes it more relevant than it was maybe twenty or thirty years ago. So, it looks like there is a concept of things kind of the be exposed to that all work together in the same way.

Josh: Okay, really quickly. Your top three things that get aluminum out of the body? Natural remedies?

Dr. Klinghardt: It's the water that I mentioned, the Acilis water, is a main one. There is an herbal mix that I developed is called Polmerlo, several herbs that are able to cleave aluminum from the brain, and from the lung tissue, and mobilize it. And the third one is a strange one, is the ionic foot bath. That's a fantastic tool. We have a particular model that are all a little different. You put your feet in for thirty minutes and there's a coil int here that creates an electromagnetic field. We did urine studies

afterwards and found that between the hour eight after the foot bath that day. That people's aluminum excretion goes up 600 to 900 percent from where it was before. And so, these are my three tools and it works fantastic.

Josh: Okay, excellent. So, we're out of time. Just closing with one last question here. This is a lot of information. So, valuable. Thank you so much for how you frame this, and how you're bringing the solutions, and you're bringing a deep level of awareness for so many people right now, Dr. Klinghardt. Thank you.

Do you have any perspective or viewpoint on the mental perspective or the world view that we can hold, so that we don't just go into fear and close down? But so that we can help this awareness spread and be solutions focused? Secondly, how do you see that going from here? With our relationship with technology in the big picture?

Dr. Klinghardt: Of course, I have to be a little bit cautious what I say because I have a medical license to lose. But it looks like now, that the form of government that we have right now. So called democracy. That they're so vulnerable to the corporate influences. Our Democratic systems of failing right now to protect the citizens. And as you know, from Michael Moore's work or so, corporations have only one responsibility and that is to create money for the people that have invested in them. And they do not have a soul. They do not have ethics. They are not life affirmative. And this increasing tendency that the government has to listen to the big corporations rather than to its people.

And so as long as the developments going in that way, expect for another few years we're going to go downhill. But the conditions on the planet are going to be so unsustainable, that there's going to be a shift again. And it's up to you, and me, and you know an increasing number of others, to raise awareness. Because at least in the Democratic countries, you need two things to govern. You need money to be elected. But you need the votes also.

And we know that there is a huge rise in activity in the green parties and recognition of the green parties. Even though, unfortunately none of the green parties know what the hell they are doing. None of the green parties, or members that I have interviewed in the last few years, have had any understanding of the dangers of the cell phone radiation, any understanding of toxins, any understanding of the chemtrail issue. But there's an intuitive this off the followers of the green party that know something is really badly going on. We are here to educate people. So, eventually people can with the vote change the future. And it will happen. But it will be a few more sad years.

Josh: So, Dr. Klinghardt, just in closing here. Something that we are doing in addition to the Summit, at the same time, we are realizing a tool on our webpage, for anyone to quickly send an e-mail to their elected officials. Multiple elected officials just in a few seconds. They can customize it. They can e-mail. They can tweet. They can phone easily their elected reps. So, how important is it that people do that process? And educate, inform, and hold accountable their elected officials with this kind of information?

Dr. Klinghardt: I think it's the only chance we have for a better future. I think it's the most important step. You and I can educate. But ultimately, it has to be the political action that interchange of policies. That is actually needed to protect us the citizens from the corporate damage, you know, that's done. I know people high up in AT&T, as I mentioned before. There's nobody evil there. There's just people only have small compartments of knowledge. They are not aware of the huge damage that they're participating in. There may be a small group of people behind wherever we see that is aware of this. And that funnels their intent into these technologies. That is something that I don't know for sure. But it looks like it.

Josh: Dr. Klinghardt, thank you so much for your time today. I appreciate it so much. You are just giving this value, wisdom, and information to all of us. I really appreciate it.

Dr. Klinghardt: Thanks Josh, and we connect when I'm back in your neighborhood. Yeah?

Josh: Yeah, sounds good.

Safeguarding Your Home from 5G and EMF

Guest: Larry Gust

Josh del Sol: Joining us on the summit today is Building Biology and Environmental Consultant Larry Gust. Larry, welcome to the summit.

Larry Gust: Thank you, Josh. It's pleasant to be here.

Josh del Sol: It's great to talk with you again. You and I first spoke, I think, in 2013 in L.A. where we screening an early addition of *Take Back Your Power*. And it was excellent to meet you then. And you've been doing really life-changing work for a lot of people and a lot of clients in your area. On how they can make their home safer. This is one of the main topics of discussion here in the community in the summit.

Larry, I'm so excited about this talk because you're going to identify the causes of EMF radiation, one by one. And then we're going to get into specific solutions. Things that you do for your clients.

And so, I'm so excited about that. We're going to dive right in. And before we do so, I'm just going to share with the audience out there a little bit about your background.

Larry Gust is the president of the Board of Directors of the Building Biology Institute. He is an electrical engineer and also has expertise as a past certified mold remediator. In addition to helping lead the organization, Larry is a Certified Building Biology Environment Consultant, as mentioned, and a Certified Electromagnetic Radiation Specialist through the institute. Since 1996, Larry has been teaching classes for the institute. And for 25 years before then, Larry was

manufacturing product development and total quality management for Mobil Oil Corporation until he saw the light.

So you've went from kind of doing some mid to upper-level management work in Mobil Oil to really changing people's lives for the better. How many clients, how people, families you'd say you've worked with as a building biologist?

Larry Gust: Josh, it's been 26 years. I mean it's really difficult, 2,600, 2,000. Something like that. Atlanta, Georgia first. San Diego second. And then Los Angeles, the greater Los Angeles area now.

Josh del Sol: Excellent. Yeah, that's great. What is building biology?

Larry Gust: Well building biology was born in the post-war era in Germany when some people they were architects, builders, environmental doctors, noticed there was a degradation in health among people with post-WWII construction methods and materials. And they decided they would need to study that. And what was born then was building biology.

If you think of all of these different disciplines, they're kind of siloed and they don't talk and so building biology brings them together. So we can take a look at all of the different aspects and come up with a more health supporting indoor environment.

Primarily, we're looking at homes. But this certainly applies to businesses as well.

Josh del Sol: Okay. Would you agree that the main focus of the building biologists has become electromagnetic radiation? Is that correct?

Larry Gust: Gosh. Unfortunately, that's true, Josh. I mean I have done the full gamut of building biology trade. Which is mold, chemicals, dust, water. However, electromagnetic pollution represents a larger portion of my practice today. Because it's just so ubiquitous. And so problematic.

Josh del Sol: Okay. So let's dive in then to the sources. Tell us about the sources of electromagnetic radiation that we and us all are faced within our homes.

Larry Gust: Yeah. So let's do that. I call it man-made electromagnetic radiation. Because there's natural radiation coming from the cosmos, from the earth, and we've grown up with that. And our bodies are used to dealing with that.

But the man-made radiation our bodies are not. And that takes the form what I call power system radiation. That is what comes along with

electricity that you have put into your house and have run through every wall and lights at the top of the room. Creating, if you can just think of it, a mesh of wires, a cage of wires that surround you on the walls and the floors sometimes. And in the ceilings.

And those create particular kinds of radiations. Which we'll talk about as we get into that in more detail.

And then that was really important 10/15 years ago. And I've been at this, as I said, 26 years. And we made a lot of improvements in people's health when we took care of those things.

But with the advent of wireless age, we have gotten radiofrequency, or high frequency, or communications radiation, have come into our environment from outside. And people have embraced the technology. And they have polluted their own environments with things that they buy and put into their houses. That are actually making them sick or will make them sick eventually.

Those are the two areas. I might also, before we move on, Josh, add that with power system fields you have magnetic fields. Which generally comes from wiring or being to close outside magnetic fields sources. And electric fields which comes off the wires. And it happens because that's the way we wired our homes. We could have done it differently. But we didn't.

And then believe it or not with the advent of all of the electronics that we have today, we have certain devices called nonlinear power supplies that create, dirty electricity is the popular term for that. We call it micro surge electrical pollution.

The industry has used the term electromagnetic interference or EMI for a long time. EMI is actually talking about how this dirty electricity can interfere with the operation of devices, not so much as how it interferes with the operation of people.

Josh del Sol: Okay. So there's power system fields. Electromagnetic radiation that's associated with the power systems in our home. The wiring and the magnetic field that sort of emanates from the wiring. And then the dirty electricity or dirty power is a component of that.

And then there is the wireless, the radio frequency.

Larry Gust: That's right.

Josh del Sol: Okay. So you can talk about the radio frequency sources and that side of the equation?

Larry Gust: Yeah. So those have become the big gorilla in the room. And you have to think about where it's coming from. So there's a typical cell phone system. Principally comprised of the third generation system or 3G, or the fourth generation system or 4G, and then the roll-out of the fifth generation system or called 5G. Which is a topic of conversation in this entire get together.

So that's outside. So you can't do anything about outside except shield against that. And I think we'll talk about that a bit later.

Josh del Sol: And also, take action and talk to your government and get together. But yes, yes. So we're talking about mitigation. I heard somebody's question out there. You can't do anything about it. I heard that.

So we're talking about mitigation within the home. So yes, please continue.

Larry Gust: Yeah. Just to amplify what you said, I mean we need to go to the state level and get the state to object to the fact that our freedom locally has been taken away. And together with the states who've got the resources and the lawyers to fight with the federal government, that we can get something done to all of those laws that have been enacted back in 1992.

And then the extensions of those that allow the government to tell local people what they can and can't do. So that's an aside from what I am here to talk about today. But it's vitally important if people get off of their duffs and go do something active in their communities. Because it's all forming up now.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. How can concerned are you about 5G rollout?

Larry Gust: I'm very concerned about 5G. Concerned because hidden in the wrapping in that so-called 5G is the lately discovered factor that they're putting 4G antennas on the poles of 5G antennas. And there's some difference between 4G and 5G.

Now, 5G doesn't run unless there's demand for the service for some sort of data-heavy thing, like a videotape. But 4G is like we got right now. It runs all of the time. But now it's going to be outside of your house by your bedroom window. And this is a tremendous downside to what's being proposed here.

Josh del Sol: Okay. So there's two main categories, the power system related electromagnetic radiation. And the wireless. Let's talk about specifics now. On the power system side, we know that smart meters, advanced metering infrastructure, whatever you want to call them.

Digital meters contribute to an increased level of dirty electricity. The voltage transits we talked about.

Larry Gust: Yeah. I mean that's kind of on the cusp between outside sources and inside sources. Because it's hanging on your house as well as your neighbors' house. And the RF high-frequency RF transmissions from those devices are still going to be an issue. Especially if they're right opposite your windows from your neighbors.

There's a certain amount of that RF transmission that's going out from the meter that gets on the wiring and comes into your house on the wiring. And as you mentioned a second ago, and there is a dirty electricity component associated with those meters. Because there's a nonlinear power supply inside the meter to be able to make the electronics work. So they can do what they've been intended to do.

However, I will say, taken with all of the rest of the dirty electricity sources that exist in your neighbors' houses and in the typical house that most people have today. The contribution by the meter isn't particularly large and we've had a very difficult time finding the dirty electricity. Which is a much lower frequency signal. On house wiring because of all of the other hash and dirt that's already there.

But the radio frequency signal is something else, again. Which was never on your wiring until we put these meters in.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. And the radio frequency energy it seems to use the wiring in the house as an antenna. So it goes throughout the house with every pulse that that meter does. Have you found that?

Larry Gust: Well, it does go on the wiring. I don't know that they purposely use it as an antenna.

Josh del Sol: No, not for a functional perspective. But just as a side effect, yeah.

Larry Gust: RF will get into any kind of metal. It'll get on your wiring. It'll get on your pipes. Your water pipes. Gets on your heating ducts. It just follows every potential path around the house.

Josh del Sol: Okay. So we're talking smart meters. Now what do you recommend people do if they have a smart meter on their house and what strategies do you help them with, with regards to that?

Larry Gust: Well here in California you can opt-out. And that was a hard one that was brought about by a citizens' group that fought our public utility commission until they caved-in and allowed an opt-out. That's true in other areas of the country.

But some states or localities don't have that and it's another fight you have to take to your public utilities commission to give you the right to have that meter removed from your house.

That's the first step.

You could move the meter potentially, depending upon your property status and distances and all. And who would pay for it to have it moved off of your house to a post away from your house? And do you shield that post from your house so that the radiations from the meter are not coming toward your house? I've done that in one particular case in Florida.

So that's the way to deal with it.

There are some filtration mechanisms that we could look at for the dirty electricity component that you put on the entire electrical system. We'll talk about that in a while that would deal with the so-called dirty electricity coming from the meter.

It's a lot more difficult to be filtering out radiation that's out at one gigahertz. Or 2.4 gigahertz that these meters would be using. Either they're going to be transmitting on their local area network back to the power company or they're going to be talking with your appliances in the house. And those appliances are going to be reporting back what they are doing. And that information is going to go from the appliance to the meter.

We didn't hit on that, but that's another internal source that you could have in your house with modern appliances. Which is like having them for a WIFI transmitter. In your refrigerator. In your washer. In your dryer. And you have to work hard to determine if what you're buying has that. Because most people in the sales trade don't know what you're talking about. The salesman or the saleswoman you deal with at the store. You will have to do your own research to figure out if you can get something that does not have that in it.

The push is to make everything like that. So the power company can turn off your air conditioner if there's a power consumption peak. Or they can turn off your service if they don't like you or if you're not paying your bill without anybody having to come out to your house.

So that kind of covers the outside sources from the cell phone system.

We didn't talk about if you're very close like we are in California, it's only ten feet to my neighbors' house. What if they've got a nice powerful WIFI sitting on the wall in their house right next to my house. So that's another external source that could be an issue.

A cordless telephone that they might have would be an issue. People now like their cordless phones. They can get them, walk out their front door, down the block a couple of hundred feet and still get reception. So these have grown more powerful over the years in order to provide that kind of performance.

Josh del Sol: Before we get into the specific radio frequency devices within the home. The other area I want to ask you about, what are your thoughts on compact fluorescent lights, and just fluorescent lights in general, and anything other, any other culprits related to the power system itself? And appliances?

Larry Gust: Yes. Well, there are some things that you have in your house like I do. Like my computer. My computer has a power supply that creates dirty electricity or this multi-micro surge electrical pollution. And I really can't do without it. But I don't need to have compact fluorescent lightbulbs all over the house. I've removed those. And there's no need for me to have LEDs that have power supplies in them. Because now we've moved to LEDs that don't have power supplies in them. They're just running straight off of 120 volts. And therefore they do not make this dirt.

And you can go back to regulation incandescent lightbulbs as well. Which are still available on the market. I've kind of stocked up in a couple of sizes myself. The reason for that is because the light spectrum of CFL's and LEDs is not really conducive to good eye health. Unless you're paying for an LED. And there are some out there have been made with a full spectrum where the reds aren't missing. And they toned down the blues. Which can create oxidation in the eye.

So that's not really electromagnetic radiation, what you would typically think of, but it's something you really don't want to have in your house. A bunch of light that's hurting your health over the long term.

Josh del Sol: Something I appreciate about this subject. It's so multilayered. There's so many aspects of our life and various types of technology. That we really need to start thinking about safety and mitigating.

That's why the work that you're doing is so valuable.

Okay. So everything with a power supply contributes to dirty power. We'll get into some specific mitigations for that in the solution section later on in this conversation.

Now let's focus on other sources of electromagnetic radiation in the house which we haven't talked about yet.

Larry Gust: They are manifold. Frankly, Josh, you almost need to buy yourself a low-cost RF meter.

Josh del Sol: Right. We recommend these Cornet ones. I know that there's an Acusto Meter. There's Safe Living Technologies that has a little meter.

Larry Gust: Safe and Sound Meter, yeah.

Josh del Sol: Safe and Sound, yeah. Gigahertz Solutions if you want a larger device. But absolutely. I totally agree with you. But please continue.

Larry Gust: Yeah. And I think most folks out there are probably better off with a meter that has some LEDs on it that shows you ranges. As opposed to dealing with a bunch of numbers. But that way you can always find that next device that you bring home. You actually didn't know it but it's pulsing and putting out RF.

So going back to your question about what's inside the house. The things that are inside your house have grown. It used to be it was your wireless router. And the computer that connects to the wireless router because it's a two-way street. Because you've got the emissions from your laptop, your desktop, going to the router. And you've got the emissions from the router coming back to your laptop, your desktop. What's the worst? Well, you're sitting right in front of your laptop or desktop. The radiation level there, 10,000, 20,000, 30,000 microwatts. And substantial radiation.

If you've got that printer, if you've got that router sitting right on your desk, which most people have it right in their office, right? New routers, 100,000 microwatts. Or maybe 200,000 microwatts on top of what you're getting from your computer. So you have a very, very high level of power density in the office.

Josh del Sol: Microwatts per meter squared, right?

Larry Gust: Microwatts per meter squared.

Josh del Sol: Okay. And your building biology guidelines will say that, so you mentioned 100,000, it could be 100,000, it could 200,000 from a router.

Larry Gust: One thousand, that is considered to be extreme.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. That's the threshold for extreme concern.

Larry Gust: Yeah. I'm kind of like no concern is less than 1/10 of a microwatt. Well, that's not really possible in most areas today. I'm kind of

dealing with wanting to get people down to ten microwatts per square meter.

Josh del Sol: Excellent. And on the Cornet, for those people that have one, it is 1.00. That's the translation for 1,000 microwatts. And Larry talked about the lower levels as well. It is really what you want to get down to.

So WIFI routers, what else? And WIFI computers.

Larry Gust: WIFI. And then the other thing that almost everybody has in their office is a cordless telephone and the base stations in their office. That's the part that plugs into the telephone company incoming signal at a wall outlet. I guess you say a wall port. And that always emitting from most of these, even when you hang I up and aren't using it. It's still putting out that signal that you walk out your front door and be down the block, and still have a connection. So those signals have been going up, up, up, up and up. So then you add that to the 100,000 from the router to 10,000 or 30,000 from your computer. You're working on nearly a half a million microwatts in your office. Which is a ridiculously high level of that.

So those are the principal things that we've had for quite a while in the home. For ten years anyway.

Then we've added to that all of our new entertainment systems. Which have got smart TV's. Which are pulsing, if you listen to them they're blipping all of the time. You've got cable TV, the black boxes associated with the cable TV. Instead of being the control for your cable box being through infrared, which is light, it's now RF. And the receiver that you have is always transmitting beacon signal to make sure that the device that you're holding in your hand can find it. And those, they're a couple thousand, 300,000/400,000 microwatts right there when you're sitting on your sofa.

Apple TV and Roku, they emit pulses. Even though the Apple TV, you can plug it in hardwire to the internet, it's still emitting pulses. Even though you have it plugged in. The Apple TV 5 and newer use RF to communicate with a handheld device and the Apple TV black box itself.

I recommend that people wrap those Apple TV boxes in aluminum foil. It does drastically cut the signal down. But it still comes out with the wires in the back of the Apple TV, but it cuts it down a lot. You can still communicate with your handheld remote, but you reduce the pulsing when you're sitting out there watching the TV. And then, when you're done watching TV turn the power off on the Apple TV. In fact I would put a power strip on everything for the entertainment center, and flip that off when you're done being entertained.

Anything that's pulsing is no longer powered and goes away.

Josh del Sol: Good. What else other than the office? Do you want to touch on anything else in the office? The peripherals, the printers, the mouse, keyboard, how critical is that?

Larry Gust: That's a really good point, Josh. Because most printers have a wireless function. And that's another WIFI going. And they're surprisingly strong. Because you want to be able to print to that from all over the house, right? So you've got to communicate all over the house just like a router, right? You've got to communicate with that all over the house. So, most of those printers you can turn off the wireless function, but you can't always trust it. You turn it off and it doesn't function, but the signal is still there. Running into a few printers like that.

And then, everybody's got a wireless keyboard, wireless mouse. So those are what they call Bluetooth. And they're made to work at like 30 inches is the distance that the signal is good for. But it's very strong. It's another 3,000/ 4,000 microwatts, and not to mention that it's in your hand. I mean that signal is going right through your hand. I mean this is not zero with a cord on it. It's a whole lot worse when you have a cordless mouse. And then, of course, a cordless keyboard has a Bluetooth signal coming out of it as well.

Josh del Sol: To what extent do you think that wireless keyboard and mouse contribute to like sore hands or carpal tunnel syndrome?

Larry Gust: Well I think they contribute a lot.

Josh del Sol: And there's a lot of science to back that up, right?

Larry Gust: Yeah. I've got clients who once that went away along with perhaps some other things, depending upon how sensitive they were, like reducing the electric field from all of the wires around your workspace. That really made a big difference in how they felt. Headaches, mental foggiess. For some people had to work around this because it's their job. It was like a Godsend for them to be able to get rid of this.

You can still buy corded mice, corded keyboards. At the risk of your own health, you really don't need these things. They work perfectly fine the old way.

Josh del Sol: What are your thoughts on, as long as we're talking about the office here, what are your thoughts on blue blockers?

Larry Gust: Well I think that's a good idea. Or you get yourself like Iris. Which is an app you put on your laptop which changes the color

rendition. Makes a less effect on your eyes. I've got one of those on my iPhone. Which I keep on airplane mode most of the time. Except when I'm out trying to avoid radiation as much as I can.

My clients and I don't want to be in that same boat myself someday.

But the blue blockers watching TV before you go to bed, the blue blockers are a good idea. Particularly if you find there's a correlation between watching TV and not getting to sleep.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. Okay.

Larry Gust: Because of the effect on your melatonin levels. Because of the blue light that's coming from the screen.

Josh del Sol: Yes. Thank you. For me that was critical. It's one of the keys for me to sleep better and increase my energy level.

So we've basically covered the office and the entertainment center, right Larry?

Larry Gust: That's right. The entertainment center. And the smart meter, the pulsing thing on the side of your house.

We didn't really mention gas meters and water meters. Which are also going the smart meter route. And there's a lot of different variations of the systems that they're using.

Generally, depending upon what your utility decided to do, they are not sending information on kind of very frequent basis that electric meters are doing. And they don't have beacon signals that let surrounding meters know that they're there ready to send or receive your data.

One thing we might point out, Josh, is that as far as these electric meters are concerned. There are collector meters. They don't tell you if you have a collector meter on the side of your house. And that might be a meter that collects signals from all of the surrounding meters on other houses. And retransmits it because the other houses are not close enough to the collection point. The cell tower to make that work. So then, you end up with much, much more in terms of the level of radiation that's being put out by your meter.

Josh del Sol: Yes. It's obviously it's criminal. And so, for those of you who haven't seen it yet, my movie *Take Back Your Power*. Which exposes the smart meter situation is free on YouTube. If you can find it. It's been shadow band on YouTube, go figure.

So, Larry, what's your thoughts on other devices? Such as in other rooms we might have wireless phones with other base stations. We might have baby monitors, right?

Larry Gust: Well baby monitors are child abuse. Because most people are doing video baby monitors and they have put a WIFI transmitter right above the baby's crib. Which is incredibly strong for the little tiny thing that's just a couple of pounds. It's just a criminal thing to be doing. You could still do that through a hardwired system.

You go to techwellness.com. Which is a website specializing in helping people do things that they can do themselves. They feature there the systems that you can use, and you can run the signal over your power wiring. If you don't happen to have ethernet wiring in the house, then you can get that dog-gone radiator antenna out of your child's room.

And if you're going to hardwire your house for your own health, I mean, what good are you to the baby if you are sick or dead. So, when you got to be healthy for that baby for 20 years, right? So parents need to be thinking about their own health and not just tomorrow but down the road a long, long way. So they ought to be hardwiring their house. And then the baby monitor that's wireless doesn't work. It's going to get hardwired there too.

There's a lot of help out there for people today, Josh. If they start searching they'll find all the help they need.

Josh del Sol: When your website gustenviro.com is a fantastic source. And for information.

Larry Gust: And there are links to other people's websites there as well for information.

Josh del Sol: Okay. We touched on wireless or decked phones, like the landline wireless phones. For those of us who still have landlines what kind of phones should we have?

Larry Gust: Well, you want wired phones. Cordless phones. You put that cordless phone up to your ear, and it's going right through your brain.

Josh del Sol: And the base station on many of these decked phones is always transmitting. That's something that surprised me when I learned about it.

Larry Gust: Isn't that the truth. Always transmitting so that those satellite phones know that there's something there to hook up to. And the satellite doesn't transmit unless you're on it. That's sort of like a

small advantage because when you're on it it's going through your head. It's not a good idea because it's just sort of like the baby brother to your cell phone. We know that there's brain tumors and many things associated with exposing your head to that.

Josh del Sol: Before we get into solutions specifically, do you want to touch on wearables? Like Fitbits. Apple watch. What's your thoughts on these?

Larry Gust: Anything that is going to take information without a wire someplace else is no good for you. I mean, Fitbits and people who put those on have a rash going up and down their arm from the Fitbit. It's putting out a pulse and your arm is one of the pulse points for your own body wiring system. The cell energy system. And then you strap this radiating thing right over that chakra. It doesn't make a lot of sense from that standpoint at all.

And there's already been enough negative reaction to it.

You need to avoid devices that send data without a wire. Because it's got to be going through the air and will be going through you at the same time. And your children, and your wife, anybody that's around you.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. And like you said, I mean we're just finishing on the other parts in the home now. Be really mindful as you said, you're getting a "smart refrigerator." You're not having different appliances through the house having wireless capabilities. And so, it's really up to us to do that due diligence, isn't it, Larry?

Larry Gust: It is because, we didn't mention this earlier, Josh, but the pulsing that is the part and parcel of digital wireless communications. Thirty years ago they knew that was extraordinarily more biologically active than the electric fields and the magnetic fields from power systems. And everything is working on a digital basis. And so, you're getting all of this pulsing all of the time. So it's incredibly important to become responsible for your health and get rid of these things from your environment. It may be inconvenient, but it's going to be worth it in the long run.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. Good. I like how we've already begun the discussion of solutions. Because that's the biggest piece for a lot of people is, "What can I do?"

Before we dive into that next part, what symptoms have you noticed both in your clients, and before they got their houses cleaned up, and in the scientific literature? What symptoms are caused by electromagnetic radiation? Just as a recap.

Larry Gust: Yeah. Absolutely. Electromagnetic radiation symptomology it overlaps in terms of is it power systems electro field, is it power systems magnetic fields, or is it RF? These are all kind of like in a grab basket. And different people grab different symptoms and display them in their body.

And there is this sort of like the electrical disease. Where you're eyes turn yellow like jaundice. You've got to keep that in mind. So everybody might not be experiencing this laundry list.

But there's like difficulty concentrating. Good thing to have in schools, right? When you're trying to teach students.

Josh del Sol: WIFI in schools. WIFI laptops, that is a huge issue. That if you haven't seen the movie *Generation Zapped*, please do. And share that with parents, principle, school board.

Larry Gust: Exactly. Fatigue, sleep disruption, irritability, headache. Depression, we see so many teens depressed. They sleep with their phones. They've got cordless stuff in their rooms. They've got wireless connections because they want to float around the house with no cord. Digestive system upset. Nausea, dizziness, appetite loss, muscle spasms, numbness, and tingling. If you've got your fingers on that wireless keyboard, your liable to experience that sort of thing in your hands. Tinnitus, ringing in the ears. I can't tell you the number of clients I've got who just got their smart meter, and then all of a sudden they had ringing in their ears. They were fine with their WIFI.

But the very sharp, high, energy pulses in the smart meters, and those seem to throw a lot of people over the edge for reactivity.

Then there's lightheadedness.

So those are some of the symptoms people experience with this.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. So what have you noticed in terms of your clients? You said you worked with over 2,000 in 26 years. That's amazing how many lives you've touched already. In terms of your clients, what types of symptomology improvements have you seen? If you want to give us a few examples.

Larry Gust: Oh, very wide-spread is the inability to sleep.

Josh del Sol: People can sleep better?

Larry Gust: Yeah. So, people who get up multiple times a night, the can't get to sleep. They've got heart palpitations that wake them up at night. I can't tell you the number who have had those symptoms go

away within the first night that we turned off all of the energy in the bedroom. Or within a reasonable period of time. Let's say up to a couple of weeks depending upon how badly abused their body was before they started this process.

And so, depression going away. I mentioned headaches. Headaches all of the time, once those smart meters got put in a lot of people had headaches all of the time. And irritability, and inability to think, inability to make decisions. Many people are probably familiar with multiple chemical sensitivity. Where people are sensitive to perfumes and they get brain fog and things of that nature.

Well, these symptoms seem to be copies of the ones who are chemical allergic. There's electrical allergy and it's much the same.

Then there's the research side of it. Showing connections between cancers and Alzheimer's, and Lou Gehrig's Disease, Parkinson's, there's a lot of brain function issues associated with RF radiation that's getting into the brain.

We can talk about the work of Martin Paul from the University of Washington. Are you covering that elsewhere?

Josh del Sol: Yes. Martin's in the summit. A very powerful presentation and conversation.

Larry Gust: Yeah. He's kind of wrapped it all together, and why are these things happening. Lots of great mechanisms explaining why these either do happen. Because they've been studied and shown to happen or why they could happen based on body chemistry. Very good to be paying attention to.

Josh del Sol: Okay. Larry, so what other types of symptoms? You mentioned your clients see improvement typically in areas of sleep, and areas of less heart palpitation, depression seeming to lift.

Larry Gust: Well absolutely, all of the things you just mentioned. Heart palpitations, allergy response, and muscle cramping, and getting up to go to the bathroom seven times a night. All of those things decrease when you clean up the electrical field environment or the electrical magnetic radiation environment.

I was mentioning the ADHD and the Autism Spectrum. One of the things they think about Autism is that the kids have a lot of chemicals in their bodies that part of the treatment regime is to chelate. And do things to dump those heavy metals and so forth out of their bodies. I've seen instances where the dumping, they did all of the requisite things, they could not get these things out of their bodies. There was an autistic boy

in the case and a normal girl, both of them had been tested prior to my being there. And then, we found high magnetic fields in the bedrooms and RF from the router that was below the kids' bedroom. And of course, the electric fields which are in everybody's bedroom.

And when we turned those off they started dumping heavy metals like crazy. There's an interaction between all of these things we are seeing in our environment. Chemicals, radiation, the things we put in our body and get rid of. Which changes the way we function, including how the brain of these children function.

Josh del Sol: Wow. Yeah. And the symptoms that you're talking about, Larry, isn't it interesting how pretty much all of these are listed in a 1970 U.S. Naval research report. It has 2,300 studies, I believe. It's referenced in my film. All of these symptoms are listed as what happens with microwave exposure.

It's not like Larry is just making a claim. And not able to back this up with science. The science is there.

So let's dive into the solutions, Larry.

Larry Gust: Just one more thing, Josh. I understand there's about 10,000 studies confirming that man-made electromagnetic radiation that varies in frequencies have an effect on health. Started with the Navy studies of radar, results of radar and communications radiation. And the findings haven't changed after 50 years of research. They're the same.

Okay, so solutions.

Josh del Sol: So solutions. Yeah. We got to get into that and into the politics and like why? How is this happening? But other talks are helping us address that. So solutions, okay. So the first area of solutions the power system fields, the magnetic, the electric, including dirty electricity, what can people do there?

Larry Gust: Exactly. So magnetic fields. Magnetic fields come from wiring errors. Being too close to appliances that have high magnetic fields. The wiring errors, you can buy a Gauss meter. Which measures magnetic fields. You can monitor your house, and you could discover areas that are high in magnetic fields. And if you can turn off the power in your house, like turn off the main breaker and they go away. That means you've got wiring errors, right? And if you turn it off and the fields change, but don't go away totally, you probably have parallel neutral paths bringing current into your house by the water pipes and the cable TV connection. Which got nothing to do with your own wiring. Either or, or both in that particular case.

And then, you need to be aware of the fact that if you sleep on the other

side of a wall from the kitchen. You've got a refrigerator running there, you could have high magnetic fields in the bedroom in that bed if you're close to that refrigerator. So, you've got to be aware of your sources. And then reorient the way the furniture is sitting in the room to address that. Because distance is your friend with magnetic fields that come from point surface like the TV. Or like the air conditioning system. The fan motor in the air conditioning. Like the refrigerator motor. Freezer motor.

They use lots of electricity and generate very intense local magnetic fields.

So then, there's electric fields. Electric fields, in most houses today you have a plastic jacketed wiring in the walls. In a few places like Chicago and New York, they have metal conduits for the wires that they are in. Or they have flexible conduits that the wires are in. Those places have low electric fields from the walls. But 99 percent of the houses have high electric fields.

The easiest solution is to find the circuits that are causing that problem. In your sleeping rooms. And then turn those off at night. Generally, you don't need electricity at night. Maybe you need for the air conditioning or you need it for the refrigerator, you may have to rewire a couple of circuits to keep those running when you turn these circuits off.

There are very inexpensive body voltage test kits you can use. Figure this out for yourself by measuring body voltage with a person in bed. And then turning the circuit breakers on and off. All of the breakers off and then turning them on one at a time to find which ones affect the bedrooms. Labeling those and then you can make a map for every bedroom in your house.

Josh del Sol: What are your thoughts about lamps or radio clocks that kind of plug in, but especially the kind that don't have a grounding plug? Does that do anything?

Larry Gust: Well, you're thinking of the plug that has three prongs on it. The electrical field from a wire that has three wires in it. A hot, a ground, and a neutral. Lower electric fields come from that. But not significantly lower to solve the problem.

I mean we're looking to be less than 0.3 volts per meter. The typical sleeping situation is ten to thirty volts per meter. You're way, way, way, way too high. And the only way to resolve it is to shut those circuits off. And if you unplug the lamps, you will get some correction. But you've still got what's coming from the wiring that's buried in the wall that you can't affect.

Now, you could shield the bedroom with a particular kind of paint. Which is beginning to get kind of complicated. But if you put that paint on the wall, you ground the paint outside to a stake in the ground. You'll stop electric fields and that paint also stops RF.

And so for some people they may want to shield their bedroom for RF. And you can get a double bang for the buck in that particular situation.

Then you have to be careful about what you've got plugged in because of all of those cords to your lamp, to your clock radio, even to your charger for your phone, they all put off electric fields that have not been trapped. And you have to take action to either unplug them, put them on little switches, or things of that nature to complete the remediation.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. Okay. Good. Now, what about dirty electricity?

Larry Gust: So dirty electricity is caused by internal sources. You're electronics. Your compact fluorescents. Your older LEDs. You could get rid of all of your LEDs and compact fluorescents. Track lighting that has those MR16 bulbs that are running at 12 volts, those create a horrid bout of noise. I can confirm that from earlier tests in my house. But you don't need them. You can get other ways of lighting with newer fangled LEDs that don't have transformers, 120 volt MR16 bulbs, which are available and there are fixtures are for. Once you eliminate all of those sources in your house, you're left with your computer. There are some relatively inexpensive devices you can plug in at your computer to work on that.

And then you're left with all of the dirt that your neighbors are making, and local industry, and office buildings. And that's riding all over the electric lines and coming into your house.

Josh del Sol: So how do you filter or what to do you do to mitigate DE?

Larry Gust: You need a whole house filter device that takes care of removing the stuff on your two hot wires and your neutral wire. And those are available. There's a couple of different brands. I guess we're not going to get into those, are we going to get into the brands here that you might look at?

Josh del Sol: Oh, yeah. If you like. One of them is we are interviewing as part of the summit, Terry Stotyn. And I highly recommend everyone check out his interview. He's a dirty electricity expert and he has a technology called Sign Tamer that is shown to be pretty significantly beneficial.

What do you recommend? What other technologies do you like?

Larry Gust: Oh, I've been using the Satic Filter. Which is another filter that is sold in the industry to control your voltage spikes and power factor. And they built some of those units that are adapted to houses. I guess you would want to look on the internet to see if you can buy some comparative performance measurements between these different devices that are out there.

And make up your own mind on which one you would like to put on your house. I don't want the Sign Tamer is looking at. But the Satic Filters are running around \$1,400 plus installation for one that's for the whole house.

Josh del Sol: Oh, you mean one the Satic, you said Stetsor.

Larry Gust: Yeah I meant Satic.

Josh del Sol: Okay. And what's your thoughts on the Stetsor filers, and the Greenway filters, and the different brands that plug into an outlet without doing the whole home?

Larry Gust: Well, they do some good. They have 30-safe capacitor in them. Which is what they're doing that taming of the reducing of the voltage peaks which represent the dirty electricity. Those are \$30. We just talked about something that's \$1,400. It's got a lot more stuff on the inside. And how it goes about taking care the micro-surge electrical pollution that's riding on your lines is different than the less expensive ones.

So you get what you pay for. These more expensive filters do other things. Like they prevent your computer from blowing up when you have voltage surges by way of the powerline. Lightning strikes. Problems on the powerline. And they do a power factor correction. Which could save you some money. Various manufacturers make various claims about what on average you might be expecting to save. You are not going to save your entire electric bill, some fraction of that. But they do, do that.

So they have three things going on for them. They get rid of micro surge electrical pollution, they get rid of it, I've got to be careful here, they considerably reduce it. For a lot of people, that's enough. They clamp voltage spikes. They don't ruin all your electronic equipment. And they have some effect on your power factor, so you got a lower cost running the refrigerator, the AC, your heating system fan.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. From Terry in that interview, one of the things he says is he doesn't lead with this. But his customers typically experience a ten to thirty percent, sometimes more decrease in their electric utility bill.

Larry Gust: Yeah.

Josh del Sol: Just from cleaning up the power that's being used, that's running through the wires in your home to make it usable power. So you not paying for the transits, the spikes anymore, right?

Larry Gust: It's pretty cool. Because you can get this benefit we've been talking about. While you save some money on your electrical bill and you can pay for the cost this installation over the years. It is like a zero-sum game here. So that's a beautiful outcome.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. Good. Okay. Let's switch now for this last segment of this interview. Kind of running out of time. Let's see how much mitigation solution strategies specifically for radio frequencies, specifically for wireless in the home, Larry. What can you tell us?

Larry Gust: Okay. So the first and number one thing is to get rid of everything in your house that's wireless. And that means you have to wire ethernet system. That can be done by putting in hard wires. Calling in a low voltage communications company to run those. Or there are ethernet over powerline where you inject the ethernet signal onto your powerlines. This may not be good for people who are very, very sensitive electric fields. But for most of us, because it's such a small signal it probably is okay.

But if you are going to slice and dice this finely. You want to go for actually dedicated ethernet wiring for people who are really, really sensitive.

You can run those all over your home. You could have 40 of these ethernet powerline things all going to separate computers all on your wiring and not getting mixed up.

So that's the thing to do.

There are similar devices for putting these signals on your cable TV lines. Which many houses have running all over them these days.

So there's solutions there.

You should get rid of cordless phones and corded telephones.

You can get regular AT&T service where they have their own wire running out of your house. Or you can go with Voice Over Internet Protocol, where your voice signal rides on your cable line, or on your AT&T fiber optics line.

Those are all good.

You can call forward your cell phone to your landline. You can go to your computer and do your texts, and do your texts on your computer. And you can turn your iPhone or Android phone on occasionally to see what's happening.

Josh del Sol: And you can wire your phone, right? There's like ethernet adapters now online.

Larry Gust: You can. It works flawlessly with iPhone X. It's a bit of a problem below that.

Josh del Sol: Oh, so yeah. With regards to cell phones and the adapters for ethernet, they are getting better. I have an iPhone6, and I actually have to use two adapters still. But it works quite well. Especially for just internet connectivity.

And I also want to ask you with regards to whole-house wired ethernet solutions. There's also a technology called MoCA 2.0. Which uses the in-house TV cabling system. What can you tell us about MoCA 2.0?

Larry Gust: Exactly. That was what I was attempting to get out a few minutes ago. Exactly. The nice thing about that it does keep off the electrical wiring. There may be less interference issues.

And in some houses, and I have one locally where you just can't get a signal very far because they've got something in the nature of a higher frequency signal that's coming into their house. The cable TV wires would probably address that if they had them to every room. And I think every house since the 1980's had that done. So that's an excellent way to go at it, you know MoCA.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. And for people that have a wireless router and they connect to it via ethernet, but they still won't turn off the wireless. Dr. Klinghardt was telling me about this company called Little Tree Group. I think littletreegroup.com. And these make these bags with RF blocking fabric that encloses the wireless router in the bag.

Larry Gust: Well that's certainly good. It's like wrapping your Apple TV. That we were talking about earlier. But all of the wires that come out the back are like antennas and that signal goes out them.

If you can't do anything else do this with the bag, or wrap it in foil for that matter. Or you can get RF cloths yourself. You can buy it online from various places.

Josh del Sol: Well let's talk about that RF cloth. Both for the home and for clothing, what can you tell us about the fabrics and mitigation?

Larry Gust: Well you have to look at what they propose or what they show for their specifications as what frequency they block. And how much of those frequencies are blocked? Swiss Shield makes a fabric, quite a lot of them. There's one called Swiss Shield Wear. Which is meant to be incorporated into wearables. There are Swiss Shield Natural. Which is like a woven-like muslin. Very fine wires, very close together. That probably has the greatest performance of all.

The general fundamental principle that I would put out there for people is that wires that are woven together have holes in them. The holes are between the wires allow RF to get through. As the RF goes up in frequency the waves get smaller and smaller. So those holes have to be smaller and smaller to be effective. So right now, there's some question that existing fabrics will be useful for 5G type radiation. Which we haven't gotten to. Because they're looking to use, at least early 5G up to like six gigahertz signals. And they would go through much of what we have today. Which has only been tested up to two and a half or three gigahertz.

But my preference is metal. Because metal blocks everything. So aluminum foil. But you can't put aluminum foil over your windows. So you want maybe curtains that maybe block it. So there's various choices. Daylight is another type of fabric from Swiss Shield. It looks like a window screen. It's a little bit finer than window screen.

But it's got bigger holes, so it's effectiveness is not as good. Well even for lower frequencies. It's good at 20 DB, so how strong is the signal. If you've got a 10,000 microwatt signal and you've got one percent left coming in, that's probably too high yet for many people.

You've got to know what you've got outside that you're trying to block on the inside before you can make good decisions about what products to buy to do that job.

Josh del Sol: Okay. Good point. Are you a fan of the EMF shielding clothing?

Larry Gust: I've had many clients who claim they couldn't travel without it. And every client has got a different response to that. I mean there's hoodies available out there on the market that are lined with this. So people claim that they can't function without those. I've had clients who had made like a sleeping bag, and when they get in the airplane they zip themselves up in this thing. And the face area is like that Swiss Shield cloth you can see out of. It isn't quite as good, but the rest of the bag is very high in reduction. And they can travel very comfortably.

They've decided to look foolish, but they can travel and they don't get sick. So there's lots you can do with that clothing.

Josh del Sol: And the style of it is improving over time.

Larry Gust: Yeah. So I mean you have to get it, try it and see what it will do for you. I had an airline pilot who had been sensitized, I mean obviously a lot of emissions in the cockpit of an airplane. And he was so sensitive he could feel the fuel pump turn on next door. He had like a scarf of multiple layers of something like Natural, and it was a Godsend for him.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. Two areas left. One is what are your thoughts on for people who really want to mitigate at nighttime who perhaps really have a hard time sleeping? What are your thoughts on the full canopy, full bed canopy coverings?

Larry Gust: Well, number one I think the first place you start is your sleeping period time. You have a couple of choices. You can paint the walls with RF shielding paint, and make sure the windows don't transmit. They would have to be low-E glass. Or you would have to put film on the windows.

For those people who can't do that who are in apartments, there are these RF tents I call them. And they can be made out of Daylight fabric. Which isn't as good as the Natural which is like muslin fabric. One allows ventilation easier than the other one. It's all about how sensitive you are. How low do you have to go?

When people who need it say, "Well, I don't mind the lack of ventilation, at least I can sleep. I don't even notice it when I'm sleeping." But how big is the signal?

I mean there's some places where you need to paint the walls and get an RF tent to get the numbers down enough for the people who are really sensitive. So it depends upon your circumstances.

Josh del Sol: And you mentioned that. And my last question was, you touched on it just now, painting your walls with reflective paint. Any tips there? Any brands that you like? And does it have to be grounded?

Larry Gust: Well, I would stick with a brand that meets the military specification. Sold to the military and there's a specification that they say. The military specs they're buying under. There's been some amount of variability in other brands.

Frankly, for years I've used YSHIELD made in Germany. For the German military. Very successful.

Grounding is not necessary to get rid of RF. RF is being reflected not conducted away. It's like 97, 98, or 99 percent reflectance. And just a

little tiny amount of absorption on that paint.

And some transmittance. I mean it's 99.9997 percent effective with two layers. You paint it on. You paint over it with three layers of paint because it's black you know. You have to cover the black up. And if you're trying to go to white you have to use three layers of color paint to get away from the black.

You have to decide how good of a job you're going to do if you've got window frames, or you've got fiberglass window frames, or PVC window frames. The RF comes right through those. You could paint them. Got to the ends of earth. You would paint the frames. You would have to use special paint for PVC. So the RF paint doesn't peel off. So there's a primer. So you can do it.

And there's window film that you could put on that passes about 80 percent of the daylight and blocks 99.999 percent something, I don't have the figures here in my head, of RF. Or if you got low-E glass which most windows since the 1990s do. That does a pretty good job.

We talked about getting a meter. If you have your own meter then you can check these things out in your house so you can make reasonable decisions about what to do.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. Excellent. Any other final thoughts in terms of tips, or strategies, or perspectives for our viewers?

Larry Gust: No. The only thing I would say, Josh, is I have seen so many lives ruined by becoming so sensitive that people can't function.

The horse is out of the barn and we're trying to put the barricade up at the door.

This is affecting everybody whether you're symptomatic or not. Martin Paul will tell you about that in his presentation. It's happening to you right now if you're in a place with high levels of RF. It's doing things in your body. You may not feel them. But they're happening.

Martin Blank, unfortunately, passed away. He's got that appeal online for all of these scientists that have signed on to appeal to the United Nations. He tells you about what the cells are signaling and what the people, and some of these sorts of things that have been told to you what the cells are signaling. They are saying they are in distress. We need to take action to clean up our environment. That starts with the sleeping environment, Josh.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. This is such a big topic. There's so much value here we just got in that huge download, Larry. Thank you so much. And so,

where can people contact you or also need to get a mention of the Building Biology Institute, has experts all over the world. They are all trained like, I don't if as much or as deep as your training, but they are all certified to be experts in walking with you through making your home safe. So, check out the Building Biology Institute. And also, Larry's website. What's your website, Larry?

Larry Gust: It's gustenviro.com. And by the way, the Building Biology Institute, which is a nonprofit, would love to have your support. It has a lot of information for the public online. To continue your education about these electromagnetic radiations.

Josh del Sol: Excellent. Larry Gust, thank you so much for your time today. We'll look forward to learning more and look forward to your continued leadership and updates through the Building Biology Institute.

Larry Gust: Josh, it's been my pleasure. Great getting together with you and doing this.

Josh del Sol: Thank you.

Larry Gust: You're welcome, man.

Eliminating Dirty Electricity in Your Home

Guest: Terry Stotyn

Josh: With us today on the summit is dirty power expert or dirty electricity expert Terry Stotyn. Terry, welcome to the summit. Thanks for your time for being with us today.

Terry: Hey, Josh. Pleasure to be here. Thanks.

Josh: Great. I'm going to share a little bit with our audience about you and your background. So Terry Stotyn has been controls electrical and tradesman for approximately 40 years. And is an expert in solving the problem with dirty electricity, or dirty power caused by so called Smart Utility Meters and other devices.

As the president of Cratus, Terry has been actively helping individuals and companies lower their utility bills, protect their appliances and equipment, and improve their health by cleaning up the dirty power in their home, and doing so at the root level. So, Terry, just before we get into this whole super interesting conversation, which actually dovetails onto a very effective and fundamental solution for Smart Utility Meters, first of all, I ask you what in your view is the connection between 5G and so called Smart Meters?

Terry: I think that presently there is no connection, because it's all got to do with the data that's produced and the way it sends right now to the power providers. But I think that via the Internet of Things over the next few years, and how everything evolves and changes, that it definitely will have, it will all be tied together.

Josh: So tell us, how did you get into this whole thing with your background of your technology, and you've been servicing companies for decades, and with Smart Meters and dirty power?

Terry: That's a long story. Basically, I was a contractor for many, many years, mostly HVAC and controls. And quite a few years ago, I was approached by who my partner is now to bring this product out in the open in the North America. Our product has been around for 35 years, the technology of it. And I basically travel extensively in North America, soon to be Europe. Traditionally, I have helped companies. I do a lot of PowerPoint presentations for companies and CEOs, and you name it. Engineers, electrical people, explaining the merits of what's happened with our power over the last hundred years and how it's affecting us now and how it affects basically our electronic and our electrical equipment, how that has changed. And we all know how our electronics has changed.

But the focus on companies and militaries and governments is they spend billions of dollars on equipment, on process equipment and sensitive electronics. And they needed to function like it was intended to function without all the harmful effects of the dirty power issues now that costs the money in downtime. So that's traditionally been my focus, company wise.

Josh: So you've been working with like big -- Fortune 500 companies.

Terry: For big companies, corporations. That's right. And so that's what I do. I travel around and I give presentations to people and testing for them and approve what's going on and improve our product. And we're very effective at doing that, because of what our product does, and we can get into that after. But a few years ago, I was approached by a gentleman by the name of Brian Thiessen who's sort of Kalona that was big in the power smart meter industry, the anti smart meter effects.

And a couple of doctors down in the states that I don't even remember their name, but I remember getting emails from one of them. And they asked me about my product, and whether it would be effective in dealing with the issues with the smart meters. And honestly, Josh, at that point in time, I had no idea. And I thought they were pulling my leg, Brian included. I said like, when they were explaining to me what the Smart Meter does, and the issues that it has. I literally started laughing, I thought there's no way that like everybody else, our government would do that to us or power providers.

Josh: What did you know?

Terry: Yeah. So I had no idea. And when I took it upon myself, I had a friend by the name of John Wort, that was a good friend of mine. He's

been in the microwave industry for 50 years. And so we put something together where we started to test buildings in Vancouver, and we started in East Van in a house. And literally within an hour of testing, I was shocked. I actually had to sit down and I thought there's no way this could be happening. So over a period of weeks and months, we continued our testing process. And we went to various properties around BC, and pretty much all came up with the same results.

Every time we hooked onto houses with the smart meters, and we even hooked on some with -- that time they were still employing them. So we hooked on to some of the analog meters and we still got effects coming into the houses. And then it just kind of catapulted for me. I started continuing to do testing, but at the same time, I started to wonder what was out there that was helping the problem. And I never tested our product for quite a while until we finally did and realize just how effective it was at these finer frequencies. But yeah, it's been a long process with the Smart Meter technologies, a shocking one. That's what really got me.

Josh: Yeah, I love that you were super skeptical at first. You know, that's kind of how I started too. I just wanted to get to the bottom of it when you hear these stories. So we'll get into a little bit later like some of the testimonials and some of the experiences you've had. When I first learned about what you're doing and the effects, I felt immediately just a resonance with it, like I had to help get it out. But let's go back to establishing a foundation; what is dirty electricity or dirty power?

Terry: Okay. Dirty power and dirty electricity has a lot of different names. But in reality, dirty power consists of line voltage transients. Transients are the root cause of dirty power. People talk about harmonics, they talk about all kinds of -- those are conditions of, but dirty power is really transients, whether it's line voltage transients, or it's the higher kilohertz or the higher frequency transients. Transients are the key.

Josh: What is a transient and where does it come from?

Terry: A transient is anything that impedes the flow of the normal sine wave flow, sine wave is an energy voltage. Now it's a spike, a transient in reality is a spike. And the spike is made or induced from anything that switches, whether it's a light switch or motor starting and stopping, contacts up and down that are turning on and turning off. What you're doing is you're breaking and starting and breaking the power so that it causes the spikes. Now, these spikes can be very small, they can be from a few volts up to thousands of volts or amps. And in the line voltage side the regular power side lightning, which suppression and filters were made for originally. But transient spikes are the root cause and they are the issue with dirty power.

Josh: Okay. So just let's dive into this a little bit more. So something with -- was it called a switched-mode power supply? We talked about that briefly in Take Back Your Power. Does everything that converts AC to DC or vice versa has a switched-mode power supply? And is that essentially the thing that chops the sine wave that creates the spikes that ride on the 60 hertz or 50 hertz and other parts -- on and cycle?

Terry: Yeah. The switched-mode power supply -- everything that's electronic has a switched-mode power supply in it. And because they operate on DC power, direct current, not AC power, alternating current. So everything electrical, whether it's a hair dryer or curling iron for our wives. Anything that's digital, our phones, our chargers, everything has got switched-mode power supply.

The difference is -- and everything that creates a transient, I'll go a little deeper, creates RF and EMF. But what they do is they put small chokes, usually in behind all these little appliances so they don't dump back onto the power. The switched-mode power supplies in the smart meters, they switch often. They're constantly turning off. It's like a chattering effect. And because they don't have any chokes or RF filters built into them, they're cumulative. So everybody within the grid gets everybody else's energy, and it climbs.

Josh: Okay. So we're just going to pause here and show a really quick clip of a couple of years ago. Health and Safety advocates, Warren Woodward and EMF specialist Paul Harding, put together a video in which they showed on oscilloscope's smart meters and dirty electricity. If you haven't seen it yet, take a quick look. And we'll be right back.

Paul: So we're going to attach this to a panel. And now we're going to measure electricity running through the smart meter. All right. Right now, the switch is in front as you can see, there's nothing happening. So we're going to turn this on.

Warren: Wow, look at that.

Paul: So we've got quite torsion. All right.

Warren: Yeah. And that tick, that's the smart -- listen to it. Wow.

Paul: I'm trying to catch it when it trick.

Warren: Yeah. That didn't look like that. Wow, we just had the analog, right.

Paul: So I've had enough of that.

Warren: That was a lot of transmissions to it, just a small amount of time.

Paul: And we're seeing this with the new smart meters.

Warren: Yeah, they're more active.

Paul: Much more active.

Warren: Yeah.

Paul: Is not just the 900 megahertz. That's—

Warren: That's the microwave effect.

Paul: But this effect is much greater. So this is not like your baby monitor. This isn't like your cell phone. This is like no other device you're exposed to because it's using all the wiring that travels through this panel as an antenna. So it's an energized antenna.

Warren: Because it's connected to it.

Paul: Correct. It's the largest antenna and you're exposed to this 24/7, if you're in the house 24/7. This doesn't stay in the wiring. It actually radiates 6-8 feet from the wire.

Warren: Many people involved in the Smart Meter issue are focused on the 900 megahertz frequency, which is the microwave transmission. But none of us knew that there were these other frequencies, sort of hidden in that and are being transmitted as well. So in my opinion, this is why people are getting damaged. Why people who previously could handle all the wireless gadgets, Wi Fi, their cell phone, and then when they get the smart meter in their house, all of a sudden, their world falls apart.

Josh: Okay. So there we saw visually on the oscilloscope what happens when a smart meter transmits or emits wireless radiation. And is it that the wiring is an antenna and it rides that antenna signal, is that part of the problem in addition to the switched-mode power supply itself? Help us understand at a deeper level.

Terry: Now a transient, like I mentioned, can be thousands of volts or could be 10, or 20, or 100 depends on the frequency and the voltage and the switching action and the load on the other side of it. So as a transient, which is a spike, as it rises to the peak, it creates RF or in this case, a kilo hertz frequency. As it reaches its peak, drops, it creates magnetism or EMF. So that's why the transient is so important in dirty power to go after because you don't want that in your system.

And it's like unwanted characteristic of the switched-mode power supply that is causing us the issues. And because there's so many of these transients happening over continually, it's basically coming in and riding

right on top of our power line. And then it uses all our house wiring as an antenna. And when it hits the panel, it just splits and goes to every circuit. And so it uses basically our house wiring, like they mentioned in the video. And it emits from the walls at a 90 degree lateral. And we get it you know, for 6 feet, where it's penetrating into us like living in a microwave.

Josh: Is other frequencies other than the 60 hertz cycle that's used, and it's also wasting. It's not only like emitting from the walls and causing harm according to the science. Like, there is science that indicates that these frequencies are harmful.

Terry: The kilohertz frequency is very harmful. The United States government has known about it since the Second World War. The Russians have used that as weapons. The kilohertz frequency breaks down our human cell structure. So the kind of frequencies that these give off is the kilohertz anywhere from a few -- you know, kilohertz right up to 10 megahertz, there's a broad range in there that happens from the smart meter. And it's harmful to us and you pay for it, it's on top of your power, which raises your levels.

Josh: That's what I was going to ask. So it's basically this wasted electricity that isn't really usable, that is just emanating from our walls, because we haven't figured out how to get rid of it yet. So number one, is that one of the reasons why people's bills have been going up, sometimes extraordinarily when they get a smart meter installed? And number two, what happens when they clean up the dirty power? What happens on their utility bills?

Terry: Well, interestingly, I get asked this question every day. And because the old analog meter were just a device that monitored the power. Basically everybody had five little dials on there. And they knew that the faster those dials spun, then they were in for a big bill. But their voltage levels were fixed, they were fixed at 120 volts RMS of the sine wave. And they had to adjust their billings accordingly, like when they were calculating the kilowatt hours, they couldn't charge for anything more than 120 volts RMS. Now the top of the sine wave was actually 173 volts, so it was the bottom of it. So in essence, it's the root mean square, it's like an averaging value of the sine wave. And with the induction of the smart meters, because they're so sensitive, they can react and show. And they can read all those peaks of the transient levels.

So those transit levels could be 400 or 500 volts if you've got, maybe your neighbor is a welder next door, or maybe you've got some a lot of air conditioning in your house, your compressors are starting and stopping. So you're going to have very high transient peaks on your sine wave. And accordingly, hydro can now or any power provider can read the tips of those peaks. They're no longer held to 120 volts anymore,

they could be charged at 250 or 350 volts times the amps they use, and they calculate your bill that way. So you're paying more.

Josh: So utilities for smart meters on people, which not only increases the problem of dirty electricity, along with the other infrastructures outside of the home that comes in and adds to that dirty electricity. But it begins to charge for that dirty electricity or dirty power even though it's not usable.

Terry: Well, they used to have to go to utility commissions to get a 1 or 2% raise hike on their rates, they don't have to worry about that anymore. They get it automatically with the smart meter.

Josh: Okay. Terry, tell us more about the RF, the radio frequency and the EMF caused by the smart meter.

Terry: Okay. Like, I mentioned earlier with the transients spikes and RF on the climb and EMF on the decline. Now, my experience on testing is that the strengths of the RF in particular, the kilohertz frequency will climb throughout the day. It can range anywhere from in volts, it can range anywhere from -- on average, early in the morning when everybody's power systems aren't active, everybody's getting up getting ready to go to school. It'll go anywhere from say, 3, 2 to 5 volts peak to peak on the sine wave. And then throughout the day, it'll fluctuate depending on what happens on your transformer grid, because you're all tied to everybody. And it'll climb up to 11, or 12, or 13 volts peak to peak. But at night, late in the afternoon, and we studied for 24 hours. So we did a number of those tests. And we found that anywhere after about 4 o'clock, 3 to 4 in the afternoon to 10, 11 at night, that could climb as high as 30 volts peak to peak in the states, in a lot of areas in the US, 40 volts.

Now, that's pretty significant. In the testing, and the research that I did anything over 2 volts or 3 volts peak to peak is considered carcinogenic in the kilohertz frequency. So it's important to note that we're tied to everybody by the smart meters. Everybody on our immediate grid, like I mentioned earlier, if your neighbor is a welder, or they got a lot of equipment, or you don't know what's going on next door, because all this kilohertz frequency travels on top of the wires, it all comes into your house.

Josh: So you're saying that even if you preserve your analog meter that doesn't emit RF, it's still coming through that you still have that in your home, dirty power.

Terry: And it doesn't necessarily have to come in on your voltage lines, it can come in from your neutral and your ground as well.

Josh: Well, let's dive into that. The line and neutral and ground, and looking at -- what is the difference of plug-in power filters, and an actual suppression device like what you're doing?

Terry: Before we talk about that, I think it's important to note that -- you know, in an average house, we have two legs of power, which they call legs of power, or two different wires coming into our house that have 120 volt power on them. And then we have a neutral leg and we have a ground wire. So there's always excess current when we utilize something then it turns to amperage and we use that power. There's always a little bit of trickle that's not used. And the intent was, it was supposed to go back to our neutral wire, which went back up the pole to the transformer and tied to all the common neutral wires and went back to the power provider. Well, that's been grossly undersized for many, many, many years. And the power providers, they changed the codes because the neutral and the ground bars within our panels used to be segregated so that the neutral could carry out, and the ground was always ground to do a ground rod or a plate.

Well, because they're overloaded, they basically bonded the neutral and the ground within the panels. And that's why we have so much ground current now outside some, and people more than others. And if somebody has old houses, the grounding wasn't done properly, maybe they put a ground to a water line or a gas line. And then maybe 10 years ago, it got changed from the city.

And then they went to plastic so they really don't have the ground. You know, these are all issues that if people have electrical sensitivities, or they have issues in their house, they really should get a qualified electrician. And I tell people all the time that you need to really go through your electrical systems if you have problems, to make sure that your bonding and your grounding is done properly. Because no matter what kind of filter or suppression unit you use, it won't do much good if you don't have proper grounding and bonding done at the house level.

Josh: Now, Sam Milham wrote the book on dirty electricity. He has said that he's measured before and after where so called Smart Meters go in, the ground voltage wherever they're installed increases measurably that seems to line up with what you're saying.

Terry: And you know, we have plug-in filters, we have filters that whether they're small units -- you have to differentiate the difference between suppression units and plug-in filters. The plug-in filters are -- not that they don't work or that they're not good, or they're bad. They have limitations to them as to their capabilities. As far as the whole frequency spectrum that you need to basically protect, that we're getting from the smart meter. Typically, the smaller ones, I could be wrong, but they usually stop around 100 kilohertz. And there is quite a bit of activity

beyond the 100 kilohertz right up to the megahertz. You know, they get some of it, but perhaps not all of it. And because they're plug-in unit, they are tied to different legislation and basically rules of the electrical industry, because they're just a plug in filter.

Ours are wired into the panel into the power, so we have a whole different set of rules. And the smaller ones are -- you know, they do the job for what they're intended for, but they do it differently. Usually they move the energy through capacitance or capacitors over to the neutral wire. And so people don't see that, you know.

Josh: So does it effectively fully get rid of the dirty power?

Terry: No, what it does is it shifts it, has a tendency of shifting it, causes a lot of harmonics on the neutral wire. Harmonics basically in turn cause heat in windings of motors, and the ground, and the neutral bonding and things like that. So it's not -- there's a lot of different products out there that do it. And I've tested some. I don't really say "Yay, or nay" whether they're good or bad. I just know that when you wish to get at this problem of cleaning dirty power. And like I mentioned, it's transients, that's what we do. You have to clean every bit of the power. You have to clean the lines, the line. You have to clean the line to the neutral, you have to clean the line to the ground, and also the neutral to the ground.

Because like I mentioned earlier, you can get dirty power coming in from not only on your lines of your power, but you can get it from your neutral and your grounds as well. Even on the straight ground current. So it's very important that you are able to whatever you use for a unit for cleaning this power issue up, you have to be able to cover all the modes to do it effectively.

Josh: So there are essentially four combinations, or you can say channels that come into your home -- in order to clean the dirty power properly, you need technically clean all four of those channels, for lack of a better.

Terry: And I get a lot of calls all the time from people that want to go off grid or they want to go Gen sets or they want to go solar or they want to go you know whatever. Have inverters in them that convert to AC power. They're phenomenal for putting off transients and RF. You know, just going off grid, I've had many times where people have gone out and spent a lot of money on a generator. And then they put it down next to their power, they put on switching gear, manual switch gear or whatever. They can turn off their power from their power provider, and then go through their generator and they think it's clean power. Well, it's not. And secondly, the switch gear maybe only breaks the two lines, but doesn't break the neutral on the ground. So they're still getting off the

grid, they're still getting dirty power coming in from the neutral in the groundwater.

Josh: Okay. So anyone going off grid or partially off grid, either or, needs to clean up their power in order to be essentially have optimal health and safety in their home.

Terry: Exactly. Yeah.

Josh: Okay.

Terry: So it's very important, extremely important.

Josh: So you work with very, very respected and electrical engineer named Bill Bathgate. Now, Bill has produced, over the past few years, documents basically tearing apart and analyzing smart meters. And he has a very high level of understanding, is very respected within the movement for safe utility metering. Tell us, what information has Bill realized or what is some of the feedback that he's getting from people that use this technology that you're talking about to effectively suppress the dirty power?

Terry: I started dealing with Bill probably about a year and a half ago, or almost a couple years ago now. And Bill is very highly respected. He has a great pedigree, he's an engineer by trade; electrical engineer, and he's a very knowledgeable gent. And we share, we talked a number of times a week. Actually Bill came to me quite a while ago and said, "Terry, I've been testing for this stuff for a long time, and I've never ever seen a product that can mitigate this crap off our lines more effectively." So he basically has come on board with us. He is a US distributor for us. You know, we share information and our knowledge from our testing all the time. And I'm constantly getting reports and videos, and test results from him.

And basically, I think what pleases me the most is, for the last 6, 7, 8 years, I've been dealing with companies about saving the money. And here I'm dealing now -- what I like even better is that when people come to me and say, you know, I can sleep. I don't have migraines. My children aren't sick. That means so much to me. It's much more rewarding to me than anything when they come to me in tears and say, you've changed my life, because I thought that -- you know, I've moved away, and I just can't. I moved away and kind of got off grid and it didn't help me. And now I'm good. I feel great. So you know, that makes it all worthwhile for us.

Josh: That's really great. It's kind of like, it feels almost like the missing piece. If someone really wants to mitigate the harm from smart meters or from being on the grid. They haven't known how to effectively clean

all the channels, and clean up the inverter from the solar if they're going solar. And so this is almost like the missing piece. How many devices are you actually installing per month, let's say at this time, for people's homes?

Terry: Hundreds a month, it's getting busier and busier and busier. I'm actually selling as much these for the personal side now as we are industrially and commercially worldwide. It's getting very busy. People are -- the name is getting out there. And I deal with people every day by email. They get on our websites and they read and typically they want more information and we supply them with it. And then they end up purchasing.

Josh: Something that -- over the past few years since releasing the first edition of *Take Back Your Power*, I've started to realize it didn't seem to add up in terms of the health effects. In other words, the health effects seem to be more from smart meters, than one would think scientifically based upon the intensity of the microwave transmissions. For example, they still are getting sick if the meter is either on a pole, or at the far end of the house and they're sleeping over here. So I started to realize that -- you know, I start to ask the question. Well, what if this dirty power situation is actually more of a factor than the post radio frequency emissions from the Smart Meter? Just as a disclaimer, I'm not saying one way or another. I'm saying I'm seeing tons of evidence that the dirty power is a significant factor. What's your perspective on that?

Terry: Very much so. Like, I mentioned earlier until I studied it. I had no idea. I mean, I was dealing with line voltage power. And that was our job to clean up line voltage power. So when I got into the root of the problem from the smart meter, I'm in agreement with you. I think that the kilohertz side that the RF, the EMF, the magnetism, you know. And throughout the day like I mentioned it, can get stronger. It comes out through the wall at much stronger levels, and it'll decrease and increase. So I think there's a lot to it. I think that there's much more to it than people understand. They're worried about cell towers, and they're worried about you know, which they should be. I would never live next to a cell tower. But now with 5G coming, and I think it's going to be almost impossible to get away from it.

Josh: Well, that's why we're having this summit, so that we change this. We don't want anybody to live next to it.

Terry: Yeah, it's going to get stronger and stronger. But I think that the power within the walls, the corrupted power from the smart meter is a huge detriment to our health. I've shown it in my tests. And many other people are, "this is not just me because I sell a product." But the 5G network -- and even the 4G. The 5G, it's like you mentioned earlier, it's all coming. It's all tied together, because this is a global initiative. This

isn't something that's just brought into DC here or certain states. It's worldwide. I'm going through it now, and in England, and the France and Sweden. And so everybody's feeling effect.

Josh: So another question about smart meters here is, we have over the past few years, we've seen numerous incidents where there's been fires and explosions, either on the smart meter or on the appliances in the house, after people have gotten smart meters. And sometimes entire cities like Stockton, California, for example, 5,000 meters exploded all at the same time. Does your technology mitigate that kind of harm?

Terry: I mitigate the transients, it takes the transients away, which are causing the multiple -- I'm not going to say they're not causing the fire. So I have a different... My idea of what's causing the fires is that the smart meter has come out with a very thin posts that plug into the receptacle. Now, the analog meters came out with quite effective post. And they've been there for about 20-30 years on people's houses.

So when they pull that off, those posts are designed to have a fairly thick post from the meter to be plugged into them. And the smart meters are very thin. So I believe that when they plug them in -- and most of the people that are installing these smart meters are not trained electricians. You know, they take a one week course and the power providers put them to work. So when they unplug, and then they plug it back in, they're creating -- it's like a hot shoe. They plug it in, and it's live, because they don't go in the house to turn the power off.

And there's a gap. I believe in a lot of houses that are burning up, there's probably a gap between the terminals, and it's working, and it's creating heat. And that's what starts the fires. Transients coming in that like Stockton, that would have been a major transients that comes in and heats them all and causes them all to burn up. That's probably in the thousands of volts like a lightning strike. Yes, our product does that, we have two levels of protection. Suppression was originally made or designed by our people in Florida 35-40 years ago. And it was made for lightning quick I mentioned earlier. And so our industry, the suppression industry has done a deplorable job over the last 30 years of staying up at the times. Our engineers were able to see the need for the electrical microprocessor computer side of it years ago. And they came up with this special protection circuitry, in addition to the lightning protection. So that's what makes it so effective.

Josh: So with regards to that incident in Stockton, just one of many examples with multiple explosions and fires. What happened was a truck hit a utility pole, and then the lines touched from the higher voltage line to the lower voltage line. So in that case, if somebody had protection, like your sine tamer unit on their home, would that have protected the damage from happening?

Terry: Yeah, probably 99%. If it's a major, major one, it will sacrifice itself before it allows it through.

Josh: Okay. And now just to get back to the fire question. In your best understanding what you just described and how you see the fire problem related to smart meters, how effectively does your sine tamer unit protect from the risk of fire?

Terry: Well, the sine tamer unit deals with the power coming through. If you have a joint outside, on the other side of the wall that is working and causing heat and it's going to burn it up, sine tamer is not going to do anything for that, nothing will.

Josh: If it's on the other side of the unit, which the meter is, right?

Terry: That's right. Your sine tamer is mounted right on your panel immediately coming in from the meter. So if your meter is going to burn up because it's working, there's nothing in the world that can stop that. But the sine tamer will take everything that's on the power, it'll take it away.

Josh: Okay. So I know you don't talk about this, sort of publicly. You don't claim a significant percentage that someone's utility bill may be lowered after they get this device installed; the sine tamer device. But typically just tell us like a ballpark, is there any change in people's utility bills, whether it goes up or stays the same or is lowered?

Terry: I've never heard -- the sine tamer product draws no power. All it does is monitor the power. The only power it draws is to light two little LED lights telling you that they're lit and it's functioning. I've had instances, I've never had an instance in the last three years, or I've sold a product to somebody for their house, that they haven't had a reduced, or a drop in the utility bill. I've had them right up to 50%. So it depends on the amount of equipment they have in house, depends on the smart appliances, what they have, lots of air conditioning, hulu's, pumps, you name it, heat pumps. You know, I hate to give numbers because people come back and say, "Well, you told me I'm going to get 20 and I didn't. I get 18."

But I've had them right up to 50% on the power bill, which can be pretty significant. I tell people that the sine tamer is extremely good, if not the best product in the world for cleaning power with transients. I mean, we are the standard in the industry in the world for a reason. And up until now with this issue, with the smart meters, the single biggest issue that they should want to be dealing with is to get rid of that dirty power for their health. The cost savings should be a bonus. And because the warranties are extremely long and our units are 15 years, unequivocal, there are no hidden, prorated things. You know, we stand behind that

product. And we have very, very few failures. So the single thing that they should be looking at is their health. And that's worth it all.

Josh: Yeah. So it's basically the installation is effective for a lifetime of the house.

Terry: Sure. Usually people don't stay in houses longer than 15 years. And if you move you take it with you, I don't care.

Josh: There you go. Okay. And then before our conversation, you were telling me like you're now getting CEOs of large companies contacting you not only to protect their equipment, but on the health side, which is really encouraging. Tell us about that.

Terry: I've had one lately from a large airport that is extremely interested in making their buildings clean and safe for people. EMF RF, they want it and I don't blame. It's going to be where I see this industry going in the next few years. The World Health Association classified the electro sensitivity disease be at somewhere around 12 or 14% for the last couple of years. And at Christmas time, they bumped up to 35% worldwide for electro sensitivity.

So I see buildings and I've been getting feedback already, contractors are lining up now. They're going to be building houses and buildings now protecting from EMF and RF, and from shielding wire within the walls. You know it's going to be costly. But they're going to build safe clean buildings power wise.

So I firmly believe that's where the future is going to go. You know, painting of special paint on walls and special glass, special everything, because this problem is going to increase exponentially over the next few years when 5G comes out. So you know we're going to be overburdened with airwaves, radio waves, microwaves, let alone what's in our house, in our power generating off the walls.

Josh: So we'll just pause this conversation right now. We'll just share quickly an example of your sine tamer unit with oscilloscope visual readings, and you can see the dirty power before and after. We'll be right back.

Lady: Prior to the sine tamer box, I had atria fibrillation. I was diagnosed with that, which can cause blood clots in the heart, lung or brain. I couldn't sleep. I was fatigue. I constantly heard a humming noise, buzzing sounds. And since the sine tamer box was installed, all that has disappeared. I was getting heart palpitations all the time. I couldn't sleep. Now, I hardly get any heart palpitations at all. And sleeping better and I just feel better. Before the sine tamer was installed, this is --

Bill: You hold it up a little higher.

Lady: This is what it looked like.

Bill: Yeah.

Lady: This is four volts peak to peak.

Bill: Was quite high.

Lady: After the sine tamer box was installed, now we're less than a quarter volt.

Bill: Can you bring it closer to cam. Yeah, it's pretty flat.

Lady: Yes.

Bill: So the dirty electricity is gone away?

Lady: Yes.

Bill: Okay.

Lady: And I hear no more humming sounds. I can't explain this. It's kind of like a peaceful, sine changed my life seriously. And I would highly recommend this to anybody that is suffering like I did.

Bill: There you go. That's good. Okay. And then you showed me a picture of what it was like after we put the sine tamer in. How much improvement?

Lady 1: Much improved. The buzzing is gone. The filter has been on for maybe like six months, and it's working great. I have more than one person recommended you too, and I know you've been out there. But yeah, I highly recommend you.

Bill: Thank you.

Lady 2: I had very bad headaches, chest pain, nausea, fatigue. I was so sick, I couldn't live in the house for two months. But when I came back, I developed cardiac arrhythmias within two weeks. And we were very fortunate that Bill came shortly after and was able to install the sine tamer because that made a big difference. And the chest pain went away and arrhythmia has improved.

Lady 3: Even though my mom had the opt out meter at her house and I wasn't able to sleep. It was just like the days when I did have a smart meter on my own house, totally unable to sleep. Then he came, and we

had the electrician install it that afternoon. That very night, I could sleep like a baby. And every night for the rest of the week, I could sleep just fine. It was magic.

Bill: That's good.

Josh: So Terry, you mentioned tracking, tell us. What is the tracking characteristic of your product?

Terry: Well, our stuff is a typical suppression device that everybody else makes that we invented. If you take a look at the sine wave, and I don't have any charts in front of you. But if you take a look at the sine wave, you take top of the sine wave and the bottom of the sine wave peaks, those are at about 173 volts. So what they did and what we did 35 years ago is, we put a clamp up there probably 400 or 500 volts above and below the bottom of the sine wave. And that's where the suppression devices work. And that's where the good majority of them still work. They may try to pull those clamps in tighter to the sine wave. But they can only get maybe at 100. They typically don't get any more than within maybe 50. Now for the most part, the lowest I've seen I think is about 180 volts, somewhere in there.

So that spike whatever it happens, that transients spike has to hit that clamp before it clips it off. Now, what our guys; our engineers figured out 12-14 years ago. They could see where the microprocessor stuff was going in the finale, the finite items involved with it. So they decided they came up with a special tracking circuitry that is called frequency attenuation. That basically goes right above and below the sine wave and follows it very close, it tracks it. Because you all fix clamping, everything within the sine wave is untouched within those clamps no matter how close you try to clamp it. So what we do is we track it, we follow it above and below it. So that's why we get it down to an almost zero level.

Josh: So that's why we see on the oscilloscope readings of that sine wave how tight it is, how clean it looks in comparison to the before pictures.

Terry: Look at this. This is an actual one for Bill Bathate. That was before. And this is after.

Josh: Okay. So the before one, the peaks that we're seeing is just the transients isolated.

Terry: Yeah. It's got a filter in there. The yellow line is all there, the peak is coming from the smart meter. And that's what we do after.

Josh: Wow. I think there's a lot of people that are watching this talk right now that are really interested to learn more, and to get one of

these devices installed. Just walk us through the first steps and how that happens to somebody -- how does the sine tamer unit get installed?

Terry: Typically, like I'd mentioned earlier. When people express interest in it, I tell them to make sure that their house wiring -- I'll give them examples, I give them a sheet. I tell them to make sure their electricians check their grounding, their bonds, make sure they have a proper ground wire that goes out to a plate or a rod. It's not tied to a pipe, not tied to this or that. And to eliminate a lot of the stuff that they have in their house that is causing a lot of the issues; the nonlinear stuff, the LED lighting that they paid so much money for that they find out now is so harmful for us, the fluorescent lighting, and things like that. Anything there, the dimmer switches that chop the sine wave that caused a lot of garbage on the power lines.

So to go through the house, there's a lot of building biologists out there now that systematically go through somebody's house, and look into changing things for them to make it better. So once they do that, then I tell them, "Okay. Now, if that's the case, then you can order a unit, you can hire your electrician." I give explicit instructions on how to install it properly. I have them take pictures of the installed with panel off to make sure that it is installed properly. View hundreds of pictures a day, and then I'm in touch with them. Usually they contact me by email or through one of our sites. And we just kind of make it as simple as we can.

Josh: Yeah, good. So just kind of wrapping up here, my partner in this summit, Seyer Ji of GreenMed*info* and I, and you have had a number of conversations over the past few months. We've been looking into this dirty power problem, especially as it relates to smart meters. And I just have to say, from my perspective, this is the best, this is the best solution for solving the dirty power problem at the root level. And I have just as a filmmaker and as intended solutions provider, this is only the second product, really the second specific solution that I'm really putting my full weight of standing behind. I really believe in what you're doing, Terry. I've seen the videos, and I've seen Bill Bathgates site, comparing different technologies and actually with the testimonials of people whose lives are changed. So we are putting our full support behind what you're doing. And there's a link that we're encouraging people to go to learn more or to purchase, sine tamer unit from you.

And I'm just really excited about what you're doing. Because really, it's about taking back control of the health in your own home first, right? And then get healthy, get your family healthy. We're understanding this problem at a deeper level, which we didn't have access to this information six years ago, when I made *Take Back Your Power*. We're just kind of discovering it. And through like trial and error and synchronicity and you know, people coming to you and you're like

doubting that smart meters could cause those problems. And then you try it and then they get better. It's pretty significant. So thank you for your time. Thank you for your work and your service. You know, I appreciate your sincerity. Is there anything you want to share in closing with the viewers today?

Terry: I really appreciate you getting ahold of me and to get on this. Anytime I can reach more people with this information, the better it is for them. And I really appreciate what you've done. And I welcome and I thank you very much for your support. If they want more information of the scientific product, they can go on to; we have a new website that is fairly -- we did it to make it fairly simple for people to understand, it's called *poweremt.com*. Simple as that and/or they can go on to *cratuscanada.com*.

And the Cratus Canada has more technical articles under the Smart Meter section. But that site is going to be redone here shortly, but the power EMT is very good. On the power EMT site, there's a testimonial section and there is pictures of a before and after. And some pretty compelling video as well. So on the testimonial side. And by all means they can get hold of me through email from there, there's phone numbers, and we can talk. But I really very much appreciate the opportunity. Thanks a lot for this.

Josh: Absolutely.

Terry: Thanks.

PEMF Technologies for Healing

Guest: Wolfgang Jaksch

Josh: With us on the summit today is CEO of Swiss Bionic International, Wolfgang Jaksch. Wolfgang, thank you so much for your time and joining us today.

Wolfgang: Thank you very much for your invitation to this interview. And hi to everybody out there.

Josh: So you're the CEO and Founder in Swiss Bionic, who is a leader, a world leader in pulsed magnetic field therapy devices.

Wolfgang: That's correct. Yes.

Josh: And so this is very interesting because it's something that I have experienced, and we'll talk about my personal experience with it, if you like. As well as a lot of other people who have been struggling with various symptoms, including electro sensitivity and other autoimmune things. And actually, using EMF, there are certain EMF frequencies and certain EMF methods that your technology uses to help us heal. So it's interesting because EMF is not just a bad thing. It's not just a bad word. Since we're electromagnetic beings, there's ways that we can use this technology to benefit us. So it's nice to bring this side and this solution field to people today. So, thanks for your pioneering work.

Wolfgang: Yeah, that's correct. It's like with snake poison, snake poison can kill you and can heal you. It depends on the properties. And I think it's very important, if we talk about bad EMFs, that we also talk about possibilities and solutions to do good with EMFs, which is definitely possible nowadays.

Josh: So you are in Switzerland, you were born and raised in Bavaria,

in Germany. You were a pro hockey athlete until the age of 26. A cancer survivor. 25 years involved in energy medicine, mainly pulsed electromagnetic fields. You developed several PEMF systems, including the iMRS and the Omnium 1, which is the one that I have. And you've given more than 2,500 lectures worldwide. And you're a licensed racecar driver.

Wolfgang: That's true, yeah. That's when we figured out it's our passion. I mean, we could do an interview about that.

Josh: Really briefly, though, let's quickly talk about it. Because most of our viewers don't know this about me, but I used to be a professional racecar driver about 15 years ago. I was coming up the ranks and wanting to be in either the Indy 500 or Formula One. And so you and your wife actually race in Europe, and you have connections to Formula One teams and have Formula One cars. Just really quickly, what is the essence of the passion in that side for you?

Wolfgang: Well, the first essence is, it's a sport you can do a pretty long time because you can sit. You don't have to walk; you don't have to run. So that's pretty cool. And the second essence, which is obviously more important, is that it takes you out of business, because you have to 1,000% be focused when you sit in a race car. No matter whether it's a GT car, or a slower Formula car, or even Formula One cars, that's what I'm doing right now. Which are pretty fast, which needs full attention of your physical and mental capabilities.

And that's what I actually like a lot, to control this; to control the risk. To just get out of the business from time to time, and to challenge yourself in a completely different way. And yeah, like I said, I could live without racing but I don't want to live without racing. So it's part of my life. It's part of my success in business as well because it keeps me grounded. It keeps me focused, and I learned so much from racing, which I now can use also, in my business career.

Josh: Very good. So we're going to get into, in this conversation, your perspective on harmful EMF and wireless and 5G, and also beneficial EMF. The pulsed electromagnetic field therapy devices and technology that you brought to the world. But before that, I would just like you to give us a little bit about your background, and maybe just summarize some of the events in your life that brought you to this position of being both a leader in PEMF technology, education, and devices. And having such an excellent life that you've created. I have to give you props on that as well. But what's your history? And what's kind of your life path? Just in brief before we dive into the science and the technology understanding.

Wolfgang: Well, you mentioned it already. I was pretty much involved in sports when I was a young boy. And I actually was born and raised in Bavaria, so I mostly grew up with winter sports, hockey, and skiing. In my early stages of my sports activities, I was in the national ski team; the

junior ski team. I also played hockey and also on a professional level. But there was one incident in my life that changed my direction completely, and that happened. You mentioned it.

When I was 26 years old... I'm 52 now, so it's actually exactly half of my lifetime. Going back, it was this incident, I got diagnosed with cancer. It was a pretty serious cancer. It was a non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, and it was already stage three. So it was pretty serious. And it hit me out of nothing, I didn't feel anything. It actually really came out of nothing. I had no signs previously, I didn't feel bad or weak, or tired whatsoever. It happened during a routine visit at the doctor. I felt a knot close to my hip and checked it.

And he made an ultrasound and he said, "There's something which should not be there. We should get that out and send it to the pathologist to figure out what's going on there." And it turned out, they cut off a tumor the size of a fist, out of my lower hip. And yeah, I got this diagnosis at the time. The thing when you get hit with at 26, you don't think about that. You're not prepared for that.

You think about partying, having fun; girls, all that kind of stuff what you do. And especially when you're into sports, obviously, because your life is a little bit different. And you're more flexible in what you're doing. Yeah, but like I said, I was not prepared. And in the same time, the doctor told me that it's a pretty serious situation. So, statistically, I was I think at that time, 70% death, and 30% life. That was the statistics.

Josh: How do they measure that?

Wolfgang: Well, just by records. You have to understand, 25, 26 years ago, the medicine was a little bit different, in terms of how they recorded stuff. Especially with cancer because nowadays, they are more clever and there are more studies; there is more long term stuff. And at the time, it was not like that. It was more or less butchering; you know, they open you, they cut off everything. And they even did a second surgery on me. They opened me completely from the whole abdominal part. They took out the entire lymph string. They closed it again. It was a 12 hour surgery.

And even the mortality rate of the surgery is about 15%. So they took higher risks at the time. Obviously, everything went well. So that's good, I'm still here. But then I was on a complete stage of chemotherapy, which was just the protocol at the time. That's what they did. And after receiving that chemotherapy, I was obviously not the same person than before because I lost about 40 kilos. I couldn't even recognize myself in the mirror anymore. And energetically, and in regards to my spirit, I was pretty much done; I must say like that.

And then I realized when I went through the stuff and the day I went out of the hospital, I realized, "They leave you alone now." So they did the protocols, and then they tell you, you have to come every three months for the MRI or the CT, at that time. And you have to do your tumor

markers and blood control every month, for the first two years. "Then we extend it to every three months," and so on and so on. So that was the protocol I was on.

But nobody told me what I can proactively do to protect myself from another attack. On one hand, I felt pretty helpless. And on the other hand, I was intrigued to learn about what I can do to create a healthy lifestyle. Just to contribute something from my side. Because me personally, I didn't want to be guilty that I did not do everything to contribute to my survival. And that was my thought at that time. So I became pretty proactive. I figured out I have to get rid of these toxins first.

So I was looking into detox programs. The cool thing is, when I think back 26 years ago, Auntie Google was not there. So you had to show efforts to get information. Reading books, visiting conferences, fairs; lectures. That's what I did at the time. And, at one of these lectures that was about 25 years ago, somebody introduced PEMF technology. Because it evolved from... actually the first units for whole use were sold out of Austria at the time. And, just on my way to recovery and on my way to find answers on questions which I had, what I can do to be more proactive and stuff like that, I ended up at one of these lectures.

And this guy, he was pretty cool. He did a good job. He explained everything, and it just made sense to me. And I bought one of these systems at the time, because I figured out, "Yeah, that's cool, I can do something for my metabolism. I can improve detoxification," which is good against the chemotherapy. And I can do it in the comfort of my home, whenever I want. A lot of people have problems to seek doctors because it's related to spending a lot of time, and investing a lot of efforts and stuff like that. And I said, "Hey, it's cool. I have it at home, and I can do it."

Then I tried it and did it. Because my problem was, beside all the cancer stuff, I started suffering from insomnia because of the high toxification. And that's not a good combination; being sick, losing 40 kilos, and cannot sleep anymore. So I had days I didn't want to stay alive anymore, frankly speaking; because I felt nothing anymore in my body. Yeah, so that was my turning point in my life. I tried a lot of other stuff but this technology was overall, the best for me. Easy to use, I can do it at home. It was expensive but for me, it was okay to invest that in my house because I just felt it makes sense to me. So I saw the value at that time.

Then because of the progress I made, and I don't know, I mean, I did of course, always a healthy diet. I was drinking lots of water and stuff like that, but I did more or less nothing else anymore. I was not into nutrition, any other things; therapies, this was more or less what I did. Good, healthy food. Clean, good water; good hydration. And I did PMF and because of my personal feelings what I figured out, I got intrigued and I started investigating this technology. And this is how everything started.

Josh: Wow. There's an excellent scientific researcher on the summit, Magda Havas, who has talked about PEMF as well.

Wolfgang: I know her. Yeah, I've met her many times.

Josh: Excellent. Okay, good. I'll just share my experience with this. And then we'll get into maybe the science and the deeper understanding of it. I was going through a difficult time last year, a little bit like a mini depression, last November. I'll just be open and sort of admit that. I met Adrian Armstrong, I actually met him a number of years ago, but I found out about this PMF technology from him. It's this mat that you lie down on. And so he brought it for us to test, my family and myself, and a couple friends. And everyone just felt it, you feel more alive with this.

The way it was explained to me is that it's optimum if you can get into nature every day. If you can get into forest and put your feet on the earth, without any of this ground voltage and wireless radiation, and your devices in airplane mode. And if you can do that every day, then that's the optimum. But what I noticed is, because I can't do that every day, I was doing this mat every day, using this mat, from November and December. And it kind of slowly... it's like a cumulative effect over time. A couple months later, I started to realize more energy and health, and vitality.

And along with doing a couple of other things. These blue light blocking glasses are one of the things as well because I'm not taking in the harmful light frequencies from the screen. And there was another product called ASEA, which is a Redox signaling, cellular signaling supplement. These specific devices came into my life at this time, and now I kind of have much more energy and vitality.

And I'm able to do things like put together this summit and continue my work in the world, and go deeper in my life. And maybe one day, drive a racecar again with you because you mentioned that earlier. So I wanted just to share that personal experience of how meaningful this technology that you have brought into the world, has been for me personally. So, thank you for that. Tell us more about PEMF. It stands for pulsed electromagnetic field therapy, right? And how does it work?

Wolfgang: Well, you mentioned it already. I mean, if you take a look in medicine, everything is about chemistry. So the modern medicine is built on chemistry when it comes to treatments; but it is also built on electromagnetic energy when it comes to diagnostics. So, a lot of people know MRI, CT scans, even electrotherapy, whatsoever; this is all based on electromagnetic fields. So, in general, the term is not new, even in classical medicine. There is a lot going on with electromagnetic fields. But what's pretty new, and not a lot of people are aware of this, that we all are electromagnetic beings. So, we somehow interact with energy around us.

And you mentioned it, you know when you go on a vacation, for example, the reason why you feel good there, it's not just because

somebody brings you the tequila from the beach bar. It's also because you are surrounded by natural information around you, which is also known as frequencies. And we have a lot of natural frequencies which are already backed up by science. So that's not esoteric stuff. That's Newton's physics. We have an electromagnetic field inside the core of our Earth, with defined properties, in terms of intensity levels, and in terms of information spectrum; you know, frequencies.

And those frequencies alone, they are researched. Those intensities are known, and they are researched. Then the space around us, it's the so called ionosphere that's actually the distance between the surface of Mother Earth and the exit to the outer space where the astronauts go. This is an environment where human beings cannot survive anymore because we have essential things missing there. We have no gravity, we have no oxygen, and we also have no electromagnetic field of the Earth. So that's an environment where we cannot thrive and survive.

And on our planet, within this ionosphere, we have these so called Schumann resonances. Maybe you heard about that. It's also backed up by science. And this Schumann resonance has a certain frequency and it doesn't fluctuate a lot. That's pretty cool. So it looks like our ecosystem is a pretty stable system, within a very, very tiny, narrow window. And that also means if we have interruptions or if we have additional information coming into this environment, which don't have a natural source, it looks like that it creates some problems while we're interacting with that environment.

This is what happens nowadays. And this is definitely also the topic you are representing because when we get affected by artificial information, it looks like it's kind of a noise, which our bodies say, "Sorry, I don't understand this information anymore. I cannot interact." So it has two options; to shut down the connection, or it gets so disturbed that it forces the body to turn into a different situation. And those developments are unfortunately happening more and more. It started about I think 120, 130 years ago when the first artificial information were presented to Mother Earth, which was electricity; Nikola Tesla.

Before there were no artificial information; that was unknown. So we lived more or less in sync and in harmony with our natural environment. And nowadays, it's not possible anymore. So, we run more and more into deficiency because the electromagnetic exchange of information between us, as human beings, between the animals and the environment around us, is disturbed by artificial information sources. And that creates a lot of problems.

Josh: Yeah, I remember reading a book, Dirty Electricity, by Dr. Sam Milham. In which he shows you visually, as society got electrification, got electricity, you can trace over top of that increase in electrification, also the increase in diabetes; in a lot of the cancers. And a lot of the 20th century diseases and problems rose at the same time that all of this artificial information, as you describe it, all the modern benefit of

electricity, was reaching people's homes. It's really a two edged sword, isn't it? And it's not just with the wireless frequencies that we're talking about. It's been a two edged sword since, like you said, electricity was first introduced into human civilization.

So in one sense, this isn't new, but I like how you said, artificial information because it's not just the frequencies are artificial, and they're pulsing in an artificial way; on, off, digital pulses off... we are analog beings. But they're also carrying information on those frequencies that seems to interact with our electromagnetic essence. So, yeah, if you could tell us more about that. In terms of, okay, maybe now we get into a little bit of the harmful effects of EMF and how it's being used to cause harm. And then how we can use PEMF to help heal.

Wolfgang: So, what we know nowadays is, when it comes to the harmful EMFs, that obviously there are frequency ranges and intensity ranges, which we are not able to take. And in physics, we differentiate between the so called thermal effects, which are pretty well researched and which are mostly related to the intensity levels of these fields. So, you have this SAR value, which all the smartphones, they have to go through a test. I'm sure you're 100% aware of that. So, what happens if you use that smartphone close to your ear? Those are the so called thermal effects, which again, can be pretty well measured and researched with Newton's physics.

However, the problem is that we have a lot of ongoing athermal effects, which are mostly caused by the frequencies. And those athermal effects, till now, they cannot be research with Newton's physics because it doesn't provide any formula or whatsoever. So this goes more in the field of quantum physics, and quantum physics is probably the new physics also for medicine. However, it is not yet established in the classical medical world. And therefore, all these kinds of energy, healing stuffs, when you look at the classical medicine, it's not very well accepted.

And it's not because they don't believe in that or whatsoever, it's more or less, it's hard to do research on that because you cannot approve anything with Newton's physics anymore. Sometimes in my lectures, I tell the people, for example, "Did it ever happen to you?" You sit in a restaurant, and somebody is observing you, behind you. And you have no eyes, but you feel somehow that a person is looking at you all the time. So how is this possible? With Newton's physics, it's impossible.

But with quantum physics, we know about these quirks, these little parts, and it seems like that we are equipped with antennae, we human beings, and we are able to communicate. Not only with our eyes, ears, and mouth, but also with some kind of electromagnetic interaction with our environment. And maybe due to evolution, it just shut down over time, but we still have these capabilities. And we do this not consciously, but we do this, our body does it on a constant basis. It just does it 24 hours. And in energy medicine, the first thing you learn is that there is

no chemistry without energy.

Josh: So interesting, there's no chemistry without energy.

Wolfgang: Yeah, because every action in your body is initiated and maintained by energy. And the chemistry which relates to it, it's just a product out of it. And I like this because when we talk about what harms us, in terms of electromagnetic field, and what heals us, it's very important to understand that the way we are exposed to energy and we let energy towards our bodies, decides whether our body stays healthy or turns into an illness somewhere. When the energy levels are not balanced anymore, then the chemistry starts also going in the wrong direction.

Josh: Is it that the body is designed in a certain way that it can use certain types of frequencies or certain wave forms of energy and certain expressions of energy are associated with certain processes in the body? But other frequencies or waveforms can't be used by the body and they're disruptive. You're talking about PEMF as technology that's identified which frequencies and waveforms, and expressions of energy are supportive to the natural human body. Can you say more about that?

Wolfgang: Yes, I can definitely. Well, if you look at the frequency ranges which are present in the natural environment, you have more or less frequencies between 0.1 and 25 hertz. So it's very, very low frequencies. And, of course, we should not forget about the harmonics because whenever two frequencies meet each other, they create over waves; overtones, and those are so called harmonics. That's also very well known in music. For example, if an orchestra plays with 25 different instruments, and they do it in a harmonic way, it sounds pretty cool. If one instrument is not doing what it should do, it destroys the entire orchestra.

Josh: It sticks out. That's what you notice. Yeah.

Wolfgang: Exactly. And in terms of frequencies, I see companies out there, they claim that they know which frequencies organs resonate with. I did not find any research as of today, which proves that; but I know one thing that if we apply frequencies, which are in the range of the frequencies, which you can find in nature, then you cannot do something wrong because we evolved with nature over millions and billions of years. So, if we are aligned with those frequencies, then it cannot be bad. And like I said, the frequencies are mostly between 0 and 25%, we can measure harmonics up to 30, 50 kilohertz.

Josh: 0 and 25 hertz, is it?

Wolfgang: Hertz. Like I said, we can measure harmonic over waves up to 30, 50 kilohertz, which are always dependent on the basic, natural frequency. Now imagine you use a smartphone or you are living far away from 4G, or now we have 5G antennas, what happens actually, is that those antennas, they emit an electromagnetic field. With a

property of an intensity level, and with the property of information content, what we know as frequency. And those frequencies, I'm not so good into 5G but we are in the higher gigahertz range when it comes to 5G frequencies.

Josh: Yeah, it's essentially, the highest band is 24 to 90 gigahertz, as it's been sort of outline. But it's basically everything from 600 megahertz, all the way up to 90 plus gigahertz.

Wolfgang: Exactly, and 600 megahertz are 600 million hertz. So that's 600 million vibrations a second. And now compare it to the natural range, which is between 0 and 25 vibrations per second. So it just doesn't match anymore, those frequencies are so high. And the next thing is, what happens if one of these natural frequencies meets an artificial frequency? It creates also over waves. But because both basic frequencies are not natural anymore, only one, the over waves are not a hundred percent natural as well. So what we actually produce is non harmonic over waves. So even more overload of information, our body is not used to resonate with.

Josh: Non harmonic over waves is basically artificial waves that your body can't use. It's sort of junk energy and information that is either neutral or harmful.

Wolfgang: Yes, it's just noise. It's noise. The problem is we have no organ to detect this noise. And that's why it's not capable for us, we don't know if the 5G antenna around the corner harms me, because I have no organ to detect the problem. And that makes it so painful for us to know that there is something bad going on but you cannot feel it.

Josh: When you think about that, just that point what you just said, it's almost this threat and feeling disempowered. It's like it comes with a threat of almost survival, because in your mind, you know that there's something that's harmful. You know that these effects are harming you, but you can't feel it, you can't see it, you can't taste it, you can't touch it, and you can't smell it.

So, you can see how it could put one in, if they're not focused on either shielding or mitigating, or creating a solution, a place of considerable discomfort in knowing that there's a harmful agent there, but I can't even feel it. I don't know it, I feel kind of helpless to sort of detect it and mitigate it. That's actually one of the reasons why we recommend that people get an electromagnetic testing device. So they can actually see, and they can even hear, and then they can do something about it. So that's the Cornet device there that we recommend. But yeah, please continue.

Wolfgang: Yeah because you can only make people aware of it if you bring it in a way so that people understand it. And that's the big issue about all this wireless technology because the threat is not there; because we cannot detect it. And that's why it's so important that what you guys do, making people aware of it. And there are possibilities of

making it visible for them, durable for them; measurable. So that there is proof that there is something going on which is not right anymore, and which creates problems.

And I also think about our children, they can't do anything against it because they don't have the capability yet to decide for themselves to stay away. Most of the young kids of 7, 8, 9, and 10 years, they want a smartphone already because they don't know that it's not good for them. So we need to start educating the children at a very low age already, to become responsible when it comes to this because they are the ones, they're going to suffer from this much more than we do.

Because we more or less left the stuff behind us. But I mean, all this evolving civilization illnesses, like allergies, like autism, ADD; all that stuff. I mean, where does it come from? It's an overload of information, of artificial stuff, and the body is literally freaking out already because it cannot deal with it anymore. And this is how it shows, in allergies and autoimmune reaction. So that's something else that the immune system tells you, "Sorry, I cannot deal with this anymore. I'm freaking out here."

And then it shows off in like skin problems, depending on where the weak spot is on your body, in the face or somewhere else; sinuses and all that stuff. That's a disturbance, an external disturbance, which the body says, "I'm sorry, this is not my way to understand this anymore," and it starts freaking out with it. And that's a big problem. The biggest problem of all is, we have to be aware that we cannot run away from this anymore. That's the biggest problem.

There is no spot on this planet anymore. I've been to Australia six weeks ago, to lecture there in Sydney. And then I went for a short trip to the Fiji Islands and an amazing place there. I mean, gorgeous, like on the postcards. But you have reception everywhere, you have 4G reception everywhere, on every little island. So there is no spot on this planet anymore, more or less, where you can escape from this artificial information and where you are literally exposed to this kind of threat.

Josh: The main purpose of this summit is to help bring awareness toward the critical point, the turning point in which we can, together, have the social influence to change the course; change the direction of this crazy push for this deployment of 5G. Then educate our elected officials and take actions, to be part of that solution. To actually put directly in action. So we're making it super simple for people, after they get educated, to take action.

But secondly, this conversation right here and the focus on taking care of our bodies, in the meantime, taking care of our kids, in the meantime. Cleaning up the power in our own homes. Shielding, mitigating EMF and wireless, and this using PEMF therapy. Considering the use of PEMF therapy in your home for yourself and your family, and those around you, to really bring you back to the natural way of functioning for your body, for yourselves, and your systems.

So that's the reason why we're talking to you today, if anyone is still wondering. But this is a very important piece that, as we go about our daily lives and attempt to become aware and live intentionally to solve problems sort of out there, we have to take care of here, don't we?

Wolfgang: Yes, exactly why I was speaking so long about that fact, with the interference of information and stuff like that. Let's talk now about what PMF is doing. Because you mentioned at the beginning that people always say, "Well, how can PMF do something good for me, if everybody tells me that these electromagnetic fields are all are all bad and threatening?" Well, yeah, I said at the beginning, it really depends on the applied properties. That's very important to understand.

And, like I said, we have certain numbers, physical numbers, where we can identify the quality and quantity of an electromagnetic field. It's the frequency, it's the intensity, and it's also a third thing that's very important in energy medicine; the so called resonance factor. So, is this field capable of resonating, of interacting with the receiver, in our case, the human body? And the idea of PMF is pretty simple. As we cannot run away from this artificial information anymore, so we are constantly exposed to it; the only thing what we can do is, we can increase the amount and the dose of getting exposed to natural frequencies.

Which you could naturally do, for example, by avoiding places where there is a very high EMF exposure on the beach somewhere. I mean, it's there, but it's not on a high dose. Or you supply additional, natural frequencies and intensities, in order to build up the strength of your body, to literally conquer this threat. By offering a more strong environment from your body, and this is literally what you do with PMF. You get exposed to an electromagnetic field, a very gentle one with a very low intensity.

We talk about between 22 and 17 microtesla, which is a very, very low intensity, but in the same time, which is equal to the intensity of the electromagnetic field of the Earth. Because this is something we go along very well, since a long, long time. And in terms of the frequencies, we talk about frequencies between 0.1 and 25 hertz, which is also a very, very low frequency. And which you also can find in nature, with the spherics, the Schumann waves, the electromagnetic fields of the earth core, and so on and so on.

And this is the idea of PMF. To supply additional natural frequencies and intensity levels, in order to strengthen your body to protect yourself against these digital, high frequency, high intensity waves. I'm in this since, now 22 years in this business. We came to North America in 2006, first to Canada, and then half a year later to the US. By the way, at that time, nobody knew about PMF. So we actually introduced PMF to North America, which I'm still very proud of because I did a lot of lectures at the beginning, starting to educate people about that.

I mean, we have about right now, maybe 1.5 million users worldwide.

And we get a little feedback. I mean, from all kinds of ranges. I would probably point out, I think it's also important; in general, what does science say about evidence levels of PMF? And I can tell you from a scientific point of view, we have very, very good evidence when it comes to bone and cartilage, cartilage metabolism.

We have very good evidence when it comes to circulation. We have very good evidence when it comes to wound healing. And we have very good evidence when it comes to neuronal regeneration. And we also have good to very good evidence when it comes to pain management, inflammation, rheumatoid arthritis, and also very importantly, sleep improvement. So that's the scientific part.

When we talk about testimonials, I have thousands and thousands of testimonies, that's what keeps me going. The cool thing about my business is, normally when you buy a phone, nobody will send an email to this company and say, "Oh, I thank you, I'm so happy with this phone. I can call my grandfather now," or something like that. However, in my business, people always get back to you. Over a certain time period, they want to share with you their success. They want to just thank you for introducing that to them. And I mean, that's so amazing in this business.

We have testimonials from all kinds of people, starting from children with autism; ADD. Like I said, in every channel where we have really good science, we have proven testimonials. You mentioned a little bit about yourself, you know, depressive states. I mean, depression is always stamped as a mental disease, but it's also a physical disease, because you're exhausted, you're out of energy. It starts also on a physical basis, it's not only mental.

So when it comes to this, to rebuild your energy levels, to rebuild your immune system; to make you stronger, more energized, more balanced. That creates such a tremendous shift in your body. And that will also shift mental problems because when you feel strong again, when you are motivated, then of course, your mental issues disappear.

Josh: I like using it just a little bit in the morning and a little bit before bed, and I sleep better obviously, just the more that I do include that as part of my daily routine. Can you tell us about specifically the effects of people that have experienced microwave sickness or electro sensitivity, then using the PMF technology for healing?

Wolfgang: Yeah, this is a hard nut to crack because I call these people desensitized. So, when the entire body is electromagnetically desensitized, then it's very, very hard for them. It's a long way to build it up again. And therefore, it is very, very necessary that if you use PMF for such kind of conditions, that you take your time; you work with very, very low intensity levels. You even start with very, very short application duration; because literally every little impulse, which is a little bit too high, could lead to an adverse effect.

It's very hard to treat that but it's possible, but you need to be patient,

and you need to be consistent with using it on a daily basis, but with very, very, very low intensity levels. It's very important now to build up, to literally sensitize yourself again, for electromagnetic fields, to get this feeling again. With hypersensitivity people, the problem is, they are prone to these overloads, and they totally lose their capability of dealing with electromagnetic fields. So, the body needs to learn that again, to build that up. And that requires a lot of training and a lot of gentle approach; very important.

Josh: Gentle approach and facilitate that feeling of safety again, in having electromagnetic fields around the body because they're safe and supportive to the body fields. But that makes sense. You obviously don't want to overload. So just in wrapping up here, is there any...?

Wolfgang: There is no quick fix for that. That's absolutely not possible.

Josh: So we know that there are thousands of studies that show wireless radiation and wireless EMF is harmful. How many studies would you estimate, Wolfgang, that show that PMF can actually be helpful and beneficial to the body?

Wolfgang: Well, the question is what is considered to be a study but we have about... I can tell you, I have an encyclopedia of about 15,000 publications, which talk about the beneficial health effects of pulsed electromagnetic fields. And there are for sure, a couple hundred of clinical studies with good study design; there are a couple of thousands of trials with maybe a decent study design. And there are also a lot of publications which refer to positive effects. Which are not a hundred percent acknowledged by classical medicine, but which definitely show a lot of evidence. So there is a lot out. The same like with the harmful ones.

Josh: Okay, good. Now, what should we be looking for when we're looking at various PMF technologies, in order to get a good and safe, and efficient technology?

Wolfgang: Well, in general, if you want to use PMF as an application for treatment and not for diagnosis, for the home use, first of all, you have to make sure that you get something which is electrically safe and electromagnetically compatible. So, make sure you get a system which has all the international norms and certificates that it's electrically safe and electromagnetically compatible. And at the same time, make sure at least that it's registered with one of the National Health Authorities such as, for example, in Canada, its Health Canada. In the USA, it's FDA, and all over Europe.

So that's important, at least because there are so many PMF devices which do not have any certificate, even not electric safety. And I would not recommend to buy one of these systems because it's just simply not safe. And you don't know what's coming out of all these applications. So that's very important to look at. And when it comes to the properties, make sure that you get a system which works with a very, very low

frequency range. Like I said, a natural range between 0.1 and 25 hertz would be fine for the basic frequencies.

Make sure that it uses waveforms which are also not artificial, like basic waveforms, which we know from physics. Like sine waves, square waves, saw tooth, triangle waves, they are good; everything else is artificial. And it's maybe easy to patent but it doesn't tell anything about the efficiency of the PMF system when it comes to the interaction of the body. And then it's also good if you maybe get a system which has a built in biological clock, a so called organ clock. So which gives you the correct frequency, depending on the time of the day you use the device.

As you know, the only one in the iMRS devices have such a property built in. And it helps the people to make the application more easy, simpler, and more efficient. Because for example, when you use a late night session before going to bed, make sure that you get the lower frequency range, because this is also in correlation to our brainwaves. When we are in a more sleepy state, we have more theta and delta in our brainwaves. And it's the same with a PMF device, the later you use it, the lower the frequency has to be. And this is very important and just make sure that you've got durable applicators, which you can use on almost every surface. So this is important.

And what I also need to mention, because there are a lot of high intensity devices out, I mean, we talk about really high intensity, up to five tesla, which is the same intensity than an MRI. That's about 100,000 to 500,000 times higher than a PMF device like we supply. Those high intensity PEMF devices, they may have or may show effects, especially indications like depression. There is this new technology called RTMS; repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation. But that doesn't belong in the hands of home users; that can be only done professionally and safely, in a clinical environment. And only experienced people should use such systems.

But there are also systems in this intensity range for home use. And none of the systems I know don't even have a certificate for electric safety. So, I won't say that they are not efficient, but they are not safe to use. And like I said, they belong in the hands of really, really experienced clinical staff. Otherwise, I would never expose myself to one of these units. So that's more or less what it is. And then, make sure, like I said, that you have a steady warranty on that; that you have service, if something's going wrong. That you have a hotline where you can call. That you have warranty repair and all that stuff.

It's an investment, we talk about between three and \$6,000 for such a device, a low intensity device; so it's quite an investment. But if you treat it well, and you have a good company, you will at least have it for 15 years without any problems. Because the good thing about PMF devices, with these applicators is that you don't have properties which you have to exchange from time to time. So that's not necessary. It's free of maintenance.

Josh: But just in closing, how do you see the future of technology from this point forward? And in light, I guess, of so many people becoming aware of EMF, both harmful EMF with 5G and Wi-Fi, and wireless, and also the beneficial effects of what you're bringing forward. How do you see the future of medicine going forward?

Wolfgang: Well, for me, one thing is clear. With the involvement of all these new technologies, of the new way we are communicating with each other, with all this digital frequencies, in my opinion, it is necessary that medicine needs to evolve too. In terms of not only looking on symptoms, and on medication, and on chemistry; they have to really involve these environmental changes. They have to involve the environment, in my opinion, even in the study design.

I mean, for me as an ambassador of energy medicine, every study which is not done in a controlled environment, which 99% of the studies are not, because you don't know when you do a treatment on somebody, on a patient, during a study, whether there is a 5G antenna a hundred yards away, or whatsoever. Which would definitely... and you know it and I know it, affect the result of this treatment. So in my opinion, all this study design is old fashioned, and it's pretty useless nowadays, when it comes to investigating all these evolving illnesses; which in my opinion, are more or less environmentally related.

So we have to put the environment into place when we do such studies. And that's why it's so important. We get 5G now. We get the higher frequencies. We get more and more antennas. We've got this total overload of all this artificial information. So there has to be an involvement and an acknowledgement in energy medicine. And I think that's going to be... the future of medicine is to combine the classical aspects, the experience what we have with classical medicine, which by the way I'm not against, because without classical medicine, I'd probably not be alive anymore. So I want to point this out too.

This guy cut my tumor off and he did a very good job with this. He cut off my entire abdomen, pulled out the bad stuff and closed it again, and I'm good. I'm active, I'm healthy. So not against classical medicine, but we need to become more open minded, not only creating awareness of the threats, but also creating awareness of the possibilities to protect yourself and to treat illnesses which will definitely evolve over time; caused by all these threats. We don't even know yet what we're going to do with 5G, because there is no long term study nowadays. There is nothing out which proves how bad it really is.

This is what I see and what I wish for, for this kind of community. We are dealing both with people who are already affected by harmful EMF, people who seek solutions and who think about creating technology to protect yourself from it, and so on. And also classical medicine. So we have to become more open minded. We have to get our forces together, and we have to also, what you do, we have to work a little bit against all this lobbyism from the corporate world. Which of course, don't like

that topic at all, because they want to sell their stuff. They want to make the money with it, which I understand but there has to be more responsibility in the nearest future when it comes to that.

Because we talk with human beings, we talk about children, we talk about creatures who are not able to protect themselves, and it cannot go on like this. And that's why, like I said, let's put the forces together. There's always a solution, but the other side has to make a step towards our side. In order to be more open minded, and to listen a little bit more to what we have to say, to create the best possible future ever. For us still, which we probably have 34 more years to live, and for our children, which their life just started. I mean, that's the kind of responsibility I think we can expect from everybody who is involved in this kind of topic. That's my wish, and I will contribute whatever I can to promote this and to support this.

Josh: Excellent. Wolfgang, thank you for your time. I know we had our challenge here with the connection. About three times we had to reconnect to get this interview done but we did it. The information is getting out. And I really appreciate your work and your pioneering leadership, and spending time with us today on the summit.

Wolfgang: Yeah, thank you very much for having me there and for getting to know you. And like I said, my invitation stands, whenever you want to jump in a race car, let me know. I will prepare one for you.

Josh: Absolutely, I'm going to take you up on that. We'll do a video. We'll put it out on YouTube.

Wolfgang: Absolutely.

Josh: Thank you. Have a good night.

Wolfgang: Thank you, Josh. Have a good night as well. Thank you very much.

Solutions for a Toxic Agenda

Guest: Dana Ashlie

Josh: Joining us on the Summit today is YouTuber and You-Truther, Dana Ashlie. Dana, welcome to the Summit.

Dana: Thank you so much, Josh, for having me. It's a pleasure to be here.

Josh: I'm just going to take this moment and share with our viewers a little bit about your background. And then we will dive right in. You have some very interesting, powerful information and perspective, and dot connecting. So, really looking forward to this chat today.

Dana Ashlie is a leading YouTuber with over a hundred thousand subscribers and some compelling content in the arenas of 5G, wireless radiation, as well as spiritual prophecy. And is considered a modern-day watchman to her loyal base of viewers. With some of her videos exceeding a million views, her background in branding and publishing makes her content a more digestible version of these harder to swallow topics. She combines her wealth of knowledge around health and corporate propaganda with tact and humor and panache, I would say, in exposing harmful agendas. And offers viewers a big picture perspective regarding the ultimate purpose for 5G.

So, I was checking out some of your YouTube videos, which is just under your name, Dana Ashlie. And what kind of response are you getting? Just in general? Connecting the dots, bringing in information about wireless, you know, weapons, and 5G, and all this information forward?

Dana: Well, overall very positive, which is kind of shocking, very humbling. I think mainly because I'm really no expert. Unlike a lot of the people that you will have on your fantastic Summit that I'm happy to be a part of. But again, like you said, I'm more of a dot connector between many subjects. More of a jack of all trades, master of none, kind of thing.

But even though I'm never the first to speak about the topics that I bring up. I think that perhaps they're working with people because I present things in a way that talks to a larger group. And I always want to assume that no one has any clue about anything that I'm speaking about. And I also assume that no one is taking a critical perspective of these issues.

So, I think that makes it have more shares. For example, my video about the wireless warfare. You don't just come out and say, "Your cell phones are going to kill you." You know, you have to say, "Has the government ever approved anything else before that has caused harm?" "Well, absolutely, yes." What are the conflicts of interest that you so brilliantly, you know, brought out in your film about smart meters? What might the FCC have to gain by approving levels that are not safe for human beings? Things like that. And can bought and paid for science happen? Most people don't want to believe that that's true.

When you sort of like set up all these reasons to actually motivate people to get critical in their thinking. Because we're trained not to think critically in school. It's like, "Okay, multiple choice, which of these is the right one?" Where we're having children regurgitate what they're telling us is true, rather than teaching people how to figure out truth for themselves. So, I think people tend to project their own good nature's on to those that run things. And unfortunately, although it's coming from a good part. It's not serving them ultimately.

And so, it's only from that perspective that you can start to talk to someone about how their most prized possession, their cell phone could actually or their Wi-Fi, could actually hurt them. Otherwise, they're just going to go out and cut and paste a study that is not independent science, that you know supports their addiction to their technology. And believe me, I love technology. I was a Wi-Fi hopper before all this started. So, I get both sides. But when you come at things from a logical perspective and you really break down that initial reason to question what you're saying. Then not only is it well-received, people tend to share it because then it'll speak to more people. So, for that reason, I think it's working out on the channel.

Josh: Yeah, well said. You mentioned about people projecting their good intentions on to others. And then finding it confusing, like literally just wondering how it could be that that this modality of psychopathy could be running a lot of these agendas? Like we don't understand that, almost. So, maybe we can get into that a little bit later in the

conversation. I'd love to hear your thoughts on that. On the source of that and how that functions and how we can best respond to it.

But for now, I'll ask you, how did you get into the subject of wireless radiation, health effects, and all of this?

Dana: Well, like you mentioned in the intro. I do have a background with exposing harder-hitting truth for about twenty years now. I co-published a magazine in Seattle where we talked about fluoride, and pesticides, and the importance of organic food. And kind of preaching to the choir up in Seattle about that.

But even back then, I was promoting things that are like questioning what could be the alternative reasons why 9/11 might not be the story they were telling us? And this was like before we knew that there were no weapons of mass destruction. So, although I've been sort of into this critical way of looking at things for a long time. I also had a background with health, and detoxing, and fasting, and questioning these mainstream beliefs. That I never knew that eventually all this knowledge would help me understand this big picture perspective about the real plan behind 5G. Which we'll get into later. But it absolutely does. But as for the wireless part, like I said, I was a Wi-Fi hopper. I loved my cell phone. Which I still have it for certain things. But it stays on airplane mode a lot of the time.

Being a new editor with the YouTube channel, what happened was I became way more bombarded with these frequencies having my laptop in my lap and all this kind of thing. It actually started to impact my health. And having been in the health world for so long, I was very, very, disappointed with myself for not having figured this out sooner. I mean, I only figured this out like September of last year.

And so, being a researcher once I did start realizing, "Wow, I've had migraines for exactly the same number of years that I've had Wi-Fi." And you know, I'm very healthy. And that was one thing I just couldn't rid in my life. And I have not had a migraine since getting rid of my Wi-Fi at this point. So, when you see these fantastic studies that are out there. That are not getting traction, I mean, there was no stopping me with regards to yelling from the treetops, to help other people because they're ultimately that's really my motivation.

I see so many people suffering and we see the epidemic of the addiction to the phones. And so, we just have to let people know. That's sort of how it came about. It was from actually getting brain fog and not being able to think straight anymore. And then ever since I've hardwired everything. Everything is kind of back to normal. So, that's good.

Josh: Wow. So, Dana we had as you know, Dr. Klinghardt, as part of the

Summit. He talked brilliantly about metals and the connection between autism, early onset Alzheimer's, and just neurological conditions in general. I want to have you talk about the heavy metals. But before I do, I just want to let the viewer know, that in the last few minutes of this, we're going to get into your specific mitigation strategies and solutions, health, detox, what you can do to protect your family and your home. So, just wanted to let the viewer know that. But please tell us what you know about heavy metals? What you've researched? And the conclusions you've come to?

Dana: Right. So, knowing about the metals plays into what I learned before learning about the wireless. And so, with my previous knowledge base about health. I've been through many different perspectives about what causes true health. Back in the day, it was all about the food, your fuel has to be clean. And even though I'm living an organic life. I'm surrounded by all these people who take their health very seriously. You know flax oil on everything. Everything was like totally monitored. And was the cleanest food you could get basically.

And yet, I'm still looking around and I went through vegetarian streak as well, which I'm not saying I recommend now. But anyway, I am looking around I'm still seeing people that are really sick. Even though they're really, you know, taking time to do things right. And through going some of my own sort of mild health issues, I learned the benefits of detoxing and fasting. And these are incredible things that you can do for your body. Learning how to clean the liver, who knows that your liver can be cleaned. I mean, I cured myself of all kinds of amazing things by these kinds of fasts and detoxes.

Yet still, some health issues persist throughout all these things. And so, over like maybe the last four years, I've really been into in comprehending the importance and interplay of metals in our health. And I've since discovered how to actually find out if you have metal issues. Which pretty much all do but some have a harder time getting rid of them than others. And that's what's going to determine more sensitivity.

But just a little anecdotal story about like how metals can impact the health of the body. So, very few doctors will say, "Well candida is the problem for your fatigue, and your thrush, and your UTIs, and your sinus infection, and joint pain." They will want to look at the symptoms rather than, "Wow, candida is actually causing all of this stuff."

But fewer people understand that it's actually candida is trying to act as a buffer between the mercury in your body. So, back in my vegetarian healthy days. Everybody was cutting out sugar for like a year, like not even a piece of fruit. But then they eat one apple again and it comes back. And so, seeing these sorts of trial and error types of situations, I

realized that, "Wow, once they got rid of their mercury. They could eat the apples, and fruits, and things, and it wasn't an issue."

So, now we know through amazing people. Like Dr. Chris Exley, who has dissected the brains of adults with Alzheimer's and found aluminum in them. And we know through this recent ability to get some children who unfortunately passed away from autism. And he opened up their brains and seen that they were full of aluminum. And then we coincide that into the wireless thing. Which when you just look at the studies, you know that in the 70s, Dr. Alan, I don't know if he was a doctor but he's a military researcher. Alan Fry proved the RF frequencies open up the blood-brain barrier.

Well, hello, I mean this makes perfect sense why we have young people who are having MS, and Parkinson's, and these issues, that usually don't happen until the brain has deteriorated over many, many, years. And so, yeah, this is absolutely and totally directly impacted by the metals and in conjunction with the wireless. But if you talk to your doctor about heavy metals, you know. At best, they'll probably laugh it off. Or they might, you know, give you a blood test. Which has no bearing on your health because that's only going to measure acute issues with it. Because the blood has to be at a perfect ph. And so, it's going to tuck those metals away as quickly as possible. You know, if you've been exposed in the last three days, okay. But what we're looking for is an accumulation of metals in the body.

So, yeah, I mean this is basically what I've been looking at and people may think, "Well, I don't have metals in the body. Where would I have metals?" But let's just take a look at that. So, we have fluoride. Which few realize actually acts as a metal in the body. And it accumulates in the pineal gland in the brain. If you know that Hitler used it on his folks in Germany to sort of like bring them more plasticity to them as he was doing his thing. When you look at your toothpaste and it says, "Warning do not swallow." That's because it has fluoride in it. It's the fluoride that makes the toxic. So that's one example.

Of course, mercury. If you have a silver amalgam filling, you're basically tucking away one of the most harmful elements in the planet into the soft tissue of your skull. And every time you breathe in, especially with a warm liquid, it is going into your body. You know, crazy, it's crazy what medicine has done.

Then aluminum, we're bombarded with aluminum. Through what we cook with, tinfoil, pots and pans. We put it in our armpits, where the stuff is supposed to be coming out. Instead, it's going in. And then of course, I will not get too much into the vaccine thing. But as you probably know vaccines have a ton of aluminum and still some mercury in them, in the flu shot and things like that.

Roloids, Tums, people have bad stomach aches from the food they're eating. They just throw some aluminum on there. We just don't know because no one tells us that this stuff is dangerous. Again, stratospheric engineering we know that it's totally declassified now. It's no longer denied. Their nano particles of aluminum, barium, titanium, coming in our sky. So yes, we all have it. It's just we got to ask, "Well why in the world that they want us so chock full of Metals?

You know, Dr. Klinghardt like you said. I was thrilled to find him because he's one of the few doctors and he is very effectively getting rid of MS, autism, all kinds of really crazy things. People have seen thirty-six different doctors before they come to him. And they're hopeless. And he helps them get rid of their issues. And one of the first things he has them do is turn off their wireless. And then he checks for the metals.

So, I am very excited to find a real doctor who is doing the work and is pointing out the same things that I kind of came to in my own research. It's very exciting.

Josh: Great. Another really powerful talk on the Summit is Martin Paul. The second part of my talk with Martin, he gets into five key areas of wireless and health. And one of them includes very, early, onset Alzheimer's. Which he mentioned this problem of millennials and even younger. And gets into the science about how that's being caused. It's very powerful, very daunting interview. But we need to know, right?

We absolutely need to know what's going on. And so, you mentioned kind of some different agendas which are all harmful. And have been shown to be harmful. And also, if you look at just specifically microwave radiation science. Back in the 70s, there were thousands of published studies that all indicated harm. The U.S. Navy, and Zori Glaser, and like government's knew this. And we're still 40 years later being told that we need more science. The science is inconclusive, you know, all this stuff.

Let's dive into the next level here. Is this being done on purpose? Is there an agenda that is being done on purpose to cause a negative effect in human beings? And if so, why? And if so, what kind of negative effects from your perspective?

Dana: Yeah, that is a big one. And it's hard not to look at things that have been going on for many, many, decades. That seem to have prepared their footing in the situation we find ourselves in now. And on that front of the metals, one thing that's important and it will help people to understand how to combat this when we talk about how to undo this monster. Is let's think back to you know, the 50s, 60s, 70s, how all of the farming started switching into this industrial farming. And what did we find through that?

Well, they basically went to sources of food that were subpar in such a striking way. That it is unbelievable. As a young girl, we would go get our milk from an actual dairy farm. And we would see the girls lined up getting milked. And there would be a big stainless steel vat and we would take our clean glass container, open it up. And I still shake my almond milk today because we had cream on the top of our milk. And that man was a very rich man from being a farmer. And my mom was very upset to find out that the government paid him more money to stop producing milk than he made as a farmer.

Now, why on Earth would we do that? Let's just be logical for a minute. Okay, let's maybe subsidize the people who are doing good. But no, we're subsidizing the ones who are making hormone laden, full of toxin, pasteurized milk, that is not a food. And we are putting the ones out of business at are.

And it's hard to not like question. That doesn't seem right. So, the over farming, what has that done? You have to eat eight apples today, to get what one apple used to get you. Non-GMO corn had 6,130 parts per million of calcium. Well, GMO corn has 14. That is 437 times more calcium. So, what we're seeing is a complete stripping of the minerals of the food supply. Which it sounds, "Oh, well maybe that's just because they're trying to save money."

But when you look at how this plays into with the heavy metals that they have been introducing. Once you are depleted of the minerals that you have, your body becomes like a sponge for the toxic heavy metals that they are putting in its place. And when you look at, Dr. Stephanie Seneff's phenomenal work on glyphosate and how she proved that glyphosate not only attacks specific strains of probiotics. But it also drains minerals from the body. And it delivers aluminum directly to the brain.

It's like what? How is this possible? So, how does this add to the 5G agenda? You know, what would metal in the body do? Let's just think about it from a logical perspective. From the earliest form of capturing radio frequencies, like when we had a radio back in the 80s, what did we do? We pulled up the big metal antenna and we captured the radio waves that are going through the air, right? So, if the TV wasn't working right, we'd get out the foil, put it on there, and make it work better.

So, metals act as an antenna for these frequencies. They just do. And we can see what aluminum does in our microwave. As a very dramatic example of what happens. So, just exactly how could they use these frequencies and 5G more powerfully is the question. Are they going to be able to directly manipulate our emotions? I mean, we know that emotions do have frequencies to them. It's all to be determined, unfortunately. But my emphasis is, let's get the metals out of our body

now. Sooner than later because the more that we get out now, the less likely we are able to become EMF sensitive. And you know, detectable by this stuff in the future.

Josh: Okay, so it's probably being done on purpose to dumb us down. Is that your conclusion?

Dana: Well, like you said, when you consider that our very own military had already done extensive research with the magnetic fields by the time 1970 rolled out. We know that a few minutes exposure, a few minutes exposure, to 900 megahertz frequencies, it opens up the blood-brain barrier. And that just happens to be the frequency that we choose to run our cordless phones in the 90s. Our military has an Electrical Warfare Department. We should ask those guys if microwave and millimeter wave frequencies are harmful, right?

And if you think about the 2.4 gigahertz frequency in particular, that's the one that's used for almost everything, right? Wi-Fi, routers, cordless phones, baby monitors. You realize that, that's the frequency that you don't have to have a license to use. So, they knew that whatever frequency they picked would be bombarding human beings. It just so happens that's one of the most harmful frequencies to the human body. And take a guess who was the company that was responsible for choosing that frequency? It actually was a particular company. And that company name is Raytheon, a military defense contractor. So, this is military grade, its weaponry. That's just what it is.

And the last thing, I'll give you an example of, do they know? I had a special OPS Navy guy come on my show. He had worked with the DHS, CIA, other federal high-end agencies. He contacted me about his specific knowledge around the millimeter wave. And he was stationed in an International Airport over seeing Homeland Security.

Josh: Who's this? Can you say the name?

Dana: I can't.

Josh: Okay.

Dana: He had small children. Yeah, but anyway, he did go into a lot of detail on the video. I do have it up. But anyway, he had a lot of training around millimeter and microwave frequencies. Because he was a counterterrorism specialist. So, he knew how to like detect bombs and get bombs from the airport. And he knew what would set things off and all this kind of stuff.

So, anyway, in this airport he was a couple steps under the four-star general that was in charge of the DHS. And through his time in the

airport, he and a team of other guys discovered, I mean because they have access to all these studies that you're talking about. And they're like, "Wait a minute, these millimeters wave machines." Which by the way, when you go to an airport, and you got your hands up, and your being scanned. That is a millimeter wave technology in action. They figured out, "Wow, this is not only dangerous to the people who are walking through here in high doses. But these people who are standing next to these things. This is bad."

So, they put together a very thorough report detailing all of the previous scientific studies that we know about that exists. They are not hard to find. You just have to look for them. But they took this, and they got a meeting with this general. And he told them to stand down. He told them that they are to not talk about this anymore. That they should not tell the employees what they have discovered. And their team that found this was immediately disbanded and separated. So, that they wouldn't be doing any work like this anymore. So, you know, do they know? Yeah, they know.

Josh: And you had another interview with a Department of Homeland Security employee, right? Or is that the same piece? Where she was talking about her process, what she uncovered, and stuff like that.

Dana: Well what happened was, this man saw that interview. It was a person who worked at the airport. And who had stood next to these machines, day in and day out, and she came down with horrifying neurological conditions. And she watched over thirty people in her vicinity die of cancer in the very short period of time. And so, he felt so guilty, I think. Because he'd been carrying that around with him for so long. He decided to come out and tell me his side of the story as well. To kind of like, look some of us are trying to get the word out. You know, there are people on the inside that may even know that this is going on. But there are people above them, that are not going to let this stop it seems.

Josh: So, people that are around these technologies that noticing, and they are questioning, and they don't know what to do. They have the information. They feel overwhelmed. What can they do? What can somebody do, who is on the inside? Either an employee or an executive who knows, can they contact you on this for example? Or what can people do?

Dana: Well, I'm happy to be a voice for people who want to get truth out. You know, that's a huge part of you know, I didn't think that I would be getting into this aspect of things again. I've only been into this since like September. But I now consider this is one of the most phenomenally, like you said, this is warfare. And it's against the people. And it's like a Eugenics program. I mean we can get into that a little bit like when we

talk about the ultimate plan of what this is really all about.

Josh: Well, let's talk about that. I mean some of our viewers have done their own research. And have looked at things like this monolith in Georgia that talks about, called the Georgia Guide Stones, as one example, right? It's amazing how it's not woo, woo, anymore. People are learning. It's not what we thought.

So, this one monolith that nobody knows how it got there. And it talked about depopulating to a half a billion people or whatever. We know that Martin Paul, one of his five things is sterility that gets into his Part 2 of his talk, I believe. If I remember correctly. That is a huge one. There's so much science around wireless causing sterility. Talk about that, a little bit more. Like what's the connection and what do you see? Is there a depopulation going on?

Dana: Yeah. This is a big long answer. But I'm by no means the best one to speak about this, but I'll do my best and just kind of give you my opinion on this. Because I'm not a scientist, like a lot of your other guests, I have more Liberty to speculate, I suppose. I've no reputation to tarnish, so to speak.

But you did an excellent job in your film, Take Back Your Power. Revealing that those things don't make a lot of sense. They are incredibly harmful. They are prone to fires. They're less secure. So, they're able to be hacked by outside influences. Nothing makes sense about them. Except that they are designed to surveil energy use of homes, right? They are designed to look at every single thing. When we have our fridge open, they're going to know. And so, I really think that the ultimate plan of 5G is along those very same lines.

Now, this is my opinion again. So, people like Patrick Wood, who I believe you have on and James Corbett are probably much better, more eloquent at this. But you know, I'll use a quote from one of the elite's themselves. A guy named, Zbigniew Brzezinski in a book from 1970. He was a very powerful global strategist. He worked on the right and the left. And that's how you know what these real agendas are. They're trying to divide us right against left. That is just smoke and mirrors. That is to keep us against each other rather than looking at the important issues. 5G is the important issue.

And so, as Zbigniew Brzezinski said in a book he wrote in 1969, okay. "The technetronic era involves a gradual appearance of a more controlled society. Such a society would be dominated by an elite unrestrained by traditional values. Soon it would be possible to assert almost continuous surveillance over every citizen and maintain up-to-date complete files containing even the most personal information about the citizen. These files will be subject to instantaneous retrieval

by the authorities.” This is from the book, *Between Two Ages, America's Role in Technetronic Era*. Now remember, in 1969, we did not even have the fax machine yet. This man was speaking about something that is absolutely happening right now.

It sounds very 1984. Most people will not want to accept this. And they knew that. So, they had to create a way to sell this grab for power to us. And I feel fortunate that these people like to brag in their books. And they're available to us. Because you know, some people have the time to look through these and figure out what their plans are. Because in another book called *The Club of Rome, The First Global Revolution*, they admit exactly how they plan to do it. “In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine, and the like would fit the bill. So, in designing them as the enemy we fall into the trap of making symptoms causes, but all these dangers are caused by human intervention and it is only through the change of attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy then is humanity itself.”

So, there they are admitting that they're going to use this global warming, global catastrophe fear tactic to sell us a bill of goods. What do you notice today, besides all the AI programming that is just everywhere? You see all this messaging. And I'm a PR person. I'm a branding person. So, I pay attention to it. About climate change. It's constant. It's in every movie. It's in TV. It's in everything. Everything, little thing, they're going to blame on climate change.

So, they kind of were talking about humans as though they are the virus of the planet. And I see it in YouTube's comment section all the time. People say that. But it seems like a kind of a reach. But what this really comes down to is that there are deep connections between the same powerful groups and families that have already accumulated the world's resources. The same people who ran big oil, are the same people who are now behind climate change. Which doesn't make sense.

When you look at what you just mentioned, that Martin Paul talks about, is eugenics, right? And so, I didn't know because they don't teach you this in school. But in the late 1800s and early 1900s, there was a movement called the American Eugenics Movement. And it was very, very, popular. And they considered it a scientific solution for social problems. I mean, most of us assimilate that was like Hitler, right? When he was, you know, all behind that. But America did it first, guys.

So, this was started by the cousin to Charles Darwin, who was called Francis Galton, he coined the term. Eugenics means well and born, together. So, basically, he was an American biologist. Oh, Charles Davenport, I'm sorry, expanded on Galton's work. Now, they taught basically that good traits are passed down. So, we must encourage

those with good traits to reproduce. And this ultimately will lead to the sterilization of those who do not have the good traits. But the problem is that they believe criminality, imbecility, being poor, or even being a liar was considered a genetic trait.

So, in the 1800's even as recently as the 70s, states were performing forced sterilization in the science of eugenics, okay. Now, here's the crazy part. Charles Davenport's eugenic work was funded by none other than the Carnegie Institution and the Rockefeller Foundation. They helped bring the science into America. And I bring that up because they are the very same people that are promoting the climate change, this rhetoric today. It sounds good. Yeah, let's leave the climate. I mean, I love my planet, okay guy? I'm a tree hugger, alright. But this is a wolf in sheep's clothing. And we have to understand that. Today the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, doesn't that sound nice, it sounds so good, right?

But they're the same lineage of people who are moving us towards an energy-based economy. Now that energy-based economy is going to surveil the spending of every single thing. How far did it take your egg to travel to you? Well you're going to pay. It's not going to be in dollars anymore. It's going to be in energy. It's going to be sort of like an energy unit that you get. And you can't go over that, right? This is total and complete imprisonment. And although it sounds good, it's all about surveillance. And they cannot do it without the 5G grid. They just can't. Nothing else makes sense about it.

The science is killing us, just like the smart meters. But they need that to be able to surveil on individuals. And if everything will have an RFID chip, they'll know what you buy, what kind of water you're using, if you're using gas over whatever, it'll all be added up. Now, I personally think that ultimately, this will end up with taking a mark on your hand or head that will enable you to buy or sell. I think that there would need to be a final linchpin in this entire system.

Josh: To force compliance.

Dana: Yeah. I mean a lot of this stuff is happening to us without our permission. But I do believe that there will be one final linchpin that will sort of bring all of their pieces together.

Josh: Yeah, and so just being open about it, some people when they hear that will think, "Well that's just, you know, biblical, fear-mongering, or religiosity, or whatever." But when you think about it, you kind of see how the dots are coming together. And you see how maybe there's some truth or at least a very clear call for us to be aware of what could be coming down the pike. In terms of you know, people that have had visions of a potential future.

Now, In Take Back Your Power, I talk about more than 5,000 patents that have been suppressed in the name of National Security, meaning corporate security. And it's just so obvious. I mean many of those are to do with energy production, let's say. And that actually solving the problem, whether it's real or not. Actually, solving the problem of like carbon emissions from burning oil and petroleum-based fuels. Like actually solving the problem. Technologies are available but they've been suppressed.

This is common knowledge and it's not really doubtable anymore to anyone that looks into it. So, what you say about everything really hangs on, you know, climate change and their Orwellian 5G grid, energy based economy solution, that is both energy-driven and data-driven. To foment this total control grid. It really makes sense.

So, when we see this kind of thing, with very strong evidence, and just people waking up and going through this process that involves processing a lot of fear, right? This is an existential crisis that an increasing portion of humanity is going through. What would you say, do you have any tips? Or what could people do with these fears that are coming up as a result of this, becoming aware and processing this kind of information?

Dana: Yeah. It's a tough one. It is, I mean, I was made a little differently. When I learn about something, I stare it square in the face and I can't wait to tell everyone. But I can tell by other people's responses to some of the things that I say, that's not how it's impacting them. So, we each have our role in how this unfolds and being true to our conscience. Unlike these people and what they are doing. You know, it's a lot. You get Presidents who promise, Obama promised, "No lobbyists."

And all these people keep making these promises, and then you see he appoints an FDA commissioner who is the daughter of two American Eugenics Society directors. Margaret Hamburg with the Carnegie Corporation father and a Rockefeller Foundation position on the CFR. Like who has time to look all this stuff up? But when you do find it out and it is scary.

I want to first say that it is fact, fear is how the enemy manipulates us, right? And so, a lot of us are kind of full of fear from this fake news, this story and that story, and the things that they focus on. And so, there's an actual form of mind control that is based only breaking down the consciousness through using fear.

And so, I understand people are just kind of over it. It's like people gotten numb to the mass shootings because it's just so hard to look at and comprehend, right? But you know at the same time we're not allowing the fear to be used to manipulate us. I know that it helps bring

up these feelings of helplessness, but I would encourage people to just take the knowledge and understand that I'm aiming to make people more informed for their decisions about the future. That is all that this is about in my perspective.

I mean, I've been called a fear monger before. And I want to say, "Well are you being a fear monger when you do a tornado drill?" You know what I mean, it's like the prophets in the Bible spoke about kind of bad things that are coming. You know, Jesus did to. Does that make them fear mongers? Or is it because it's coming from a loving creator who wants to prepare you for these things. So, if you knew a hurricane was coming to your best friend's house in Florida, but he had no TV or radio. You're going to go tell them because you love them. So, we have to learn to discern between the fear that is trying to manipulate us versus the fear that we really need to be able to face and do something about.

I personally think that there's going to be purpose in this tribulation. That's how I see it and I think that ultimately this is about finding faith in God in the eye of the storm. I believe deeply in speaking about these deeds of darkness. And I also believed in our ability to be protected through this. That might become because you figure out that you can squirt water mist in front of the 5G antenna and it will be absorbed in the water mist. It could be because you know, someone decides to have target practice against the small cell. Or it could be that God tells you to move, you know. But we have to have faith in a bigger plan in all this. And not let us break down and just do nothing. We have a job here. And that is to connect to God and to be shown what to do.

But if we're just kind of being distracted by the world, which is believe me exactly what the enemy wants. There are thousands of options to turn on the Internet or TV that they're hoping very much that you don't take a role in this. And that is absolutely not what you want to do. That's how the magician works, right? He has you look at this hand while the other hand is doing something else. So, that's what's happening with this. They're having you fight about Trump rather than looking at the real issue. Which is the one that I'm very happy that you're taking the time to tell people about.

Josh: So, you have a bit of a Biblical perspective, right? You and I have talked before this and it's not. I wouldn't say like you and Christianity have your differences. I would say, you're more sort of open-minded than religious Christianity. But which I can say, I've experienced a lot in my life.

So, with all that's going on, as part of this like awakening process. I was talking with a friend about this the other day. Like we start to question, you know is the idea of a benevolent creator real. How can there be a God who is good, and all this is happening on the planet to

our neighbors' kids, to even our own family, or maybe oneself. Which is basically can be nothing but evil or death. How come that exists? How do you reconcile your belief in a good creator with what we see?

Dana: Yeah, that was something I never would have known about. First of all, my background was very much in the New Age. I've been in the New Age, sort of just love each other, and we got to evolve out of this kind of way of looking at things. And I try to be a good person and all of that. And I was very against Christianity actually. And ironically, it's from comprehending this deep evil that exists that led me to its opposite. And I did not want to believe an inherent evil. I did not want to believe in the truth of the Bible at all.

But the crazy thing is that it actually all talks about this. And it talks about the world as a place that you know, Jesus said, "This is not my kingdom." You know, right before they killed him. So, that was shocking to me. I thought well, this is. You know, God gives everyone free will even the bad folks. But the thing is that we become so attached to this life as though it is all that is, right? And Jesus talked a lot about not doing that. You know, he talked about the kingdom of God being at hand.

And so, you know, this is a call to, I don't know how familiar you are with the scripture. But you know, the one that resonates with me and from what I can see in your work, you are certainly living by it. And that is, "Have no fellowship with the fruit misdeeds of darkness, but rather expose them." And that's what I'm doing. And it's what you're doing. And you know, it's what I have to hold onto in this. And I know this is not his kingdom. Although I love this place. And I plan to fight for it as long as I can. But it's ultimately not my ultimate and end all.

Josh: I just want to say, just for the viewer, some of these talks on the Summit, are going into things beyond the science and are engaging at a soul level. And hopefully you guys find value in this because we're having different perspectives. Even different spiritual perspectives. And you know, energy, and soul, and things like that. So, thank you for yours, Dana.

So, just talking about, you maybe like the resident prophet, I guess on the on the Summit. Maybe not, I don't know. Just kind of maybe finishing up this part of the conversation. What can you tell us about? Is there any prophecy within scriptures or within spiritual traditions or whatever that you know about that could be potentially relating to this? What we are facing at this time? In terms of like 5G and kind of the technocratic IOT specifically.

Dana: So, yeah, that was another kind of a crazy thing regarding the truth of the Bible. Which I did not want to believe in, right? So, you asked about prophecy and 5G and how it rolls out. So, the funny thing

is that you know, God talks a lot about famine and pestilence. And Jesus specifically warned in Matthew 24 and Revelation seals that unfold, alright? Three and four specifically talk about famine and pestilence. Now, there are seven seals in revelation that sort of talk about the you know, unfolding of these crazy days, right?

So, my interpretation is that the first, second, and fourth seals describe what happens to the world as it is in the hands of these evil men. That we are witnessing right now. It talks about war and talks about civil unrest. There's one line where Jesus says, "Nation will rise against nation." And most people think well, "That's war of a country against a country." But in fact, when you look at the Greek, it means ethnos against ethnos. Which is the racial tension that we are absolutely seeing happen right now in a crazy degree.

So, but back to like the pestilence aspect of things specifically and 5G. I was again very happy you had on. Dr. Klinghardt. He's one of the few people I've come across that talks about this ability of the RF and microwave frequencies to impact these pathogens and mold for example, in a really negative way.

So, he found out through an experiment with an associate that the production of biotoxins in a mold culture went up more than 600 times with exposure to the RF fields. It seems like they were perturbed by the RF fields and so they kind of like in order to exist, they come out really, really, strongly, which is not good for us obviously.

I found a NASA document from 1970, it was Chapter 6, and this is basically a document that goes into hundreds, if not thousands of different studies in proving why RF waves are bad. It basically says this, the nature of the organism's interaction with agents of infection changes sharply when humans and experimental animals are irradiated with electromagnetic waves and the radio band. They admit that it causes a resistance to microorganisms in the human being. They talk about that it's going to aggravate infectious processes, such as tuberculosis of the lungs. And it talks about on Page 94, that there is now no doubt that microwaves exert an influence on the vital activity of bacteria and other single-celled organisms.

So, what we're doing is not only harmful to humans. But it's actually enabling the pathogens, in the microbes, and the bacteria to go crazy. And so, when you think about that and you think about pestilence. I mean, what is pestilence right? It is a fatal epidemic disease. And back in the day it was Bubonic plague, which came from a bacteria. And so, what we're doing is we're actually enabling this prophecy to come true by allowing these untested frequencies on these different things. There's another one with a millimeter wave particularly says, "The changing properties of the millimeter wave affected bacteria. Peer-reviewed

research demonstrates that the millimeter wave radiation not only affects human cells. But will result in the growth of multi-drug resistant bacteria." I mean, how much should we heard about that lately? That's already happening. And so, pestilence is definitely tied into what we see happening in scripture. And then of course, there's famine, which you know, you've probably done some work about bees and how the colony collapse disorder is totally something that's never previously been observed before. And we know that when they put cell phones near the beehives, they don't come back. And different types of things like that.

But I found a couple days ago, I found a patent for a pesticide that uses millimeter wave frequencies as the form of extermination. So, that particular patent used the 24 gigahertz frequency. That is a millimeter ban wave. And on my birthday, March 14th, the FCC auctioned off that frequency to almost 3,000 different companies to use, who knows for what.

But we're talking about that frequency that is now going to be used all over and that we know kills bugs. Which you know, some people don't like bugs. But you know bugs feed songbirds. Bugs are part of the food chain. And when we think about those starlings that fell from the sky in the Netherlands, right? I was looking into that, whenever I got into this, and I realized you know when you look at the birds, they all kind of move together like a swarm. Those are starlings, right? Those birds have to use magnetic fields in order to do those kinds of maneuvers. So, these birds that fell, had a very highly sophisticated use of magnetic fields, right?

So, it makes sense that that would be the kind of bird, that's going to fall out of the sky during a 5G test. And unlike termites in this insecticide, bees also use really sophisticated magnetic fields in order to know when to come back and things like that. So, it definitely plays into prophecy whenever you study what is said that it's coming? So, we just have to be aware of these things. And again, it's not to be fearful. But it's to be prepared. It's to listen to your inner guidance, intuition, and conscience about the decisions that you're going to make as this stuff rolls out.

Josh: You can say that those kind of doing these harmful programs, their agendas. They are counting on us to be apathetic or distracted or to engaged in the supposed benefits and the features, the convenience factor. I want to talk about that.

Let's go into solutions, now. What can people do? If they are counting on us to be apathetic and if there is so much evidence to indicate that they are so fearful of this truth coming out that they are censoring left, right, and center. What can people do as an effective response in general, you could say? And then I want to get into protecting their home. Because you have some very insightful insight there as well. And then, also on the health level. If you just want to get into now as we kind of move towards

wrapping up. What can people do and this overcoming the programmed response of just checking out or not trying to cause change? Or just apathy that we're seeing?

Dana: Yes. Well, it's all about that, right? Which is why I'm very excited that you're doing this Summit. And I was very happy to be a part of it because the type of people that you're bringing together makes it very easy for people to share this information with others. And maybe someone can pick their favorite speakers that really spoke to their needs and then pass that on to other people. And let them partake of the knowledge. Because this is all about that. You are not going to get this on the news. You are not going to get this on any kind of mainstream outlet at all. And in fact, it's being suppressed as you know on Facebook and all these other things.

I think that there's a lot of things I've been doing myself. I've been trying to learn about with regards to how to better mitigate this stuff. The important thing is to just spread the word because for me, you know, when we know that the impacts of microwave radiation have particular effects, we know it causes headaches and migraines. We know that it causes the inability to sleep, that's a huge one. It causes racing, fluttering heart, inability to focus, lack of concentration, dizziness, or vertigo. That's happening to so many people right now. And they're just like, "I have vertigo." No, you have exposure to microwave radiation.

But if people don't know that how are they going to do anything about it? And then there's even things like nosebleeds. I was at my daughter's elementary school and these kids are walking in with nosebleeds out of nowhere. There in their little room with all these Wi-Fi, you know, there's like thirty-six computers on in the room. And they are coming in with nosebleeds and some kids are passing out. And the people at the schools are like, "I don't know why these kids are having these headaches all the time." I can tell you exactly why. You need to know that your kid is not just trying to get out of school. They are dealing with microwave radiation.

Then there's the emotional stuff, which is an absolute, you know, talk about pandemic. Anxiety, depression, suicidal tendencies. Even studies proving that microwave frequencies cause cutting amongst teens. These studies are out there. And so, we just think kids are just kids. It's just the millennials. They are suffering from radiation. And so, this is really important to let people know what these potential impacts are, so we can correctly diagnose it and do something about it. Now going down the road, you let it keep going, and then you are going to be dealing with MS, ALS, Lou Gehrig's, Alzheimer's, Autism is exacerbated. All that kind of stuff.

So, let's talk about backing up and how can we become less impacted

by this? Again, it's those metals, right? But the first thing I want to say, let's make sure that our resting time, the sleep time, is absolutely a time when you can rest and regenerate. That is one of the most important things that all the scientists talk about, right?

And so, I personally, I have kill switches in my bedroom, I don't have Wi-Fi at all. That obviously you got to get rid of all of the frequencies at night for sure. But even during the day in your own home, it should really be a dead zone. It's a pain to get those wires set up at first. But then you're done. And then it's just like technology like you had it before. Most people don't realize even your cell phone, there are little plugs, little RJ45 adapters, you can be on your phone like you always have. But you just have these adapters that you can put right into your phone, they plug right into the bottom of it, and that goes right into the ethernet cable. And you can still be on your phone in airplane mode safely.

So, we want to eradicate the excess microwave radiation that we're dealing with now. We're going to replace our Wi-Fi with hardwire. We're going to have our phones on hardware at home. And never let your kid be walking around with their you know, cell phones on them. This all has to be downloaded in advance. So, obviously we're going to work on that.

Now you're sleeping time has to be a dead zone in terms of microwave frequencies. And unfortunately, you know buying a meter is really one of the only ways you can really tell what's going on. And I didn't want to invest in one myself, you know, but you have to. And so, now I've used it to help a lot of other people. And so, it becomes a way that you can not only get your own house clean, but you can help other people out to. The price is really going down low on those.

For example, my printer was Wi-Fi. It was hardwired. But I didn't know that having it plugged in, it was putting out a signal all the time. But because I only ever used the wire, I didn't know that until I had that meter and I saw, and I was about to track it down. So, the meters are really kind of important.

Josh: We recommend this Cornet device here, it's a Tri-Field Meter so, it does ELF, magnetic field, and wireless. But there is the acoustic meter, Safe Living Technologies with the tiny little unit. So, many out there for under \$200 that will show you visually. That helps not only you, but it helps you share the information and communicate this. Because we are sensory beings, and some of them have a sound effect. I just encourage everyone watching to check in and really consider getting a meter as part of your process of cleaning up your home and protecting your family. So, Dana what else?

Dana: Yeah, so and again you can use it not only for yourself, for others. It is really, really, is a helpful thing. So, then you're going to and I am

sure people already know that cordless phones are also like having a cell tower. You want to have the old school cords. You know like the old days. I had to teach my daughter how to listen for a dial tone and all that.

And then once you get kind of a clean environment in your home. then you're going to start working on ridding the body of heavy metals if possible. The first thing you want to do is stop adding more of these metals needlessly. So, again things like that aluminum deodorant, fluoride in the toothpaste. You don't ever want to get a flu shot people. Please, don't ever. Just don't. There's a ton of mercury in that thing and it usually makes people more sick than better.

If you do have mercury in your teeth and you are able to invest in getting that out. Don't just go to a normal dentist to do that. They do not know because they are taught that amalgam was safe. You can wind up hurting yourself more than helping yourself. You want to go to an IAOMT certified dentist. And they can help you safely get it out. Because you know this mercury in a Wi-Fi environment, it actually releases more of the mercury than not. I just learned that recently. You want to cook not with foil. I know it's very convenient. You can tent things with foil, but you don't want to cook with foil or aluminum pans.

Dr. Klinghardt, that you had on, has really fantastic suggestions. I wholeheartedly recommend everything that he's doing. You want to cut out foods with glyphosate. And I know that's a tricky one. Because this thing basically escorts the aluminum into the brain. And that's going to be your corn, that's not organic. Your wheat that's not organic.

What else, Josh, you know about these things. Canola oil. There are people like Jordan Pederson have come out and said, "I only eat meat now." Because he was immunocompromised, it was the only thing that didn't make him sick. And I have a guess that it's because he's got some kind of, and again I'm totally guessing but you know, somebody who's got metals going on. Who had the anxiety and things that he's dealing with. And meat doesn't have that. You know, meat is not going to be the part of the animal that is going to have the metals in it. So, it kind of makes sense from that perspective.

But again, you are going to add the good probiotics to your body. The fermented dairy, fermented veggies, you know, get to your local farmers if you can. People who aren't spraying on things.

Now back to what we said earlier about how these metals took hold in the first place. We want to bombard our body with the good minerals, right? Lately, I've been drinking this stuff called black water. And it looks black and it looks like Coke or something. But it's not. It's a fulvic and humic acid which are trace minerals that are very, very, good for

the body. These are the kind of minerals that you want to just wash internally yourself with. That will help you to release some of the heavy metals that you've got going on.

Another thing that I found recently that I am like totally in love with is infrared sauna. If you think about it, you know God made us so that we will detox these things naturally. But we sit in air conditioning all day. A lot of people sit down all day, they're not getting exercise or sweating. So, if you're not sweating, you're not getting rid of that stuff. So, this infrared sauna that I got in, I am like a different person on it. It gives me these waves of euphoria. I can like feel myself cleaning from the inside out.

Josh: What brand of sauna?

Dana: This particular one is a Far Infrared Sauna. There's a debate about near versus far. This particular one is a far called the Relax Sauna. It's not the cheapest but you'll find that some of them for Amazon are just kind of like Chinese made and they're not actually what you need. You need this specific frequency of the far-infrared for some reason you're sweating like that. You don't want to sit around for twenty minutes waiting to sweat. You just want to get it done and you get this like euphoria, like you've worked out. Because your heart rate goes up as if you did. So, sweating is important.

Grounding as you know in places where there's not dirty electricity is really, really, good.

Josh: Safely and don't plug you're grounding connection into your house. You need to get outside where there's no smart meters or 5G smart infrastructure installed where there's no ground voltage. You want to get into nature, into ground. That's my thought on grounding. And I say that because I one time had an electrical burn on my abdomen from using a grounding sheet and plugging it into an improperly grounded electrical outlet. So, that's my spiel.

So, give us some final thoughts.

Dana: Yeah, final thoughts. Beside them remineralization like I'm talking about, you know, most water that you buy is kind of garbage. But there are some that have the good minerals in there that are going to help you get these metals out.

The other thing I want to mention is that if someone is already sick. If I was sick and I'm pretty healthy. I'm good now that my migraines are gone. But if I were sick and I was dealing with something I just couldn't get a handle on, I would get a hair, mineral, metal analysis. Now, I only know of one particular philosophy or group of people that are doing

this correctly. It's very difficult. Like somebody might look at your hair and go, "Oh there's no mercury in it. You are fine." But that's actually the problem. Because you are supposed to be spilling these metals, if there is none, then you are in trouble. That means your body's holding on to it. We should always be spilling some. So, this one particular group that I'm going to recommend, Dr. Larry Wilson. He has a website with tons of information online. But he has naturopaths and different people all over the country who can take little samples of your hair. And can tell you how you're doing with these metals.

And one of the main things that they recommend, and the last thing that I'll say is glutathione is really key in helping to get the body rid of these metals, naturally. And so, glutathione can come from food, sulfur rich foods are really, really, important. Garlic, leeks, onions, the cruciferous vegetables like broccoli, Brussel sprouts, cauliflower, cabbage, kale. Those are all the cruciferous. They're really good in glutathione which is really important. And then there is selenium, vitamin C. There is so much to learn. I probably overwhelmed people already.

These are the kind of things we have to start doing. We have to go back to the old way, you know. Food that's loved and grown in good soil. And stepping out of the new way which is the nose in an iPhone all day. And you know, sitting in your office surrounded by fluorescent lights. We got to like step out of that. We have to take a proactive role because if you don't, it's not if you get sick, it's when. Unfortunately, it's just how things are designed.

But we can totally do this there. There are steps you can take. And people like Josh, and myself, and others, just tap into that knowledge. Because there's a lot of people fighting this fight.

Josh: Thank you, Dana. Thank you so much. And I just want to say like, Dana's not a doctor. I'm not a doctor. She's coming from experience. She's invested much time, and energy, and money, and testing different products. So that's her perspective.

So, research it and talk to your doctor, your educated practitioner, let's say. Make your own decisions. But Dana, thank you so much for just your time today. And your heart, your soul, you are helping people. And it seems like you have found a way to kind of detached from the outcome. Like you're just doing it in service. And so, I just honor that in you. And I thank you for your time today. I encourage people, they can find you YouTube, Dana Ashlie. We'll look forward to your continued videos and wish you continued success. And may the YouTube sensors not get your media channel to be protected.

Dana: Good luck, there, right? I'll ride that train as long as I can. I have

no expectations. But thanks again so much for having me, it was a pleasure. And yes, please do your own research. Don't listen to anything I say. Get out and figure it out for yourself.

Josh: Listen, listen, but.

Dana: You've got to be careful.

Josh: You have to be careful and use discernment. Alright, thank you Dana.

Dana: God bless.

“Smart” Meters and Their Hidden Agenda

Guest: Jerry Day

Josh: With us on the summit today is Jerry Day. Jerry, welcome.

Jerry: Hello. Hi, Josh. Great to be with you.

Josh: You too as well. I interviewed you on Take Back Your Power several years ago. And you've helped many, many people with solutions to smart utility meters, and also other issues involving health and safety and rights. And I'm really looking forward to dive in today, we're going to talk about solutions to smart utility meters. But before then, which are of course part of the Internet of Things and linked to 5G eventually, we're going to talk before that about your -- you bring a really powerful big picture solution here. Like you connect the dots in a really good way and you do it with an intention and specific tools to educate and empower people. So I'm privileged to call you a colleague and a friend. And we'll dive in here.

So before we do, I just want to introduce you through reading your bio to our audience here. So, Jerry Day is an Emmy Award winning television producer and creator of freedom inspiring media. His websites and YouTube videos have exposed millions of people to the hazards and harm caused by so called Smart utility meters through his --

Jerry: I think that's thousands of people. Did you say millions of people?

Josh: Millions of people have seen videos.

Jerry: Oh, you're right on the videos. There were 7 million on my

YouTube channel. You're right there. There you go.

Josh: Don't reduce yourself.

Jerry: And thinking about the people that I directly help on the phone you know, that's thousands. So we'll talk about how that works.

Josh: Sure. And his YouTube channel is called minivanjack, and his websites are *freedomtaker.com* and *emfhelpcenter.com*. And as we mentioned, Jerry has helped thousands of people find solutions to electronic utility metering, which is of course connected with the internet of things and global data harvesting. So Jerry, what can you tell us -- let's paint in broad strokes. What's actually happening with 5G, internet of things, smart meters and technocracy? Help us to understand kind of why this is happening, and maybe some initial things, what we can do about it.

Jerry: Okay. There's a dream by the technocracy, or whoever is driving this whole thing. You know, it's always been amazing that this whole smart meter rollout is happening in apparently a synchronized way globally. There is a very, very top down hierarchy controlling this data gathering program. This is a mass surveillance program, but there's a dream on the part of the people who are installing this and instituting this system, that there will be surveillance conducted that is nothing like anything imagined even in science fiction.

When your appliances, your devices, your cell phone, your these health monitors when you're jogging, you know, a little wristwatch health monitor. This is taking actually your bodily functions, and transmitting them real time in a data set to someone who wants to control you, and wants to know that they have control of you.

And the way they do that is to know everything about what you're doing at all times, and your status and your condition. Even your emotional state will be recorded in the near future by your automobile, whether you want it to or not. They're planning all of these things to be instituted. And we are tempted with gadgets that seemed to make our lives more convenient. And you know, we're more in touch with our loved ones and all that.

They know how to give us gadgets that tempt us. And in those gadgets, they insert their surveillance equipment, and they're monitoring equipment, and they're tracking equipment and they're data collecting equipment, and they're transmitting equipment. And that's really the main purpose. And if you think of your cell phone as a gadget that you're going to pay for and if it's convenient enough, and if you're going to use it if it gives you enough service, that's not what the industry is doing. The industry is simply thinking of a way to make you pay for

your surveillance, and to have you own the equipment and pay for the equipment that will spy on you and deliver information about you and your family to a central point.

And that data, and what is meant by “the dream” is that this data -- you know, when you think about your emotional state, your bodily state, your biological state. You know, everything you do, everything you buy, everyone you talk to, everything you say and all of your conversations are being collected and aggregated by artificial intelligence algorithms, which are capable of parsing all of that data and establishing a personality profile, a psychological profile, they will have you down like no one else could possibly have you down.

Before I even knew how high resolution this surveillance data would be, I was telling people where were you in 2013 on Monday, August 3, and what were you doing? And nobody can tell you that, but DNS can tell you that. They have that data and they can pull it up in two seconds. And so your entire life is now catalogued and tracked and exhibited to people that are total strangers to you, and people who do not have your best interests at heart. And as Edward Snowden says, when people say, Well, I have nothing to hide, you certainly do. You may not have something to hide, but as Edward Snowden says, you have something to protect. And that is you, yourself, your family, your valuables, your wealth, your property, your liberty. All of these things you must protect, and those are under assault. Believe me, people are coming for you.

Once they have all of that data in a way that the artificial intelligence algorithms can really parse and really deliver to them what they would call actionable data. You will hear from them. You will hear from people who will say, “You know you have bad behavior on your energy usage, we’ve found that you use your washing machine at three in the afternoon, we have a penalty for that. You’ll see \$80 charge on your power bill next month.” You know, there’ll be all kinds of things like that coming up.

But it’s hard to imagine how they will apply this data. And they’re probably the people who have the dream of collecting your data in this way, are probably sitting around saying, “Man, let’s think of what we can do now.” You know, they have the instinct that if they can monitor your emotional state, if they can monitor all of your communications, if they can monitor what you buy, and do and where you go every day, they will have something more powerful than any central authority has ever dreamt of before. They know how powerful this will be. But they are probably just beginning to develop ways to exploit this and control you with this.

And so we have certain behavioral controls now, they’re doing all kinds of things. In the schools, they’re doing this relentless programming of

environmental issues on children. So children are now programmed to feel as though they are criminals for being alive. Because by being a human being, you're damaging the environment.

So you owe the powers that be the central authority, some tremendous service and contribution in order to make up for the fact that you are criminally damaging the environment by breathing. And by being alive, and by being a human being occupying the planet, you are the problem. And so this is obviously propaganda and it's obviously not something we should allow ourselves to be programmed with, those kind of ideas.

But that's what schools are filled with. That's what our media is filled with. I see those messages constantly. The little that I do see TV, it's all this coming at you constantly and not just in the news stories, but in the programming in the TV scripts and the movie scripts, it's coming through all of these media.

So we're being programmed at the same time, they're setting up this incredible collection system that will go so deeply into your psyche. And will be able to produce such a vivid and accurate record of your psychological condition and your emotional responses. They can affect that with frequencies and they can emit those frequencies from your smart meter. You know, if they don't like how you're behaving, they can change it and they will be able to do this more and more. And certainly when you have all these 5G terminals every 300 feet down the block, covering the entire planet or whatever.

There may be an important point I want to make right now. You know, people are talking about the satellite system that SpaceX, Elon Musk is now talking about putting up 4,424 satellites like within the next couple years. And they've already put up 600 of them. And everybody is going, "Oh, we're going to be blanketed with radiation all over the planet." And you will be to some extent, but it's not exactly how people are imagining this. For 5G, which is what they intend to finally do the absolutely global planet wide rollout of connectivity, will not operate directly to satellite. Your telephone, your cell phone will not transmit to a satellite, it's impossible that 5G doesn't go that far. It's not that powerful. And if it were, it would fry your brain if you were using the transmitting device near you. So the way that will work is that your phone will transmit to a relay. And then so often, there will be relays that go to the satellite.

So people who are very much active on this business of the satellite radiation, you got to be very careful and learn the technology because it may turn out that we're not going to be bathed so much with satellite radio radiation, but we will certainly be bathed with local transmitter radiation that will provide relays to the satellite. So the satellite maybe to some extent, incidental to the fact -- I mean, if you think about it, they just don't want to run wires. They just want it all wireless because if you

don't have satellites circling the planet, relaying all of our cell phone calls to each other, and you can immediately call somebody in China or the Ukraine or South Africa. All they have to do is put relay transmitters hardwired on the ground or wireless transmitters, they don't need satellites. It's just a fraction of the cost to deal with satellites.

So it doesn't change much that it's going into outer space in some ways. Now, when we know more about what they're actually going to be transmitting and how much they actually can beam that technology as opposed to flood the whole earth with radiation. You know, we'll know more about whether that's a serious problem, but we have to do more research. And we have to wait until they determine how those satellites are actually going to work clearly before we know what our protest should be, what we should object to, whether or not we want to build our shielding into our attics and stuff like that to be protected from this, may be a waste of time. Anyway, point made.

Josh: Thanks, Jerry. Yeah. A couple things, couple of points there. I think that this is an exercise in us getting tuned in to our free will, our intention. Some might say sovereignty, but basically, the rights that are many of which are constitutionally recognized. And as we do that, we're becoming aware that the rule of law is being diminished rapidly and in some cases is essentially gone because corporations have taken over. Even corporate ethics is saying the FCC is the most corrupted organization, you know, government organization.

Jerry: The motion captured.

Josh: That's right. But really in the bigger picture, Jerry yeah, we're moving through some fear and there's some compression. But I believe that the awareness has never been higher. It's always increasing about 5G and it's just we need to continue to spread the awareness to, for example, our elected officials and give them a chance to do the right thing, like we're seeing in many local governments are standing up to the FCC issuing lawsuits. And also new ordinances and worldwide; this is happening in especially in Europe and other countries. So it is an exercise of becoming aware, sharing the information and getting on the field. So for our viewers who are new to the extent of this problem, it definitely goes beyond just the 5G transmitters.

I also wanted to touch in on what you just said, some people when they first hear about, or even after hearing about it a number of times that this surveillance aspect of surveillance capitalism, you could say has come in, and they'll say, "Well, I have nothing to hide, or there's nothing I can do about it."

Those are two false positions. Both of those are false positions. Number one is, if you have nothing to hide, then give me all of your passwords right now for everything online, your banking number --

Jerry: Like where your children are, where you keep your valuables at home. Oh, sure it goes on and on. I mean, it's ridiculous thing to say. You have something to hide, you have something to protect. Liberty is important. Privacy is important. If it wasn't, you know, our country wouldn't have survived. You know, we have protections for those things. And what we don't have institutionally, we have to have privately and we have to do that consciously. And we have to make sure that we are taking responsibility for protecting not only ourselves, but our families and our communities.

Josh: And you have through your website freedomtaker.com. Several years ago, you started to share with people your notice processor, contractual legal lawful process. And so it's a unique time because the rule of law is being rapidly eroded. But elected officials and laws are still in place so they can be used strategically still within this window of time.

So like yourself for example, you've empowered many people to send those notices and to do that strong warning shot across the bow and now in car movement and others have a different strategy. I've been trusted in that organization after co founding it to call and to their board, but they have another notice of liability process.

And we're trying to figure out how to get at this notice based system and back it up, put some teeth into it and enforce the laws, and enforce the liability. And also in Australia, Ray Broomhall is interviewed in the summit and so he has -- I don't know if you heard about this, Jerry. But he had 900 small cell sites removed now using a criminal based process in Australia. So it's a really interesting time that is really calling us forward and we are having results, but only if we actually step up and become educated, share the information and get involved.

Jerry: Right. If I can come in, because that ties into something I wanted to bring up with what you mentioned earlier. You were talking about informing your local officials. My position is, that is not necessary in a certain way. Your officials are well informed. And it is the pretense of ignorance that is just another tool in their basket. And so we want to inform them because we want it on record that they are informed, but they are well informed. You know, when you come before Congress or come before even a county supervisor, board or city council, and they pretend to not know anything about this. There was a video online where UN whatever, their Commissioner was pretending to be completely ignorant about the hazards of wireless radiation. Come on --

Josh: Secretary General. Yeah, I released that earlier.

Jerry: That's right. And so you know, just come on. And so, there's a big pretense. And I've seen from certain politicians who I would rather not name that they're exposed over time is very clearly acting very

differently from how they speak. You know, they have a whole persona and a whole message and agenda that they deliver to the public, which is extremely in contrast to how they personally behave, and what they personally believe. And of course, if you're trying to maintain your position in the public eye, and you're trying to serve the powers that be, you're going to be extremely artificial and manufactured.

And so these public officials, the last thing we can do is trust that they really know and believe what they say they know and believe. They have much better access to information than we do. And so when we say, "Oh, we've got these all media and we're really tuned in and we're going to inform our public officials about this."

They knew it five years ago. They're way ahead of us, but they're taking huge amounts of money in order to sell a certain agenda. And they're going to pretend to be a certain way and have a certain knowledge base. And they're going to pretend that if you don't agree with that, you're some kind of Kook and loony, and you're out there on the fringe, you know, conspiracy theorists or whatever.

So this is all narratives. It's all propaganda. It's all theater. And so I would urge people to think differently in terms of how and why you're informing your officials about certain things. You're informing them not so that they will learn it, they do know it. You're informing them so that it can be shown that they were informed, and that their lies no longer work after that moment. When you serve that certified mail of that notice of liability or whatever it is, that they no longer have the opportunity to say, I didn't know this could hurt people. I didn't know this was damaging and wrong. I didn't know this was invading privacy. I didn't know this was violating rights. You just notice them that it is. And these notices that seem like well, they're sort of busy work, or you know, they're not really demanding anything. No, they're very powerful when you put that on record.

And here's what the danger is, when you send these notices and you forget you send them, and then you go on pretending with them as if you didn't notice them. You know, they're coming out continuing to lie, and you go back and you fall into their lies. No, I sent you a notice on such and such a date, that you are violating my rights, that you are emitting excess radiation that's in violation of building biology safety codes on my property, and you have to stop.

And if you don't stop within 30 days of my delivery, you are personally liable for all harm and damage. And you can't get out of that, you can't walk away from that, you're on notice. And I know Cal knows a lot about this. But if you do it in what's called an administrative process, and that's simply a fancy legal way of saying you told them three times. So you send them the notice of liability, then you send them the notice a liability

with a headline that says; Second notice, notice of fault. And then you send them a third notice that has a headline; Third notice, notice of default. And you are now agreeing with all my terms and conditions and presentments and representations.

So this is administrative process. And if you ever get in a court of law on this, the judge will say, "Well, how many times did you tell them? Once. Well, they might not have understood that. Twice. "Well, okay. That's better." Three times. "You're done." That has perfected administrative process. You notice them three times, officially certified mail proof of service. The ball is now in their court, they have to respond to that.

And of course, they'll send you back some kind of evasion or bullying or something; this is what we're used to doing is the notice of liability to the utility company. And you're telling them, this is a radiation emitting fire hazard surveillance device that emits dirty electricity. And so you've got four major problems with this device. You're responsible and liable for all of them. And of course, what did they send you back? They say, "Well, if you don't like our service, we're going to cut it off. We're going to arrest you for interfering with our business. You're a bad person." Whatever their attack you, they bully you.

Is that a rebuttal? No, they didn't answer your allegation. They didn't deny your allegation because they can't, because if they do it, they have to do it basically under a sworn oath. And if they do that they're in perjury. They're a liar because they are violating your rights. They are emitting radiation. They are conducting surveillance, they are emitting dirty electricity. They are causing a fire hazard with the lack of surge protection in the electronic meters. They explode in flames every day.

So they can't say they're not doing it. So what do they do? They attack you. And so that's a perfect opportunity to simply send them the next notice. Oh, second notice, notice of fault, sorry. Bullying and abuse and intimidation is not rebuttal. So these people are really, you know, I wouldn't want to be them, they have no place to hide. And if we do our notices properly, and we have those on the record, and we keep those in a file with our mail receipts and we can bring those back up.

Anytime someone in the house starts to get electromagnetic sensitivity, starts to get the insomnia, the headaches, the brain fog, the mood swings, the damaged relationships. We bring that out and we say, "Here's your claim. You agree to our terms, you now owe me 50 grand. And if I have to go to a legal action to collect this, you probably going to be more like 500 grand. You know, lawyers are expensive. So take your choice, pay me 50 grand today or 500 grand later." Or maybe even more, especially if someone dies, especially if your little radio frequencies smart meter shuts off someone's pacemaker and kills them, which has already happened. You're going to have a major lawsuit.

So we have to put the instruments in place. And we have to do it by the thousands and millions. So that what will happen very shortly. I mean, within a few years will be what we're seeing now with Monsanto. Hundred million dollar settlement here. \$2 billion settlement there, boom, boom, boom, mushrooming situation. You know, it will happen with radio frequency imposition on the public. It's just a matter of time.

And the first step in that is getting the notices in, you can't do this, this is harmful, you're liable. Tell me different. And if they can't tell you different, which they can't, then they're liable. And we'll have another Monsanto probably within a few years, and it'll be a question where legitimate courts will have no choice. I mean, they'll just simply have no choice. It's like the Monsanto thing. It's obviously they found direct correlation with non Hodgkin's lymphoma cancer, whatever it is. It's all established now in science so all they have to do is come in and repeat the paperwork. And that'll be what happens with the radio frequency.

Josh: We're already seeing like Lloyds of London. Like big insurance companies are not insuring, they're refusing insurance for wireless technologies. Swiss RE, Fortune 500 Company in Switzerland, I mentioned this before. They listed EMF radiation as the highest possible long term risk rating. So we are definitely seeing the beginning of that, and we hasten with that. We speed that process up of basically getting rid of these harmful technologies by every action that everyone out there takes.

I also wanted to mention -- I've seen both sides of the emailing your elected officials, you know, question. I can see both sides of that. Number one is, I would say that talking with some elected officials. In fact, in this summit we talked with Rafael Mihaem, who was the elected official in the canton of vote Switzerland. And he spearheaded that moratorium against 5G and he's saying elected officials, they need to know. They may not know because there's so much going on. Life is happening so fast and there are all these issues, and they're getting lobbied left, right and center as you say.

But one thing they need to get is they need to receive communication in numbers and then they start taking it seriously. And as well as having an opportunity to come and be part of the solution if they don't know. And then in addition to getting on the record, you give them that opportunity and you say, "Okay, look, if you're not going to be part of the solution, if you're going to allow this to happen, then you're going to be liable." So that's what we're seeing is a clear through line there. I wanted to mention your --

Jerry: Can I just add one point to that. Since you are communicating, why not make them liable? In other words, don't just make it; "Oh, I'm informing you that you're killing people." Why not say, "I'm informing

you, you're killing people, therefore you'll be liable." So I would urge that -- I'm not sure what processes you're using it for public information, but I would urge that people take it to that point where there is no backing out, they're trapped. It is a trap, they've trapped themselves by committing harm. And when the public says; we know you're doing it, we see it now we're going to hold you personally responsible.

So that's an idea you and I both had way back, and you've been doing with Cal. So don't waste your vote. Don't waste your communications resources. Take it right to that level where you're making someone absolutely liable and personally responsible and accountable for what they're doing. Go ahead I interrupted you.

Josh: No, it's fine. For those watching the organization, Jerry mentioned Cal a couple times. The organization is *inpowermovement.com*. As the time of this recording, they're still working on their automated systems so they can't help large quantities of people, large numbers of people all at the same time. That's something that's been a long time in the works and I believe it's going to be worth it when it finally is released. Your notice process on *freedomtaker.com*, was it three or four years ago, there was an inquiry into basically the corrupt practices between CPUC; the California Public Utilities Commission corresponding with Pacific Gas and Electric utility in a way that showed illegal collusion.

One of those series of emails that were made public as part of this investigation had mentioned your notice based process and there was the context in which that was mentioned. There was fear around that. Because if a number of -- if enough people do this thing, and they don't forget, like you said they don't forget they did it or they don't just say, "Oh, well it didn't work."

But they actually like follow through and actually understand that this commerce and notices is the way that all of this business happens. Then their game is up when that happens to a critical threshold. So I just wanted to recognize that what you're doing is legitimate. You've made another video on affidavits on YouTube and you explain in simple layman's terms and un rebutted affidavit stands as fact.

Jerry: That's a YouTube video called the power of paper, and people have responded very well to that. And if you just go to YouTube and my channel is Minivanjack. But if you just search the power of paper and see my face, you'll see that video. And it's an eye opener to a lot of people that don't realize how much power they have individually. Everything now is contract.

Your government is a corporate entity, if you're not entering contract, there's nothing they can do to you technically, you know, of course they violate their own rules all the time. But if you don't sign something -- you

know, I made one point in one of my videos. If the government has the right to do something to you, why do they need your signature.

So if you go to the DMV, and they require you sign something, I can promise you're waiving your rights, you're signing away some rights. If they had the right to make you register your car or register yourself as a driver with a license, you would not have to sign the paper. If you were required to file a 1040 form, you would not have to sign it.

Josh: Yeah. So it's all contract based.

Jerry: You are waiving your rights, you're entering a contract with them that says, "I'm giving up my rights, and I'm giving you the authority over me." So think about that every time you sign a document for the government. Every single document, again, if they had the right to do it, you wouldn't have to sign it.

Josh: Yeah. Now, at this time, Jerry, the cynic might say, well, it's not really a viable option in life to not sign anything.

Jerry: Yeah. Exactly.

Josh: You have to get by. And they've got us in a position that's not favorable, but at the same time we need to continue to become aware.

Jerry: Think about why you don't have a choice to sign something. It's called coercion.

Josh: Yeah. Okay.

Jerry: So what happens -- and I did this, I made video about the IRS and I called the IRS. And I said, "Do you have the right to force me to put my signature on a paper? I thought I controlled my signature." And they put me on hold, and it was like a 20 minute call. And finally they said, "Oh, well, you'll have to go to the private sector. We can't tell you." I said, "I don't go to the private sector for IRS policy. Do you have the authority to force me under threat of coercion to sign my name to a paper? And if I sign that paper, is that contract enforceable?"

And the answer is clearly no. Any lawyer would tell you no, you can't coerce the contract and you can enforce a contract that was coerced. So the answer was very clear, but the IRS refused to answer that question. And so I withheld my signature from a 1040 form. And the next thing I knew I had a \$44,000 compounded civil penalty against me. And I went back and forth with the IRS on this for about six years.

And eventually there was a trick and I got out of it. And I could help people with that, how I did that if they are curious and they contact me.

Josh: Probably you're going to get a ton of people contact you now.

Jerry: Well, let me give you a hint on that. If you're a perfect taxpayer who has paid all of his taxes, filed all of his 1040s and such and such, they would say get out of jail free form at the IRS called 14402. And it's something they don't want people to know about, and only because I resisted them for six years and they saw they were never going to get anything out of me. It's a way to get \$500 out of a taxpayer and make everything go away.

Josh: I just want to jump in there and say, we're not advocating to do anything specific with regards to your taxes.

Jerry: We're not legal advisors. We're not IRS experts. We're layman and we have opinions.

Josh: And also, I don't think Jerry or I would have a problem if what we call as government were actually a small group of elders that are committed to serve the greatest good. And need to build some infrastructure that serves the people. What we have is a corporate cabal, you could say or global elite corporatist scheme that has taken over government.

And is not only deploying harmful agendas such as smart years and 5G and changing laws so that they can get away with breaking our constitutional rights, but they're actually in illegal wars, they're doing illegal testing. So that's the context in which we're talking about this, not in the context of trying to evade something or trying to get something for free, is out of principle, this conversation.

Jerry: Yeah, if you're under the impression that the powers that be or the authorities or government or whatever. That there's any benevolence in what they're doing anymore, you haven't been paying attention. It's the individual against the collective. And they love to have black against white, they love the old against young, they love to have gender against gender, they love to have transgender against the other thing. They love to have whatever they have, that will divide us.

The only battle is individual rights against the collective. That is the only fight. If you can master that and focus on that, everything else is nonsense. Everything else is minimal compared to what you're paying for allowing large institutions and the powers that be to control your life and to set the rules, and to set the agenda. And to tell you through media constantly day in and day out what you're supposed to think, how you're supposed to view them, and how you're supposed to behave. So no, we no longer have that benevolent leader, that official, whatever. And I think you and I agree pretty well on that.

Josh: Yeah. And let's just jump into this. So the smart meter conversation. So we have nine questions here for you, Jerry. We're going to aim at 90 seconds per answer.

Jerry: Well, read through.

Josh: Okay. And I just want to say that I mentioned you in *Take Back Your Power*; my film, which can be seen for free at *takebackyourpower.net*.

Jerry: It has changed a lot of people's lives. I hear about that all the time. They started their awareness journey on "Take Back Your Power." It's a fantastic film.

Josh: Yeah. And I encourage people to continue going into this process because we are, I think, as a whole humanity is coming toward solutions and it's going to take courage and resourcefulness and community in just sharing this information. So Jerry, question one. What are the main problems caused by electronic utility meters aka smart meters?

Jerry: Right, we did that a little bit. It's the four major things; radiation, dirty electricity, surveillance and fire hazard. Radiation, I'm talking about RF radiation. Dirty electricity is electric fields, they're very different. They have to be handled different ways. You can shield radio frequencies, you cannot shield electric fields. You do that with line filtering. We can get into that but we don't have time today, but that's on emfhelpcenter.com. There's an introductory video at emfhelpcenter.com. Upper left corner homepage, click on that. It explains how to really launch into taking back the violations that your meter is causing.

And it tells you how to do it without going into adversarial confrontation and battle with your utility company. You can fix it, you can take matters into your own hands. So the smart meter is something you can control much more than you believe. And you know now even with that thing on the side of your house, you can fix it, you can take care of the problems.

Josh: Okay, good. Second question is, utility companies consistently lie about what various meters are called and what kind of radiation and electrical disturbances they cause. Please, explain?

Jerry: Never say I don't want a smart meter. You say I don't want an electronic meter. So there's two kinds of meters; a good one and a bad one. The good one is called electromechanical. The bad one is called electronic.

Josh: Electromechanical is your analog meter that doesn't send signal.

Jerry: The kind your grandma had, the old safe with the surge protection

and without the surveillance. Now if you say smart meter, they'll say, "Oh, yeah, okay. We won't give you a smart meter. We'll give you this other meter that's identical with a different brand name. Smart meter is just a brand name." And you were talking about when they lie, that's one of their big lies. They say, "Oh, this is not a smart meter." It doesn't matter. An electronic meter is the bad guy. The electromechanical meter is the good guy. If you use that language, you'll eliminate the confusion on that. I'm sorry, what was the rest of your question on that?

Josh: No, that's fine. Question three, should I accept the utilities opt out offer?

Jerry: I recommend you don't. Now everybody has an opinion. That's my opinion. And the reason I recommend you don't is because it's not an opt out. There are four problems; radiation, surveillance, dirty electricity and fire hazard. What are they opting you out of? Some of the radio frequency. What happens with the fire hazard? Still there. It's an electronic meter. What happens with surveillance? Still there. Your whole life is an open book. What happens with dirty electricity? It disrupts your incoming current, it has a switch mode power supply, they're stealing electricity from you to power their surveillance device that sends dirty electricity all through your house. You need a line conditioner to fix that. So they're lying, lying, lying, it's not an opt out. All they're saying is "Oh, it'll transmit less radio frequency, or not even." Well, so what? That's one of four major problems.

So we have at emfhelpcenter.com a notice of fraud. If you offer me an opt out that doesn't take care of radiation, surveillance, fire hazard and dirty electricity; all four, you're committing fraud because it's not an opt out. It's a fake thing. So we sent them a notice of fraud, and that's another one of those documents that you get on record. And then later on when your house has a fire that starts at the smart meter, you notice them on that fraud. They're on notice, they are liable and they get the major lawsuit.

I should go back real quickly to this thing of why we send out notices. If a million people send out notices, there would be five that could start that legal process. They would have the money to afford a lawyer, they would miraculously be able to find a lawyer that really understands and cares about the problem. There's a lot of ducks that have to fall in a row in order for this to happen.

That's why it takes numbers. It's not because 20/50 million people, they're all going to sue. It's because if the right people sue, it's only going to take 5, 10 or 20 and the whole system is going to crack apart. So the numbers are very important for that reason, because there are certain people -- unfortunately, it's how bad you're injured. And if somebody's house gets burned down and somebody gets killed, that's sad. But in

a way, that's an opportunity. That is when our notices go into full play. And we start talking about the hundred million dollar lawsuits and the settlements.

Josh: Next question, 90 seconds. That was really good, though. Thank you for this. Okay, how can I get my utility meter to provide a safe and lawful electromechanical meter?

Jerry: Yeah, that you can't. And the secret is that they won't do it. And so that's why we say go to the solutions at *emfhelpcenter.com*, where you work around that. You can get line conditioning, boom, your dirty electricity is gone. You can do some shielding, boom, your radio frequencies are managed. You can protect your house from the fire hazard with certain types of metal flashings and color, and this and that. So at least the house won't burn down, it'll just fry the meter. When you put in your line conditioning, you're also mitigating the surveillance because the line conditioner scrubs the data and it balances the data. And they can no longer identify when you're turning off and on appliances. So there's all four problems I just solved, all four.

Josh: I want to say though, to everyone watching. I mean, you have to go through the steps. I would encourage you to go through the steps of demanding your safe electromechanical meter, and in some states there is an analog opt out. So don't take that as a hard note to start with. But what Jerry is talking about is most utilities have made it that difficult.

Jerry: Well, the very first thing we tell them is, send in your notice of the liability. And that is telling them that they have to do something about this that it's on them. So the notice of liability is the first thing we recommend, even though all of the other solutions are non confrontational, non adversarial, you control it, you fix it yourself. Absolutely start with the notice of liability, that's a free download at EMF Help Center with a lot of other useful documents too if you want to use them.

Josh: And it seems like that links into question five; can I protect myself from unsafe and unlawful utility meters without a confrontation with my supplying company?

Jerry: Exactly. And that was my little loaded answer. A loaded question-answer is of course you can, and that is the entire focus of EMF Help Center. We spent five or six years putting people in direct adversarial confrontation with their power company because that's what they wanted. They said, I want my own electromechanical meter. I want to threaten them that if they don't give me a safe and lawful meter, I will put one on myself, because I have it right in my hands.

And we were helping supply those, and that was turning into a major

battle. Nobody was getting anywhere, because nobody could afford to follow through and sue them and do the whole thing. So it's going to be a question of mitigate yourself. And don't worry so much about installing this electromechanical meter, mitigate the problems of the electronic meter. At least for now, that's our best solution, because the answer to that question is, no. They're playing hardball, they're going to hurt you. They're going to come back, they're going to cut off your electricity. They're doing things like arresting people for interfering with their business.

The police in their incredible unfathomable ignorance are supporting that and actually arresting people who are doing nothing but trying to defend their safety rights and privacy. It's insane what the law enforcement has done in some of these instances. So we have to stay away from that. You know, if law enforcement is going to come in and enforce corporate policy for which they have no jurisdiction, we are in big trouble. You have to keep these people at arm's length, keep them out of your way. Don't get into the confrontation.

Luckily, there are things you can do and we've developed those. At EMF Help Center there's a center column right at the homepage called solutions. It's a long column but it's easy to read and step by step, you go through that. First thing is notice of liability. Then you look at the fire hazard, then you look at the radiation, surveillance, dirty electricity, boom, boom, boom solution, solution. So it's all there.

Josh: So send in the communications, stand for your rights, put it in notice, get it in on the record, so to speak. And then there are other things that you can do that Jerry's website helps. Okay, number six. If the utility does not provide a safe and lawful meter, and I can't afford to have my electricity turned off, what can I do? You've already touched on that.

Jerry: Yeah, we've covered it. Yeah, just take this little solution one at a time. There are those four main problems, it's all spelled out and explained very clearly in the video at EMF Help Center. Then you understand the problem very clearly, then you go through the website, and you take matters into your own hands, you can do it all. And it's self empowerment you know, you're the authority and you do have the ability, if you want to do it to take care of every one of those problems caused by that meter without having it removed. And without getting into the confrontation with the power company, because anything you do to remove that meter or to demand it be removed, will wind up in a very, very ugly situation where you're being dominated by a super wealthy and powerful institution who has the cops and the courts on their side just because they're rich and powerful. So you don't want to go there.

Josh: What you're saying though, like help me understand because I have my own perspective on this too. But I feel you still need to get your notice in there and do all three of your notices, default your process. That puts you in the driver's seat and then share with other people this information and that's what Inpower movements all about. To do this and strengthen numbers, strengthen community and meeting together in groups in person.

Number seven, radio frequencies are one problem and dirty electricity is another problem. What's the difference? You mentioned this before, but just dive into it a little bit more.

Jerry: Yeah, that's worth emphasizing. Dirty electricity is not shieldable. So they put this device on your house and they create this electric field, and it penetrates everything and it's like magnetism or gravity. It goes through everything, you cannot shield it. And people have a hard time with this. You imagine if you wanted to shield something -- a metal ball and you put it inside a metal box. Well, it doesn't become weightless. Gravity still affects it. That's how dirty electricity works. So you can shield radio frequencies because radio frequencies are like light. They emanate from a source, they're being transmitted and they shine in all directions just like light.

And so a shield, you can use mirrors, you can use reflectors, whatever. You can shield it, bounce it around. Never shield without grounding the shield. That's what pulls the electric fields and the radio frequencies out of the environment. If you just put up a barrier, a metal barrier could be foil, or it could be a reflective material, or a shielding cloth or whatever. That will just reflect like a mirror and you'll wind up with problems in your environment. So the grounding pulls that out.

So shielding is fairly straightforward and simple. Once you understand a few basic principles of shielding and grounding, the dirty electricity is a lot more difficult. But you don't have to solve that because their devices, they're called line conditioners, and you install -- some of them are plugged in. I don't personally necessarily recommend some of the smaller gadget type ones. There are some better ones on the market. We have some information about that at EMF Help Center.

But if you get the right kind of line conditioner, you immediately level out that dirty electricity and you have no more or almost no more electric fields emanating from your lines. So the easiest way to remember is RF you shield and ground, and dirty electricity you condition with a line conditioner. Yeah, and that's pretty much the start of that intro but there's more to it, but we've got the information on the web.

Josh: Good. And I also want to mention to our viewers out there; Jerry started -- is an expert in dirty electricity. He's also on the summit. So

check out his talk as well. Okay, number eight. People in my household are getting sick and tired for no apparent reason. How can I tell if that is caused by the utility meter or other sources of EMF or some other cause?

Jerry: Right. This is the common thing. And hundreds and hundreds of phone calls to me were; we got sick. We couldn't figure out why we had these symptoms. We went to the doctor. They didn't know what, they gave us pills and it didn't help at all. And then we realized it all started on the day they put in that smart meter. I heard that exact conversation hundreds of times.

Josh: That's how I got into making Take Back Your Power was my friend had his story, one of those exact stories like what you just described.

Jerry: So when you have these mysterious illnesses, and especially insomnia, headaches, vertigo, mood swings, brain fog, that kind of thing. Neurological problems, those are the initial ones, especially the ones for people who are EMF sensitive. This is what people don't understand. It's like an allergy. 15 to 20% of the population is sensitive to EMF, they're just born that way. They're genetically that way. And those are the people that are getting these symptoms. The rest of us won't really get the symptoms, will get cancer five or 10 years down the line from too much radio frequency exposure, too much electric field exposure.

But we won't really feel the immediate clinical symptoms. The people who are feeling those are usually what we call electromagnetic sensitive people. And it could be one person out of a family and the rest of the family is saying, "Oh, you're crazy, I feel fine." It's very unfair. It's very frustrating for the person who's going, "Man, I can't even think in here. My head hurts." And they don't know where to turn.

And quite often as you say, they don't have any idea that it's caused by some kind of radio frequency. It could be your smart meter very likely, because that's high energy density pulse radiation, very damaging. But it also could be a cell tower down the street, your Wi Fi, your neighbor's Wi Fi, your cordless phones, your microwave oven. All this stuff, especially the combination, the cumulative effect of all these will take an electromagnetic sensitive person and put them into symptoms.

Josh: And you can tell with a cornet device, electro smog device, like you're talking about, you can tell exactly where it's coming from. So just one thing on that, my conversation with Tom O'Bryan, he talked about overall toxic load. So he mentioned, 247 pounds of chemicals are produced every day per person in the United States as an example. So overall toxic load, there's a certain threshold, and people might have different thresholds. Kids have different thresholds and adults have different thresholds than the elderly. Chemicals and things that aren't

intended for our body and reducing wireless EMF, you're reducing both sides on the overall toxic load you could say.

Jerry: It's weird when you look at these corporations what they're doing, the chemicals in the fields that they're putting out, the radio frequencies. And how government hasn't put together into that, like, you can only take so much of this. You know, they look at each one going, "Well, that's unacceptable exposure. Oh, that's an acceptable exposure." And they're not looking at the fact that there are 500 of them. And so you're exactly right. And so the impression is after a while, somebody has intentionally depopulated the planet. How would government let all of this slide? Well, the answer to that is we have to now be responsible for what we allow ourselves to be exposed to just like you say.

And it's turning out, it's very important to look for organic foods, non pesticide type foods. There's apparently glyphosate in everything now. And it's far greater problem than we thought it was. So organic foods, and staying away from the radio frequencies, staying away from the toxic. You know, looking at what kind of house cleansers you use.

A lot of those are really bad. If it smells bad, it's probably really bad for you. You know, there are just all kinds of common sense things you can do. But there's also great information if you surf around on the web and look for healthier living, look for avoiding toxic things in your environment. There's some great -- I just saw a great talk by Dr. Seneff.

Josh: Yeah, Stephanie Seneff from MIT.

Jerry: Oh boy, what phenomenal information if you can find her on YouTube. And now we have the information we need, this enlightening information to live better and stay away from all these toxic and unhealthy exposures that are just being bombarded on us.

Josh: We are seeing some positive signs, like with Monsanto you mentioned; another \$2 billion lawsuit. The huge amounts of money here in May of 2019. So things are going in the right direction, we're not quite at that place where it's -- you know, very well could take a quick nosedive for Monsanto and Bayer. And getting this stuff off the shelves out of our lives could potentially happen if people continue to push that. We're maybe not that far along in the whole EMF, smart meter, 5G Wireless thing. But we have to take encouragement because way more people are engaged now than there were three years ago, five years ago.

Jerry: Every day.

Josh: I just want to jump into -- Okay, last question. And then we'll kind of take a collective breath here because I know we've been -- a lot of information in the last coming through quickly. Not directly related

to smart meters, but why in your perspective is global satellite 5G so dangerous?

Jerry: Well, obviously it's a lot more wireless. Obviously, in the long run even if people are dropping dead from the wireless, the worst problem will be social control. The invasiveness of the type of data that they'll be getting with 5G, with the internet of things, with the way your car will monitor your driving you know, they'll be nothing to send you a traffic ticket because they'll know what your car was doing. I mean, this type of surveillance -- and I plan if I ever go into buy a brand new car at a dealer. I like old cars, a certain type of cars. But you know, you have a lot of money, you want to get a brand new car, I'm going to go into that dealer. I'm going to say I'm ready to buy, I got the money. All you got to do is tell me that my car won't spy on me.

Josh: Yeah, good.

Jerry: And I tell you, if it's going to spy on me, I'm going to walk out. You're going to see my back and the door slamming. And you tell a car dealer that; you say, "Where did you think you get the right to go into the surveillance business?" You know, with all this computerization of the car. In fact, I don't even want a computer in my car, because if there's an EMP, it's a paperweight. I want a car with no computers. I want a car that will keep running if there is an electromagnetic pulse, and we could get one from the sun that would disable cars at this point with the amount of computerization that the car have. So no, I want a car that I can rely on and a car that's mine and working for me, and not sending my personal data to who knows who. So I would recommend -- if I could advise your listeners anything at all, is that insist on non spyware in everything.

I wanted to have a website called *nospytech.com*. I believe I have that URL a couple of years ago. So that's what we need, *nospytech.com*. So there would be a certification agency that would say, "We've looked at this product and we've certified that it's not spying on you, and you can trust it. And here's our little stamp of approval or whatever certification." You know, we need something like that, because people don't want to be spied on. Shouldn't they have an opportunity to have some certifications? "Oh, good. This is safe products. Not spying. Oh, buy that."

Josh: Very good idea. Yeah, it's standards body that is unbiased that is vetting products and companies, and different things that do not participate in corporate surveillance.

Jerry: Exactly.

Josh: So I want to thank you, Jerry, for your fire and your intellect and your emotion, and your intention is being channeled in a way to protect

life. Obviously, you have a lot of passion and a lot of fire and I'm so glad to just that comes through in this process of you're really protecting life. You're not in it for the money and you help hundreds of people. We were talking earlier today, you said probably in thousands on your websites on *emfhelpcenter.com* and *freedomtaker.com*. Let me just finish this because you're doing that almost entirely for free or by donation.

So if you're watching this and you value Jerry's contributions. And whether you've gone to him or you've seen one of his videos, or you go there now to one of his websites, please, please donate and support Jerry because he's not even asking for it. But just as a way to offer your energy back to him. I would just encourage you to do that because he's one of the people that are really making a difference in this conversation. So thank you, Jerry. Your websites are *freedomtaker.com* and *emfhelpcenter.com*.

And I wanted to just as we close out here, sorry to interrupt, but really quickly. We could kind of like close out this conversation with something else you and I were talking before, which was you're walking your walk, you're off grid.

Jerry: I live off grid solar, well water, small tank propane.

Josh: And you were telling me about this process of when -- you know, you start to take back your power literally. You're off grid, you're producing your own energy and your lights are hooked up to 12 volt system, and you're only having a few outlets but it's what you need. And you're telling me about the internal process that is part of this, like you're becoming aware of your surroundings more. You're tuning in to your environment and to nature, and that process that I think a lot of people can relate to when we shut things off. When we turn off the Wi Fi, when we're producing our own energy --

Jerry: You start to connect and be present in a way that you go, "Wow, I'm not absorbed in media right now. I'm not being distracted." You tend to come out and become more kind of aware and present. I think the story I was telling you is, we're driving in the car, listening to the radio and flipping the radio, and then shutting the radio off. And I become aware that I suddenly sensitize to the scenery, the environment to the present.

And I realized that media was keeping something inside me turned off, was keeping me unaware I wasn't really connected. So I think we have a lot of opportunity for more awareness, more presence, more connectivity, and kind of more intelligent action to benefit our lives and the lives of others. If we sort of tune in a little bit more to nature, tuned a little bit more to our surroundings, our presence with people, other people, that kind of thing.

Josh: Jerry, thank you so much for your time and your experience, and just your intention and service today. And just for talking with us today about both these topics. I really appreciate it.

Jerry: Anytime I appreciate the opportunity. Thanks, Josh, and good luck to you. And everybody look into Inpower too, and we're all doing the best we can. So I certainly respect and admire what you've done, and how terrific you've marketed all this. And you've driven all this and how many people you've brought into this movement, so all my best admiration to you too. Thank you, Josh.

Josh: Thanks, Jerry.

Local Government and Community Actions

Guest: Theodora Scarato

Josh: Joining us is Theodora Scarato, the executive director of the Environmental Health Trust. Theodora, welcome and thank you for your time and joining us today.

Theodora: Great. Thanks for having me.

Josh: I'm just going to share with our audience your bio. So you are, as mentioned, Executive Director of THE Environmental Health Trust; One of the leading scientific environmental health organizations working on 5G, small cells and cell phone radiation. EH Trust publishes research, presents to policymakers and develops educational campaigns on these focus areas. EH Trust also maintains the world's largest database on protective international policy related to electromagnetic radiation. Theodora brings a background as a clinical social worker, having directed intensive therapy programs in special education schools.

So I just have to say, EH Trust, I'm always linking to you guys in my articles and things like that. You guys do tremendous work. If I had one wish for you, it's that you would have 5 million more dollars to really be able to flush out and expand what you're doing, because you're one of the leaders and doing such good work in educating people. So thank you for your dedication and all of the energy and time, and work that you've put into your work with EH Trust.

Theodora: Thank you. We try to bring information to people and translate the science so that they can understand this issue.

Josh: Yeah. How did you get into all of this with your background? And at what point did you realize this is something that's a mission that I have that I want to help lead?

Theodora: You know, I had heard about it and didn't actually believe that it could possibly be true that something we all use could be harmful. And when I started reading the science on the impact of brain development in children, knowing what I know with my own clients who were prenatally exposed to drugs, and the challenges that they had, I delved into that. And that's what turned me from working as a social worker and sort of learning about this and using a headset to, I got to get involved. I got to work on this. This is about my child's brains. This is about children's health, and you can't take the time back, that they've been exposed, no safe level of lead. So I know that story. And so I just got more and more involved, and here I am.

Josh: So you were working as a clinical social worker and you're realizing that there's harmful effects happening to the brains of kids, is that from Wi Fi in classrooms? Was that the issue that brought you into this advocacy?

Theodora: It sparked my interest because I've got children. And so as I began to learn about this, and they started bringing all the wireless into the schools. I began to delve into the research and what scientists were saying, and learned about cell phones and you know, electromagnetic radiation and everything that we know. The literature, which is substantial, and I thought, why don't I know this? You know, why don't I know this? Because I done a lot of work with -- you know, neurologists come in and talk about best practices and different treatments, and I'm amazed that we never learned about this issue.

Josh: So let's dive into then the policy. Can you tell us about the history of policy in the United States and perhaps internationally on radio frequency or wireless radiation and the lack of accountability there. What are the key, maybe developments? And what are the keys to take away with that whole part of this conversation?

Theodora: Well, going back to when I first learned about this, the first question I had was; well, what's the safe level? And how did they come to that in the United States? Don't they have laws that protect us? That was my first question. And my mind was like, "wait a minute" when I learned that the EPA was defunded from working on this issue. When I learned that the FCC which has no health and safety, people on it who are public health and doctors, were regulating this issue. So what happened was -- and this is a summary of a very long history. There used to be a robust research that the United States was doing. It was slowly defunded over time. But the EPA was going to set federally developed safety limits and was doing research on this. There are draft reports that were never

released. There are final pages which never saw the light of day. And you can go to microwave news to read all about that.

But ultimately, even though we have foyers showing the PowerPoints where the EPA was set to release standards, they never were, and here we are with completely outdated limits. So I think this is one of the most important aspects to this because everyone says, "Well, doesn't it meet our FCC or government limits?" And that has no bearing on safety. And that was really hard for me to wrap my mind around. Once I understood the history and what it happened in this country and the fact that even internationally, the International authorities have people connected to industry in history. There's this long history where it's very clear that the levels do not protect us.

Josh: Yeah. Can you talk about that process when you realize you're struggling with -- "Well, how could that be true? Our government supposed to protect us? Surely it couldn't be this bad of a situation." Just before we dive into 5G and the strategies and like what's going on a deeper level, if you could share with us that internal process that you experienced. And that you witness so many other people having to go through? Can you summarize that for us?

Theodora: Well, there was the moment when I first learned about this, I actually started calling the health department. I called all those authorities that I thought would have an answer. And I remember being on the phone with my state representative -- they're not representative. I'm sorry. It was some health department person who basically laughed and said something like, "Oh, there really aren't any studies done recently. And no one's really even looking into that." And I thought, "Wait what? My kid? Wait." No one is looking into something that is ever growing. They're bringing wireless devices in schools. My kids' friends are getting cell phones at 10 years old and no one's looking into this. I couldn't believe it. Actually, that was one a quite shocking. And it was eye opening.

It took me a while to wrap my mind around that reality. And when I would talk to other parents or other clinicians who I worked with, they would say, "Well, of course it's safe." And one of the reasons I've been focusing on policy is that it was when I realized that in France, they were way ahead of the game in some aspects of this. And I thought, "Wait a minute." So you're already -- you know, Belgium has banned the sale of cell phones for young children. And the news report says because of the radiation, whereas in the United States, how many times are you in the grocery store and there is a child, a baby with a cell phone watching a video?

I thought we have the right to know this information. Why aren't we being told this? And why does my pediatrician not know? Why does the

health department not know? It's a hard pill to swallow.

Josh: Yeah. Is that perhaps the shift in our worldview that's required when we start to see those to whom we've trusted authority, shirking their responsibility of making sure that they do their jobs correctly? In other words; misusing the power of authority in a way that is putting all of humanity at risk. It's definitely an uncomfortable process that we have to wrestle with and the shift that we have to make.

Theodora: It's definitely not comfortable and people want comfortable, they want security, they want safety. And this makes you -- so many people like you learn about it and go, "Not safe." And we don't want to be in that space, we want to feel secure. So to address this issue, you really have to sort of be with that space of, "Wow, this is huge. This is important." And you have to feel like you can do something about it. You know, I just thought the more I learned about what other countries were doing, it empowered me. I thought you know, if they can do that, we can do this. There's no reason we can't all be at a minimum at making some changes.

Josh: You mentioned France and Belgium being ahead of the game. What are some changes, some safety precautions that other countries have made on wireless radiation?

Theodora: Well, as an example, in the United States when you buy a cell phone -- when Berkeley and San Francisco, by the way, wanted to pass a law informing people that the phone emits radio frequency, the wireless industry immediately sued. And we are not given that information, whereas in France, they passed a law where you are informed of the SAR; this part of what information that you're given --

Josh: The specific absorption rate or the rate of radiation, right?

Theodora: The rate of the absorption of the radiation. Well, it's not. There's a lot of problems with that SAR limit, but yet it is the limit that when phones come on the market, they're tested to make sure they meet this limit, which is not protective. But nonetheless, that's the limit and we don't have that in the United States. I mean, I certainly did not know that my phone emitted anything before this issue. I was shocked. I mean, it's invisible. How would we know?

Josh: Yeah. And so then France also bans Wi Fi -- was it elementary school or nurseries. And tell us about that and maybe some other countries that have done some protective measures.

Theodora: They've actually since 2010, had legislation in place related to cell phone labeling informing people about cell phones. But in 215,

they passed another law, which does ban wireless in nursery schools and daycare centers where young children are. In elementary school, the default setting for the wireless is off. And teachers can turn it on for a specific thing that they're doing and for that time. And as I understand it from people in France, they have wanted it to be that there was no wireless. But that was one of the negotiations that happened as laws move through the system.

They also, as an example, in France, if you want to know, "Hey, what's the radiation near my house in my town, what is it?" They go to the local government and they are afforded that information. That is part of information they get to have. In fact, several countries monitor into varying degrees of accuracy, but they do have monitoring systems that people can go online, click on a map and see what the reading today is. Well, whereas in the United States, we stopped.

The last report was in the 80s. And there was one before that in the 70s. And we're not doing that. So we don't even know, we don't even have data on our exposure. And that's really important because when you do science, it's really useful to have the data as to the levels that you're being exposed to every day.

So there's Cyprus as well, and French Polynesia have also banned Wi Fi in kindergarten and nurseries. And have similar to France in the schools as well. I know in Cyprus, they've actually has a decree to pull all wireless out of the elementary schools. And actually Israel as well has certain restrictions on wireless. And there's certain areas and regions in different countries and this is all online on EH Trust under our policy database.

You can click on the country and see like regions in Italy, where the mayor has decreed that there shouldn't be Wi Fi and that we need to be using wired connections. We need to teach people about how to use cell phones you know, away from the body in corded connection. The list is actually long. It's incredible. I mean, eye opening as why aren't we doing that? You know, for starters like baseline, let's at least get there. And then let's go further.

Josh: Yeah, very good. What is 5G? And how is it different from 4G?

Theodora: Well, 5G is the technology; the fifth generation wireless technology. It's going to tie together the Internet of Things. Meaning not just our cell phones, but self driving cars, censored appliances that we have, your Wi Fi washing machine. There's even a breast pump that connects to your cell phone. Socks that babies wear that measure their temperature, and then connects back to the parents' cell phone. All of these they call it the digital ecosystem which I -- is deeply concerned about the language that's being used by industry because it makes it

seem like it's an ecosystem you think of like the trees and the frogs. But they're talking about machines and devices connecting to each other, not living beings, biological beings.

But for that to happen, because that's so many invisible signals of radiation in the air, they need to come up with different engineering standards. So 5G there's a way that this will be engineered. And it's going to rely on "small cells" an industry term, which is, in fact, wireless antennas that are mounted shorter to the ground in neighborhoods at every two to 10 homes. Tom Wheeler, actually was FCC commissioner, said we need 800,000 more wireless mini cell towers, small cells in the United States alone. And that's just for now, their estimates up to 2 million. And of course, worldwide we're talking millions.

Josh: What frequencies are being used or what different ranges of frequencies are being used with 5G?

Theodora: Well, it's going to utilize everything we have now. All the spectrum we have now and then go higher into sub millimeter waves. According to industry reports, different carriers are using different frequencies. And on top of that, when you get a close proximity microwave antenna in front of your home, it's going to have not just 5G but 4G, because 4G is the backbone for 5G. And in some communities, you'll have 2G and 3G depending on what country and region and what they're using. So the phones that they are developing now actually will switch back between the 5G and the 4G. And so really what we're doing is adding another layer, we're not swapping something out for something else, we are adding an entire other layer.

And we have all this on our site as to how industry is saying that this will increase the radiation exposures. That these new antennas to the degree that they have to change the limits of countries that have more protective allowable limits of radiation, like Poland and Switzerland and Italy, that allow much less radiation from cell tower networks. I mean, that should be eye opening itself.

Josh: So how many studies do you think there are? Because we know that the agencies -- I was going to say industry. But the agencies who are heavily influenced if not totally corrupted by the industry. The agencies don't take all the body of science into account. So how many studies do you think there are that show biological effect from wireless radiation at levels below the so called safety standards?

Theodora: Well, there are hundreds if not thousands depending on how you run the numbers or decide what you're going to include in your review. There's a substantial body of evidence documenting harm at levels lower than the FCC limits lower than other countries even more protective. Are not quite protective, but they allow lower levels and

very low levels. There are hundreds of scientists who are calling for a moratorium on 5G, and hundreds who are saying what we have now is not safe. We need to reduce exposure in use of technology.

So the problem that we have is that the people in the decision making positions are turning a blind eye. They have industry connections, or they are being told information and not given this information from independent scientists. So well meaning politicians you know, the local government they're not getting the information to -- You know, they say the FDA says it's fine or it's meeting FCC limits.

Josh: Just a backup a little bit on my last question. What evidence do we have to suggest that federal or international or other agencies governing health and wireless have been corrupted or influenced by the wireless industry?

Theodora: There is a long history, and many scientists who tell stories of when they have found effects. Either their studies have been stopped being funded at that point, or they've been accused of fraud or they've lost their jobs. Or the studies had been reorganized. You know, you can start with -- Well, there are many stories but Dr. Henry Lai who found DNA damage from microwaves. I don't know if you know about the war game memo.

Josh: Tell us about that.

Theodora: So there was a memo that microwave news first posted. It was leaked to microwave news where there was a PR firm and Motorola having a conversation. And it talked about War Gaming; Dr. Lai's studies. That was the term. And I think about when I was a kid and play those games where you know, asteroids get shoot up and you hit one by one. If you hit the the asteroids, you can stop from being hit. And that is a plan that is very much in place now.

So each time there's a study that's a problem, there is either critiques put out to show the other side that are often industry connected. Or the scientists are saying that that's fraudulent. There's some criticism put out and then when those studies are brought to the table as credible evidence which they are, they are dismissed because of these attacks.

There is no perfect study. I mean, every study has limitations. So the National toxicology program as an example that was a \$30 million study that the Food and Drug Administration asked for. They wanted well done animal studies, they have a whole nomination statement where they put that into words. Because there was this human, you know epidemiology that showed a real association between someone's risk of a brain tumor and the cell phone to the head. But that's not controlled as carefully as laboratory studies. So here we have these animal studies

that were done. They were designed to look at non thermal levels that we assume are safe. I mean, our FCC limits are based on the assumption that if it doesn't heat you and cook you, it can't harm you. That is an assumption.

As long as that assumption is true, our FCC limits are supposed to be protective. So this study was designed and Dr. Ronald Melnick, one of our advisors in 28 year, NIH scientist, describes how that study was designed and what it was intended to do. And as he says, they tested that hypothesis and it failed. They were effects found from long term exposures to radio frequency at levels that did not heat.

So that's a problem. That means that everything we think about this radiation is, we have to question because obviously there are effects at non thermal levels. And not only that, but if you dig into that study -- and I was at the peer review with several other scientists, and there was a nonlinear effect. Sometimes even lower levels. And there are research studies that have looked into this as well. The windows of effect; so very low levels had effects, whereas when you go a little higher, you don't have those same effects.

And traditionally, scientists would think, "Well, that means it wasn't an effect or what does that mean?" But scientists who works in bio electromagnetic are aware of this that this is happening and are discussing that as part of how electromagnetic radiation interacts with our biological systems. Anyway, I just jumped into that, but I don't know if you know what happened with the NTP study.

Josh: Yeah. I actually, as part of the summit, I'm talking with Dr. Ronald Melnick.

Theodora: Oh, perfect.

Josh: So I'm really, really excited for that and would highly encourage everyone to dive into that and get that full story about how -- I think you were going to say, how the science was done. And the FDA who actually asked for that study back in 1998 just ignored, they just ignore the results. They just don't even do the risk assessment based upon the study results. So a fascinating conversation. But I just want to dive into this. So based upon that \$30 million government study and you know, the body of evidence out there, for someone new to this focus area, Theodora, what are the main effects? What effects has the published science concluded are caused by microwave radiation had levels below the safety standards?

Theodora: Okay. As the EMF scientists appeal states, there is peer reviewed published science showing the following effects; DNA breaks, cancer, promotion, brain cancer, impacts to reproduction, sperm

damage, and increases in blood - brain barrier permeability. And I talked about impacts to brain development, headaches. The list is long because the whole body is affected. So all the systems are affected.

And one thing that's really important is the increase in oxidative stress, which can lead to a myriad of issues impacting your ability to -- if your body to be healthy, so you break down. There can be many, many things that impacts. And I think there was a review study that showed over 90% of the 100 studies that they looked at found impacts to oxidative stress in the body.

Josh: And are children more affected than adults?

Theodora: Yes, and that's been documented for several reasons. So first, children are more exposed and will absorb proportionately more of this radiation deeper into their bodies and their brain centers. We compare to adults with the same device because their skull is thinner, the bodies are smaller, they actually have more liquid in certain tissues. So they're getting proportionally more exposure.

And of course, they're developing. Their brains are developing and when you impact a rapidly developing biological system or your brain, there can be impacts not just now, but later in time that are more serious for children. And we see that within all other environmental exposures that the younger the person being exposed, the more vulnerable they are. And of course, children are the first. I mean, cradle to grave exposure. But we didn't have that, I didn't have that.

I got my first cell phone ironically when I was pregnant to protect -- because I was working actually at that time in an area and I had an old car. And it was so that I could call tower. My car was towed so many times. It's just something that I had as a way to protect myself. It was for safety. But that was when I was like 30 years old. I got my first phone. Now children are exposed, not just to phones but to baby monitors, which are totally different than the baby monitors when my babies were babies. They're digital, everything is like on steroids, much radiation is coming out of these devices.

Josh: Yeah. So dialing back into 5G, you mentioned it's not just millimeter wave radiation, is not just 24 to 90 gigahertz, but it includes that. So has industry done any science on those higher 5G frequencies? And is there any existing independent science on those higher frequencies?

Theodora: Well, there are a couple of important pieces, and I would refer to a review article by Dr. Cindy Russell on 5G and millimeter waves. So we don't have any long term research on exactly fifth generation. We know what 5G will mean for people. It's not been rolled out yet. We don't

have the worn bodies. We don't have animals being exposed. But we have a copious research going way back on millimeter waves, because it was investigated by the US government and other governments; actually Russia for uses weapons and impacts to the body.

We know that at levels that are non heating, there are effects from all these other frequencies and modulation. So scientists will say that, "We know that this is going to be the opposite of healthy." And one of the things that you'll hear a lot is, millimeter waves only penetrate so much into the skin. So they're going to be safer.

This is perpetuated by industry, it was in the New York Times. This is not based on logic for a couple of reasons. The skin is your largest organ. And there are many biochemical things that happen in your skin that affect your whole body. So even just that level of discussion, it doesn't make sense. We have receptors and we have so much stuff going on in our skin, that it should absolutely be thoroughly researched for long term safety before we expose the public to it. Millimeter waves have never been used commercially before.

They're using the Active Denial defense as a weapon. This was developed two decades ago because it made your skin feel like it was on fire when the millimeter waves were at high power. And so there's some research on our site, which I know Dr. Davis talked about in her talk with you. We have published research on millimeter waves, as well as on 5G and how much the phone gives off. But going back to millimeter waves, apparently in the skin, there are certain tissues that absorb it at a much higher rate. That's why it feels like your skin's burning. Because one part of your sweat gland, according to this modeling, could be absorbing it super high levels. Whereas the way our government make sure phones are safe is by using "a plastic head filled with sugar- salt liquid" not even looking at these different tissue structures we have in our body.

So if you hear that 5G is safer because it's a millimeter waves, it's not based on a thorough investigation into the science or what independent scientists are saying.

Josh: So has industry done any studies or is there any indication that it's safe scientifically?

Theodora: Senator Blumenthal asked industry at a Senate Commerce hearing about that question. And they said no. That there's not been studies on long term safety to biological systems. They certainly done a lot of -- industry is funding a lot of study on the penetration into the body and how much can a phone give off before it meets this limit or that and how do we make sure there's compliance? And how are we going to define compliance? Industry has funded that science, the scientists, the group who is setting the new limits for the higher

frequencies. A lot of industry money there, but there's not science on exposure and the health of the other biological systems on the long term.

Josh: Yeah, so there's this proceeding anyway. And there's no precautionary principle. There's no weight of evidence principle. It's just we don't have the studies, we're not going to do them. We're just going to deploy. That's what we're dealing with here. And that's one of the reasons why we're getting together in this summit and talking about this, like how to actually solve this problem. So what is actually going on when all of these people have written to the government, have written to the FCC, have written to federal and state authorities demanding answers, like what happened? Has there been any response or any encouragement that there are positive things happening on the sort of the government regulatory side?

Theodora: Okay. I have a big answer. But so when they write the response they get is that the US health agencies; the FCC wrote a letter back to Senator Blumenthal and back to there's about six representatives from Congress who've written so far, I guess four or five letters. And the FCC writes back that, "Well our health and safety agencies have looked into this and are sure it's safe." Or the most recent letter, "We did to our limits that we have that it will meet our limits, that they were developed to protect the public." But as I said, those limits were set two decades ago based on actually a decade or science from even earlier than that. I don't include the recent science nor independent scientists' perspective. So we circle back to that problem of not having limits that protect us. There we are. And that's what our government is saying.

And by the way, the FCC is referring to the FDA as having looked into this in one of the letters. I know Dr. Melnick will talk about this more, but several scientists and also myself wrote to the FDA and said, "Why are you saying there doesn't need to be a change to limits based on what? Where are the documented scientifically defensible reports?" And they haven't answered. Not only that, and this is a really important key point. The FDA has an overview for cell phones, cell phones are found to be harmful, but there none. There is no agency that is addressing the environmental levels, meaning the levels from all these small cells in our backyards, front yards. There's no health, environmental agency in charge of that.

Josh: What happened to the EPA?

Theodora: The EPA was defunded and is not. They're not working on that. Try writing to the EPA and ask them to see the answer you'll get. We actually have on our website answers that we've gotten. Now I think they won't answer anymore where they say like, you know, we don't do

that. There was a letter from 2002 or 3 where there was confirmation that the limits don't apply to long term exposures. There are only to short term exposures that were by Norbert Hankin who worked in the radiation office there. He's now retired. And there's no environmental review. What about the impacts to birds, to bees, to trees, to the tree canopy, to the leaves. What will it mean to them?

And there's a research again on our site *ehtrust.org*. We have a page on bees. We have a page on wildlife. We show the peer reviewed published literature showing that they are sensitive to these frequencies and they are harmed. Trees are harmed by these frequencies. There was actually a study. I don't know if you saw the study on insects. They took a couple insects you know, not a lot because scientists have so much time and probably took months and months and months to do this research. And they looked at millimeter waves. And they modeled how much the insects would absorb, and one was the western honeybee. And found that as the frequencies got higher, the SAR rate was higher to where the researchers cautioned. You know, what will be the impact to the physiology and behavior of these insects.

One other point in that study which blew my mind. It said, this is the first study to investigate the impact of millimeter waves on these insects. And I thought, "Wow, we're rolling something out. And this is the first study." And they only looked at a handful of insects. I mean, how are we doing that? Where's the respect for our natural environment?

Josh: Yeah. I mean, where is the sanity? You know, really what it comes down to. So what strategies are being used by people, community, cities fighting back against the FCC, against the industry for pushing 5G?

Theodora: A lot. At every level of government, there is action on this issue from the local town council where there are resolutions being put forward. Some being passed like in Hallandale, Florida, calling on 5G calling for safety documentation to state bills. I don't know if you're aware of the New Hampshire bill, which called for a commission to study the issue of 5G, and had a list of the most incredible questions that this commission would look into. Like, why are some of the world's top scientists calling for a moratorium and yet the United States is not doing anything.

And then at the federal level, there's lawsuit by cities and communities who are saying that the FCC has overreached. And that there should be an environmental review before deployment, because what happened is the FCC has issued a series of regulations sort of stripped the authority of local communities to regulate the placement of cell antennas on their own land. So that even if a mayor or if the whole community says you know, we don't want this here, they can't stop it.

When people hear that and they say, "Wait, I want control of my authority." I mean, our elected officials in our town should be able to make those decisions. People are protesting too, it's everywhere writing op-eds. We have many pages dedicated to that on our site.

Josh: Okay. So cities, one interpretation is they have no rights, but they are fighting back. There are strategies and there are different interpretations of the level of rights that cities have. Can you tell us about specifically, how cities are approaching this problem and how people are working with our local governments to toward a solution?

Theodora: Yeah, it's really interesting. And there are been so many cities that have been able to pass as protective as possible regulations to maintain as much authority as they can. Because at first, when this issue comes up, the City Council says, "We aren't allowed to regulate it all. The FCC has stripped everything away from us. Industry can do whatever they want." It's actually not true. And there are many things that cities can do related to aesthetics or setbacks in some cases, or into permitting so that they can retain some authority, although a lot is being stripped away. But there's a lot that they can retain.

I know there was a California Supreme Court case that said San Francisco could actually regulate based on certain parameters. That was a case that had gone to court. I know that in Mill Valley and Fairfax, they are saying prohibiting small cells in their neighborhood residential zones. And we'll see industry may Sue. And it will be interesting to see what happens with that. There are cities that are saying a wireless facility meaning those mini cell towers; those small cells, but they don't have antennas on them, need to be 500 feet from a house. Rather than like in my town, the first ordinance that was put forward was 20 feet. And once people learned about that, they said, "No." I mean, 20 feet. That's like right at the sidewalk. And the council said, "Well, we can't do anything. It has to be that way because of the FCC where -- and we can't even talk about health."

And over time people as they dug deeper into this, and it's all on film where one council person found out that, in fact, the district can regulate the wireless facilities as long as it's like anyone else who's bringing internet into the home. And then in fact, it's not a utility, and they shouldn't be granted the same rights as utilities. So it seems complicated but really, when you start looking into it and you get your council people to really look at what's going on around the country. So much is happening. I mean, people are getting educated everywhere. Elected officials are getting educated and people are asking for protections and not to be exposed to this without their consent.

Josh: Yeah. And people are really like they're really coming at this from a very committed, dedicated place where they're firmly respectfully, firmly

bringing this information to their local government. So how important is it that we the people, bring this information and bring awareness of the responsibility to our local officials?

Theodora: The most important piece of all of this is to raise your voice on this in a respectful way, asking for your elected officials to do their job to be accountable to people and to people's health. And I think there are people who are speaking at meetings who have never spoken at a meeting before. There are people who I speak to. And I say; "You need to go to your town council, your elected officials, and you need to talk to them about this." And they say, "I don't even know who those people are." And then they figure it out. And next thing you see them on camera speaking on this issue. And a year later, they are leading these groups in their organizations. And that's actually what's happening not just in the United States, but worldwide. It's incredible. I mean, when I spoke -- I've never done what I'm doing now.

Personally, certainly not with EH Trust. But once I learned and got involved and learn more, and this is happening for a lot of people, actually. It's really inspiring to see that.

Josh: Thank you. And EH Trust is playing a central role in that. You have on your website, there's a page on all the actions that cities throughout the United States have done. And of course, we know we talked about Europe and we're interviewing several people from Europe and what's going on there in this summit as well. But how many, if you were just to take a guesstimate? I know that in late 2018, early 2019, when that ruling first came out from the FCC, basically grabbing away the power of the local governments, there was like hundreds of local governments throughout the country that were threatening lawsuit. And so some of those on health, probably the majority of them on the fact that like you're taking our decision capability away. So that's against the 10th amendment of the states. But my question is this; how many would you estimate local governments in the country are or have I've already taken action of some sort on this matter.

Theodora: That is a challenge because we only have maybe under 20 on our site, but I know there are many, many more. I mean, like many more, because we are contacted constantly. I wish we had the capacity to put what everyone is doing online. But it's incredible how many folks are getting involved at the very local level and at the district level and at the state level. So I wish I could tell you that.

Josh: No, that's good to know. That's encouraging. So as people get involved and get together with their family, their neighbors or community, local government mitigation, what are some tips to reduce our exposure to wireless in the meantime?

Theodora: Well, there are personal things that we can do with the devices, the technology we use every day and I can talk about that. Unfortunately, it's not going to fully protect us from 5G outside. But it is a critical first step, because if you can get your home and your sleep, your levels lowered, you're going to give time for your body to heal. And then we can work on the meaningful policy change that we need to work on. So I just wanted to say that first.

So starting with your cell phone, or how you make phone calls, and this was so hard for me. It was like changing the relationship with my phone because I loved my phone at the time. You know, first the safe phone is a powered off cell phone and use a corded landline whenever possible. This is easier than it seems. Because I don't have a copper line availability in my neighborhood. But I was able to get a line off my internet provider from a wired; not wireless modem. And I use phone which is corded, which I'd show you but it's too far over there for me to grab right now. That has a current line not cordless phone. Cordless phones emit radiation like cell phones, different levels. And they -- in fact your dect phone.

When I first got a microwave radiation meter, I had eliminated everything from my house but not the dect phone. Somehow I had missed that that emits radiation and I couldn't believe the numbers and how much I was being exposed to from that cordless phone sitting on my desk.

Josh: Even just the base station of that phone, right?

Theodora: Yeah, the base. It emits all the time. And then when you pick up the phone, it connects and emits too to the phone. Every wireless device is always connecting to its base station. I think a bit like although it's kind of hard to make this metaphor but like a mother and a child. Your young toddler always knows where you are in a room. Like, wherever the mom or the dad goes, the baby is looking, checking, playing, always knows where you are. Similarly, a cell phone always knows where a cell tower is, and the cell tower always knows cell phone is.

And your wireless computer is always checking in with the wireless router. Even when you're not using them, as long as they're powered on and open, they are connecting. They are putting spikes of radiation out. So you need to know that fat because once you know that, then you can turn it off. If you turn it off or turn the Wi Fi off, for example and use a corded connection.

Right now I'm using an Ethernet connection with my computer that I'm talking to you. And I have to turn the Wi Fi off of the device itself. Also, like virtual assistance, they emit radiation too wirelessly to the router. All manner of anything wireless, your cable wireless mouse. I mean I have

a corded mouse. You want to use corded accessories, corded computer, corded printer. Smart meter; get an analog.

And sometimes that means so as you know, fighting for an opt out and then trying to get everyone to have a free opt out, which is really the only defensible policy that protects people. So these are a few things to do and being cognizant of -- if you're a parent, I would put my baby in a sling, or in a carrier. And then I would tuck the cell phone right there with the baby, because I didn't know that the phone device emitted radiation. And parents need to know not to put wireless devices near their children. And to make sure the children are using wired technology.

Josh: So you're wearing an air tube headset there to further minimize the exposure from the phone to your ears. Can you talk about as well like airplane mode in your phone, and using hands free versus, you know --

Theodora: Oh yeah. So if you're in a situation where you need to use a phone or a cell phone area, many people like start out by making changes with their cell phone. So to start; the easy first start that will have no impact is when you're not using it, turn it on airplane mode when you're not talking to someone. Also, you have a lot of antennas in your phone. Most people don't know that you've got like five or six antennas in your Smartphone. Turn off the antennas you're not using like the Wi Fi, the cellular, the hotspot, all of those. Just like I was saying the mother and the child, it's always radiating to the source.

So turn those off when not in use. If you want to take pictures or take a video, do it. But have it on airplane mode and make sure that the antennas are off. And I say both those things because it used to be that you turn your phone on airplane mode and all the antennas would be off. Unfortunately, the newer phones some will come back on or maybe Bluetooth will still be on. And so you've got to turn every wireless antenna including Bluetooth to off; completely off.

And then keeping it a distance. Put it on speaker mode far away from your body. Don't do what many of us did when we first learned about this; we use a headset. And then we take the phone and rested on the leg or in the pocket thinking, "Well, it's away from my brain" But yet there it is near your skin, your abdomen, your reproductive organs. You need to know when does your phone go to high power and minimize those times. So for example, watching a video that's streaming. We have choices about when we can watch; like do we need to be watching a video when we're out walking around, can we wait till we're home on a corded connection? Not like when you're watching a video, downloading large files.

Sorry to tell you know -- both of us are on wired technology right now, but many people will FaceTime, chit chat while they're shopping. And if you're in a basement or an area below reception, you're going to get more radiation.

Josh: Yeah. I've had numerous people come back to me when I put this challenge to them, like, just start by turning your Wi Fi router off during sleeping hours. Just at night whether it's manually or whether it's going on Amazon and getting like \$8 power timer. And then people come back to me and so many like, high percentage of the time they say they're either sleeping better or they're feeling better or their kids are sleeping better, something like that. Just really quickly; what stories have you heard when people just take that first step to cut their Wi Fi at night or similarly --

Theodora: Personally, so my husband was skeptical about this issue. And when we finally took the plunge, and I'm so glad I did and got a wired modem. We got rid of the Wi Fi completely. He said, "I sleep better. We really all slept better." So I hear that all the time. Headaches, dizziness feeling wiped out, but the sleep was so important. So you know, try it. Actually once we did it, I thought why did we wait so long just to get those Ethernet wires and plug them in and split the Ethernet with a port switch. It can be done. It's doable, people are doing it. People call me and they're like -- everyone -- you know, I need people to help me, we cable, we're doing it. We're cleaning out our house of this exposure.

Josh: Yeah. And just a quick shout out. I have one more question for you. Quick shout out for MOCA2 technology. Anyone watching this, look up MOCA2. And what that is, it's on Amazon. And basically I've set up four homes like this including my current one where you can actually use the existing TV cabling system that runs through your walls in the various rooms to carry the internet in a wired fashion. So one adapter at your wired router and then another one in each room. And you can get wired through your TV cabling system in your house. So it's brilliant technology there. There are no negative side effects and it doesn't interfere with your TV service if you have that.

Last question; Okay, big picture from the heart or the soul perspective, whatever, however you want to answer this, is there an awakening here? Is there an opportunity individually and collectively to use this crisis for our good perhaps, and if so, how best can we navigate it?

Theodora: Yeah, I think so. I think that as we people are coming into realizing they have a voice that they can speak and participate in, I hope our democracy. I think about, you know, what does freedom mean? Freedom means being able to say yes, and being able to say no. And we can't say yes or no to something we don't know anything about. So

part of this process has been like, wait, I do have a choice. And I want to make a choice. I want to educate myself so I can make an educated choice and people are just -- we're just learning. I mean, getting educated and speaking up on this issue. I'm actually really excited about what's been happening. I feel like we're at a turning point. The tipping point is here on this issue.

Josh: Yeah, very well said. Thank you so much, Theodora Scarato, Executive Director of the EH Trust. Thank you so much for your time today, for your commitment, your passion, your courage, and just getting all this empowering information out. I really appreciate you being on the summit with us today.

Theodora: Thank you so much. And please go to our website *ehtrust.org* to learn more, and we have a newsletter too. So once a month, we put stuff out. And I thank you for bringing this issue to people.

Science about Wireless and 5G

Guest: Dr. Sharon Goldberg

Josh del Sol: Joining us on the summit today is internal medicine physician Dr. Sharon Goldberg. Sharon, welcome to the summit.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Thank you. Hi.

Josh del Sol: Thank you so much for being here for spending this time with us. People may already know you. Those that are familiar with 5G and the conversation from your testimony at the Michigan House Energy committee hearings on 5G. In late 2018. And so, I'm really looking forward to this conversation because with your background and your extensive knowledge and expertise in medicine in electromagnetic radiation.

We are going to give a very powerful set of grounded facts and perspectives today in this conversation. So really looking forward to dive in.

And I'm just going to share with our audience a little about your background. And then we'll get started.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg is an integrative internal medicine physician. She is one of a small, but growing number of physicians to have completed the advanced electromagnetic radiation course work with the Building Biology Institute. And by the way, Larry Gust is in the summit as well.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Great. He was one of my teachers.

Josh del Sol: Excellent. And has technical experience with electromagnetic field assessment and remediation.

Her background includes fifteen years as an academic hospital medicine physician, and medical educator. Responsible for the training of medical students and resident physicians at teaching hospitals in New York City and the University of Miami.

She has co-authored publications in the fields of dietary supplementation, autonomic nervous system assessment, and nutritional epidemiology. And Dr. Goldberg is an editorial member of the journal *Electromagnetic Biology and Medicine*.

So very extensive background.

We'll dive right in. How did you first become aware of the effects from electromagnetic radiation?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Well, I was just like everyone else I didn't think twice about carrying a cell phone in my pocket on my body using it all of the time.

So about five years, and I was working at the University of Miami where my cell phone came from the Department of Medicine. So I was due for a new phone. I wanted an iPhone. I had a Blackberry. I brought the new phone home and I had a conference call that I did holding it on speaker like this for twenty minutes.

By the end of the call my finger was burning. It was like a neuropathic pain that a diabetic would get in their toes. Like a burning pain in my finger.

I thought, "Wow, this is not okay. What's going on?" So I started reading that night about electromagnetic fields from phones and health effects. And I was really shocked to find out that actually there was a lot of science to show that the conditions that we treated in the hospital and in internal medicine clinics; there's a lot of science to show that path of physiology overlaps with the effects of electromagnetic fields. So that was a big shocker for me, and an eye-opener.

The next morning, of course, I brought my phone back to my administrator and I asked her for a low SAR phone, which I got the following week.

Josh del Sol: So a lessor radiation phone? So SAR, Specific Absorption Rate?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Exactly.

Josh del Sol: So a phone that microwaves less power, right?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Exactly.

Josh del Sol: Okay.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: It's the amount of radiation per unit weight. It's a measurement. It's not such a great measurement, but it does measure something. In this case the phone that I had been given was an iPhone 5, which I was told many years later was actually a high radiation phone. And then I switched it to one, at least on paper, is a lower radiation phone.

So that's how I got interested in it. That was five years ago. But that got me really interested in it because I had been like you mentioned I had been doing some research. And doing a lot of teaching with medical students and residents. And one of the things that is a big issue for all physicians is that our patients have just been becoming sicker, and sicker with every passing year.

Internal medicine used to be essentially geriatrics when I started twenty years ago. The young people that were hospitalized in the internal medicine wards all had a reason to be there. They weren't just there. When I say, a reason to be there, I mean they would be dialysis patients. They would have epilepsy. They would have autoimmune disorder or some type of acute infection. Or other issues. But everything was kind of clear and we knew why they were there.

What's been happening over the past twenty years is that internal medicine patients are becoming younger and younger. With more and more comorbid conditions. So like a longer list of diseases. That they come in. And longer medication lists.

So this has been a challenge for, I think all physicians, but also for medical educators who deal with medical students. Because in my last couple of years at the University of Miami, I saw something that I had never seen, which is medical students would show up on our ward their first day for their clerkships. And they would look at how sick the patients were. And you could just see it in their eyes. They were burnt out already.

How can you teach someone to take care of a simple medical problem. Like abdominal pain in a patient who has a history of stroke, heart attack, cancer, this long list of problems. So that's how I got into it.

Josh del Sol: What are some of the common misperceptions in your view of EMF's? And EMF's, Electromagnetic Frequencies, Electromagnetic Radiation being interchangeable terms.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Yeah. So I think there a lot of misperceptions. A lot. I will mention two. The biggest one is that we keep hearing this controversy or debate in the scientific literature about whether or not electromagnetic fields, and I guess I'll speak specifically about microwave radiation. Because we're talking about 5G and wireless radiation. So we're speaking about microwave radiation now.

The misconception is that we don't have enough science to make a decision as far as whether or not we need to warn the public, and take action to lower exposures. And this is completely false. We have such clear evidence that microwave radiation, that it is what I would call a broad spectrum pathogen. So it causes all sorts of different diseases. And a multisite carcinogen. So it causes cancer in many different parts of the body.

We understand a whole bunch of basic mechanisms about why this would be. We understand that. So it's completely false from the scientific perspective when you hear, "Well, we need more research." "It's still a debate." There isn't anything to debate. That's I think the biggest misperception out there.

The other thing that I think people don't understand is we assume that there are health protective guidelines out there. That everyone sites the FCC guidelines for EMF, for microwave emissions as being protective of human health. Actually, this couldn't be further from the truth.

First of all, these guidelines, they are decades old. The reason they were set as high as they are is because when the conference of all of the people got together to figure out where they were going to set the limits. It was a time when the military needed microwaves for military telecommunications and for radar. It was very important.

If you go back, and I believe it was in the late '60's when they first set these levels. And they set them intentionally high to allow for military use. And it was important at the time because we believed that the country was under threat for nuclear war. And this was important. So that's where everything started.

But then the problem is that the guidelines were never revised. And so they're based on this false assumption that if microwaves, we call it the thermal effect. Essentially, what that means is if the level of radiation, if it's not enough to heat you, it's not enough to harm you. That we now know that's completely false. And we actually knew in the '70's this was false. And I can show you. I have this book called *The Biological Effect of Microwaves* from 1976.

They actually write in this book that it's not enough to say that harm from microwave exposure has to do with thermal effect and nothing

else. It's not true. They write it in there and that's from 1976.

So as far as the health protective guidelines go, these FCC guidelines that are cited all the time as an assurance of safety. They are not relevant to the chronic daily exposure that we see in our country. They only apply to exposures that are 30 minutes or less. So it's for a short term exposure. They were developed by engineers, and mostly people from industry in the military. And physicians and people with public health training weren't consulted.

So I think those are really the two big misperceptions. It's really important to understand that there are not guidelines now. That really no one is looking out for our health in a regulatory manner. There's no regulation. Because the guidelines are simply too high.

Josh del Sol: And only based on thermal effects, and they don't even look at all of those thousands of studies that are referenced in that book from the '70's, right?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Right. I have two things that I was going to show you. Here's another one right here, okay. I picked these because they are good. This is from the Naval Medical Research Institute from 1971. This is a bibliography of the effects of microwave radiation that they knew about in 1971. This is really easy to read. Essentially it's a bibliography. It's just sort of a laundry list of all of the effects that they were seeing in the '70's from microwave radiation. It looks like this. Does it show up? It's a list of effects.

The bottom line here is if you look at the way public health has deteriorated over the past twenty years. And I'm not saying that this proves that microwave radiation is the cause of everything. Obviously, it's not the cause of everything.

All I'm saying is that there is very compelling science to show that many, many of the chronic conditions that we see today are linked mechanistically. And are linked in the older science that is very accessible to anyone.

So to just give you an example. We have an epidemic of suicide in the United States now, depression and suicide. That's been going on. And we have states that have a 50% increase in their suicide rates. And this is horrible. This isn't just because times are tough. I mean something organic is going on.

So if you look at this right here, well what does it say. There's a whole section on psychological disorders, page 9, section F. Human Behavioral Studies. What did they see? Number 1, neurasthenia, which they explain as general bad feeling. Number 2, depression. Number 4, anxiety.

Number 8, hallucinations. Number 11, increase irritability. Insomnia. Loss of memory.

And this isn't the only source. We know that the connections are there. So it's just a matter of blowing the dust of a lot of the older research and connecting it with our current health situation. And we really need to do this. We can't afford any more sick people. We can't afford to pay for it. We just can't afford it.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. We mentioned Larry Gust. President of the Board of Building Biology Institute. Who we talked to. For those who want to dive right into solutions, he goes step by step in how to make your home safe. Both from sources of EMFs in the home and outside of the home, and what to do. So highly recommend that talk for everyone.

We talked also with Dr. Ronald Melnick. Very compelling conversation. He was the designer of one of these many thousands of studies, but a very prominent study called *The National Toxicology Program Study on Cell Phone Radiation*. It was originally commissioned in the late '90's by the FDA. And when the results were finally published in 2016, and again in 2018, the FDA basically said, "We're not doing a risk assessment. We're not going to look at the data. We're not going to look at the results. It's not applicable to humans."

So what is your take on that?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Well, I think that really my most important take is that I don't see any point in funding research if we're just going to blow-off the results when they're inconvenient, which is essentially what happened. And from what I understand, and maybe this is not 100% correct, but I've asked a couple of senior people who have worked on these types of studies. I had a question for them about, "Well, has this ever been done before?"

Because the National Toxicology Program Studies are really the gold standard of exposure studies for toxicant in the United States. When you do a National Toxicology Program Study on an agent, if the study shows an association, what ends up happening is that that agent gets labeled and it gets listed on our ATSDR, the Agency for Toxic Substances. Hopefully, I'm not messing up what it stands for. And that's what has always happened.

I had asked them, "Well, is this the first that this has happened? How is it possible that we can have a positive NTP study showing clear association with cancer of the brain, and heart, and DNA damage, and cardio myopathy." Which is a precursor to heart failure. "How is it possible that the study is done and then no actions are taken?" And I wasn't able to get a good answer. The answer that I understood is that this is a first.

That it's a first time that a National Toxicology Program Study has been just disregarded completely.

So as far as the results being nonapplicable to humans, so that's a really good question sort of from the research perspective. Really what they're implying is that well, we need to redo the study and we need to do it on humans. That's what they're saying, right?

And this is really an important point about microwave radiation and our ability to research it as of 2019. Because we have so much basic science and clinical research, and it is so clear that there are harms associated with microwave radiation exposure it's not possible to do human exposure studies. Because we know that these exposures are dangerous.

In other words in order to do a study on humans you have to go before an institutional review board with a whole proposal outlining what is your research plan. And part of that is well what does the existing research say about the exposure that you're planning for your study participants? With microwaves they're going to look and they're going laugh. And they are going to say, "Well, no way we can't approve this. It's not ethical to expose a group of people, participants, to an exposure that we know causes DNA damage, blood brain barrier leakage, cell membrane leakage, calcium channel issues." And on, and on. Any one of these basic effects is a really big deal. But we have a whole laundry list of affects that we know are associated with microwave radiation exposure. So to answer your question, it's really misleading to say that the results are not applicable. The only way to study this was with laboratory animals. It's not possible to study with humans. So it's misleading. That's my long-winded answer.

Josh del Sol: What are your top health concerns about 5G?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Well, first of all when you look at the science on microwave radiation and cell towers in general, the distance from the antennae really matter. As far as clinical endpoints. As far as symptoms.

I think my top concern about 5G is that, and this is based on my understanding as a non-engineer. Is that what's happening now is they're putting up these small cells and the justification for the small cells is that the millimeter wave technology, which is going to come later. So the highest energy microwaves don't travel very far.

So the base stations or the small cells, have to be placed closer to homes. But my understanding is what's being placed in these smalls cells it's not the millimeter waves. We're using our existing networks. And we are bringing them closer to homes.

So this is very concerning for health effects. So I think that's number one.

The second thing is that 5G is being rolled out without any kind of pre-market safety testing. And we hear from the FCC and from the wireless industry that, well maybe they haven't used these words, but they believe that it's safe. That there's no reason to believe that it's harmful. But when you really look at the scientific literature, I'm not sure what they're talking about. Because we've got plenty of studies of millimeter waves that show health effects. They show biological effects.

So we know that there are serious concerns for eye damage. So we know that millimeter waves are associated with cataracts, corneal damage. This is what the science says. So eye damage is a big one.

The other concerns are immune system effects. Because the science shows the effects on the immune system. Effects on endogenous opioids. So nervous system effects. Potentially mood effects. Likely mood effects. And the biggest one in my mind, well it's hard to rank them, but is what about the effects on bacteria. Because we know that millimeter waves have been shown to cause antibiotic resistance in *Staphylococcus* and *E.coli*. And so, I mean think about it, all of the superbug MRSA infections. That's stuff. But the *E.coli* infections that you see.

It actually kind of makes sense if you think about it just from the science perspective. Because the general effect of electromagnetic fields on living cells and living systems, is that when you expose them over time it induces a stress response. So with toxin forming bacteria, if they're put under stress for periods of time what do they do? They form toxins because that's how they defend themselves.

So that kind of mix is biologically plausible. Those are my concerns, really. That we have good scientific evidence to say that millimeter wave technology is harmful. And that we already know that the existing networks are harmful. So we shouldn't be bringing them closer to our houses, that just doesn't make sense.

Those are the main one.

Then, of course, it will lead to 24/7 mandatory radiation of the entire population. For instance, pregnant women, children, people with chronic conditions, elderly, we know that they're at a higher risk for having adverse effects. So there's no informed consent. And there's no way for them to opt-out of the exposure.

Josh del Sol: In this summit, Dr. Devra Davis actually goes through and names some of the specific studies and their conclusions. Studies that have been done about specifically millimeter wave radiation.

Independent studies. And also, Sayer Ji talks about a briefing. He shares a briefing that he received detailing some pretty startling facts about the satellite component of 5G. And the plan, which has been verified. It's fact now. It's not just some idea. But it's fact that the plan, according to the FCC and these corporations is for approximately twenty thousand satellites to be launched by the end of 2020.

Amazon, OneWeb, and SpaceX being three of the leading companies. And five million watts I believe was the approval for each one of these.

Do you want to touch on that? The satellite component of 5G and how significant of a threat is that even just by itself?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Well, I think that the whole concept, I think what it all comes down to is that if you can't expose humans to microwaves in a lab, in a controlled environment. If you can't even do that ethically. Because we have so much evidence of harm. None of these technologies should be getting rolled out.

This is illegal. There are all sorts of laws that are supposed to protect us from being experimented on. But this is human experimentation. This is experimenting with the planet. It's experimenting with human health. With the health of our insects. Our birds. It's just unconscionable.

Josh del Sol: What do you say to the FCC and industry claims that there is no proof of harm from 5G, or microwave, or millimeter wave radiation?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Well, I think that they need to read the literature. That's what I have to say. It would be pretty easy, I'm sure, for a lot of the people that you're interviewing for this summit. If we had an hour or two to sit down with these people. But I'm sure they don't need to hear from us.

The studies are out there. They're accessible to people who want to access them. And yes, EMF science, it requires a bit of training to understand and to interpret studies. But it's not rocket science. It's not. This is pretty black and white stuff. This isn't something that's open to interpretation.

We know that DNA damage is a really bad finding. We don't want DNA damage. We don't want our cell membranes to leak. We don't want all of these things that we see, we don't want corneal damage, immune system.

The bottom line is that microwaves, they interfere with normal housekeeping functions of the body. That's really just sort of the ultimate take-home message. When you microwave a population of

people, they get sick. Because the body isn't able to just do its thing. All of these different mechanisms, these different, our physiology has to be able to remain intact. And it's not. That's really the bottom line.

The satellites, I just don't understand how it's happening. But it's very scary.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. You mentioned millimeter waves radiation, the science that links to eye damage, the corneal damage. And also, skin damage. But the industry is claiming, and that should be enough right there obviously, but the industry is claiming that the effects from millimeter waves don't go deeper than the skin. What do you have to say about that?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Well sunlight doesn't go deeper than the skin, right? We know that sunlight exposure sets off a whole cascade of events in the body. Neuro/hormonal processes, Vitamin D production, mood effects. So that argument could be debunked by a first-year medical student. It doesn't make sense.

Josh del Sol: And we know Dr. Devra Davis talks about a specific study about sweat ducts and how they act as helical coil antennae's to transmit that energy deeper into the body. So that's another aspect that blows that claim out of the water.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Right. And our nervous system in our skin. We have receptors in the skin. So yeah, exactly.

Josh del Sol: Why is there so little awareness than within the medical profession of EMF harm?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Well, first of all, the awareness is growing, thankfully. There are several reasons.

I think first of all doctors are reading the same newspapers and watching the same TV news shows. Unfortunately, the mainstream media doesn't cover this issue. They don't cover it for many reasons. They don't want to lose advertising dollars. There are conflicts of interest. They just aren't covering it.

Doctors are hearing exactly what everyone else is hearing, which is that there's some type of debate. That we haven't figured it out yet. We don't know. Are cell phones safe, are they not safe?

They're getting all of the same information.

Josh del Sol: So they're not getting trained properly is the bottom line, right?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: They're not trained. In medical school, there's no discussion of electromagnetic fields. You get the same sort of canned explanation of well if it's ionizing radiation it's harmful. Nonionizing radiation is not harmful, which we know is not true based on the 50 years of scientific literature that's out there.

But doctors are busy and they take care of patients in their own specialty. And they have a lot of literature that they have to read in their own specialty. So to read about EMF science, first of all, it doesn't make it into the medical journals. For that very reason. It's just not on their radar. No pun intended.

But they're not thinking about it. But the interesting thing that is happening now is that there's this growing interest among doctors, particularly among medical students. And the Institute for Building Biology where Larry Gust is faculty actually has not one, but two MD MPH students. So it's the joint medical doctor. Masters of Public Health program students in this current class. They just graduated an RN MPH. So a nurse MPH. With a lot of experience doing behavioral health and psychiatry. And they have a third nurse. And these are small classes. It's not like a huge class of hundreds of people.

So it's very significant. They're having more and more people from the health professions sign up for their courses every year. Because they're interested in using EMF remediation in research and clinical care.

Josh del Sol: Do you think that doctors are actually seeing cases of what we might term Microwave Syndrome or effects/symptoms caused by EMF, and not recognizing it?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Oh definitely.

Josh del Sol: Like to what extent? To what scope do you think that's happening?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Well, it's really hard for me to say. But I think what everyone needs to understand is that there's a lot of talk. When we think about electrosensitivity or the terminology that's used electromagnetic hypersensitivity, which is really a scientifically incorrect term. Because hypersensitivity implies excessive sensitivity. That someone is more sensitive than they should be. That it's sort of an unreasonable response.

But really what the science shows is that all humans are affected by microwave exposure. Certain people are able to feel it. So certain people are electro perceptive. Certain people are electrosensitive. What that means in my mind is that they've made the connection between their exposures and their problems.

But what you have is everyone else who is affected by microwave radiation, but they haven't made that connection. So as far as recognizing Microwave Syndrome in the clinic or in the hospital, I can tell you just some of the really classic presentations that I've seen. That really should be a red flag.

The most important one would be sort of youngish, college-age students, or young adults who are presenting with signs of dementia. With cognitive impairment. Short-term memory loss. And it's the cognitive problem coupled with what we call orthostatic hypotension. That they get dizzy when they stand up. If their blood pressure is low. And that they're not sustaining their blood pressure.

So generally when you see those two together if you ruled out other causes, this is very common. You see this very commonly in young adults who have had cell phones from a young age. And they'll often tell you, "Oh, my dad gave me a cell phone when I was nine or when I was ten."

So they've had that exposure for a long time. This is something that I see.

And a second presentation is particularly behavioral changes in younger children.

And the ones that are extreme moodiness. And that particularly coupled with blood pressure.

But really it can present as anything.

Josh del Sol: ADHD predominately, or really just any behavioral changes?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Well, as far as the pediatric stuff it's a little harder for me to say. Because I take care of the parents.

Let me just back up for a second. Because people may be wondering, "Well how can you diagnose someone, or how can it be decided that these problems are due to microwave exposure or electromagnetic field exposure?"

And the way that you figure it out, because this is a clinical diagnosis. There's no test that you can do. Or imaging study that makes this diagnosis. It's that when the electromagnetic field exposure for that particular patient is lowered as much as possible. And in some cases it's not completely possible to do. If their home is under and right next to a huge power line. There's nothing you can do about it. It's the magnetic field.

So certain people it's very hard to fix the problem. But for everyone else. Let's say a person comes in. A college student comes in and has very low blood pressure, is dizzy when they stand up. Can't get the blood pressure up. They're not dehydrated and they have signs of early dementia and short-term memory loss that can be really impressive.

So the intervention would be, I think someone like Larry or another building biologist go into the home and evaluate the home for really the four key electromagnetic fields that we know are harmful to health. And when they lower their exposure as much as possible, if you see a big change in symptoms then you have your diagnosis.

Though, this is a part of why doctors are not really able to make this kind of a diagnosis. It's difficult because they can't really do it alone. They need to work with a building biologist or an engineer. Or just someone who has the training and who has the equipment to be able to do the measuring in the home.

Josh del Sol: Okay. So other aspects of 5G. One of the talked about or publicized aspects of it is this whole autonomous vehicle thing. Dr. Timothy Schoechle in the summit talks about this. And he said, "Even if we want autonomous vehicles, even for those people who want them, wireless and 5G is not needed." And so, I just wanted to ask you. Do you have a perspective on the internet of things, autonomous vehicles, or any other aspects of the 5G planned rollout?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Yeah. So, one of the biggest problems that we have now is that our existing scientific literature, like I said has just been sitting and collecting dust for decades.

We have this disconnect between what is happening in industry and what the science says about electromagnetic fields on human physiology. And because of this regulatory vacuum, there aren't really any meaningful health-protective guidelines in effect to guide industry. We have the development of just all sorts of products that emit various EMFs that we know are harmful to humans. Or that underlying our basic physiology.

So cars are a really good example of a technology that we need to improve. And that we could improve really, pretty simply by just looking at what are the EMFs in the average car? How are they problematic? And then how can we re-engineer the car to lower the exposures?

To give you an example. Most new cars nowadays, first of all, they have Bluetooth in them. You're going to go and drive the car. So you get in the car. You get in the car with your phone. Your phone is emitting microwaves. The Bluetooth is emitting microwaves. So different frequencies. The car is made of metal. So we know that microwaves

when they hit metal, it gets back and you have an even higher power density. If you're in there with a meter measuring you'll see the level of radiation go sky high.

That's just microwave exposure.

I think some other cars may have WIFI and other sources of microwave. I don't have a brand new car. So I'm sure about that.

So that's just microwaves, okay. Cars have magnetic fields and depending on the car and how it's designed the magnetic fields can be really, really high. And we know that magnetic fields, for instance, we have good literature showing that magnetic fields correlate with obesity. Particularly when it's prenatal magnetic field exposure. That the babies have an increased chance of being obese.

And all sorts of other literature on magnetic fields.

So cars emit microwaves. Cars emit very heavy magnetic fields. And so, in the case of these newer cars, electric cars. The magnetic fields are through the roof. And usually, it's in the backseat of the car. So who rides in the backseat? The kids are riding in the backseat. So the kids are getting these huge magnetic fields.

Then you have electric fields. And you can also have what we call dirty electricity. Micro surge electrical pollution.

And so, the question is could we make a healthier car? Of course, we can make a healthier car. We need to look at the science. And say, well the science says this. We need to read the science and say, okay we need to use our science to make healthier cars. And how could this change public health? Well, it could make a huge impact on public health. Because if someone were driving a healthier car you would lower their exposures to multiple fields.

For instance, like people who spend their entire day in cars. Taxi drivers.

I used to live in New York City and I remember when they introduced this thing called Taxi TV. Where it's a big screen so the passenger when you're sitting in the backseat of the car you can watch ads. And I guess the cab company makes money off of that. So there's screen there. Obviously, there's wiring in the seat. What's going on with the driver who's got the screen on his back, what are the fields in these cars. And we also know that there's been this epidemic of suicide among taxi drivers in New York. And I'm not saying that I have the answer. But I'm saying that we're not even asking the questions.

We need to be asking these questions. If we have an epidemic of suicide,

how do we negotiate the fact that the science links depression and mood problems with EMFs?

We have an epidemic of diabetes. We need to be asking these questions. So technology, we need to ask the questions.

Another really good example is our medical devices. For instance, this was news to me. I found out recently that they're using apps for Type I diabetics for continuous glucose monitoring for cell phones, which sounds like a really good idea. If we know that microwave radiation causes oxidative stress, and we know that. And we know that some of the most dreaded complications of Type I Diabetes, like Retinopathy. Are linked intimately with oxidative stress, well what is this doing if someone is staring at the phone with Type I Diabetes, and causing oxidative stress to their eyes?

We have to be thinking about these things. Because we simply can't afford to make people sicker than they are. And they are already sicker than they should be.

Josh del Sol: You mentioned cars should be being made safer, and you gave examples of why and how. In that example, let's just look at cars how they are being manufactured. What would be required in order for manufacturers to stop trying to compete with each other to have the latest wireless gadgetry? And sort of like this competitive arms race based upon convenience. To shift from that paradigm to we need to actually make cars safe based upon the science. Like what would be required? Is it just an awareness thing? Is it a numbers thing? Is it enough people speaking up? How do you see that happening?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Well, the public has to be educated. Because right now people don't know. So if the mainstream media doesn't cover this issue, the people that are talking about it sound like they are crazy.

Because it's like, "Oh, well I read in the *New York Times* that there's no evidence to show that cell phones are harmful."

The public needs to be educated. And the public needs to be educated from a place of the state level or the federal level, it needs to come from our institutions of public health. Or the CDC. I'm not sure who would get into that. But I think starting at the state level is a good idea. Because the states are the ones getting stuck with the Medicaid bill when people show up with end-stage kidney disease in the hospital and need an urgent team or dialysis.

People that don't qualify for emergency Medicaid – ultimately states have to pay for Medicaid. And as people get sicker you're seeing more and more young people getting funneled into Medicaid. Because they're

having strokes. They're having a heart attack. They're having heart failure. They're having these catastrophic health outcomes. They're having cancer and they're not able to work. They lose their benefits. This is what's happening.

I believe that looking at how we can educate people at the state level, departments of public health, I think that's a good place to start.

First, they have to understand what are the health effects of microwave radiation. And once that's done, and once they understand it and it comes from a credible source. Then they can at least make informed decisions. An informed decision could be, "Well, I would like to have a healthier car. A low EMF car." Or it could be, "Well, I would like to have my internet at home come from a wired modem and not a WIFI router." "I don't want to have WIFI in my home." Or "I want to have a landline."

It could be a whole bunch of different decisions. But it all starts with the public being educated and being aware that there's actually a problem. Because right now there's not a lot of awareness. Because of all of the confusion that's been really deliberately created by the wireless industry, in the press, that's what we're living with now.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. The awareness seems to be mostly limited to online, right? So it's not coming through traditional channels. It's not coming through media or academic institutions or government. Especially, the higher levels of government. The federal government for example.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Can I just say one thing?

Josh del Sol: Please.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: There is one newspaper that does actually cover this issue and they cover it very well. And it's called *The Epoch Times*. And I had never heard of this newspaper in my life until a reporter contacted me to do an interview. And I've actually subscribed to it. They have a really good mind and body section. It's a very good newspaper.

So there is one newspaper that covers it. Maybe there are a few more.

Josh del Sol: And there are actually to that end, there are an increasing number of mainstream papers that are at least questioning is 5G safe? You know like *The London Telegraph*, *The Chicago Tribune*, the *WIRED* magazine. Even engineering journals. Even *IEEE* is publishing some studies on 5G, on millimeter-wave frequencies showing their harm.

So this conversation is happening. It's just that we need – so if someone in a public health stakeholder position is watching this right now. What are the key messages that they need to be aware of? Whether it's people

writing them, their elected offices and stakeholders. Or whether it's just on this call right now. What would you say to people in that position?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: To people working in public health or legislators?

Josh del Sol: Yeah.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Well, I don't want to beat a dead horse. But I'll say it again. There's no point in funding scientific research if we are going to ignore it.

So, first of all, to start with we need to really look at the science. We need to look at the independent science. Not the science that's been funded by the wireless industry. Because we know that there's very clear bias there. That the outcome of medical studies is linked to funding sources that we've known for decades.

So really there are potential solutions to our greatest health challenges. And those potential solutions lie in that science on electromagnetic fields and health. And really when you microwave a population over time, they get sick. When you stop microwaving them or lower the exposures, many symptoms get better. So what this would translate into is improved population health.

I can't guarantee it. But this is what the science says. And you can't prove it any better than we've already proven it. Like we're not going to be able to test these things on people as I've already mentioned.

So we have to work with the existing science that we have. And we have a lot of it. So as far as practical solutions and what really needs to be done, because really there is this economic imperative. We have to take action. We really can't keep dragging our feet on this. Because we can't afford more sick people.

So to start with we need a fiber-optic network. We need optical fiber to homes and offices. And there are so many reasons why this much better than 5G. So many reasons. And I'm sure you have other people talking about this.

Josh del Sol: Dr. Timothy Schoechle actually lays out examples of how to do that. How a city takes back control of its infrastructure and wires. And he gives specific examples of cities that have already done that.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Wonderful. So yeah, so there's are so many reasons why any legislator should be looking to fiber as a much smarter choice. Because of its speed and cybersecurity, and safety, and poles can't collapse in a storm. Just so many reasons, aside from the health reasons.

But to start with really, we absolutely need fiber optic. That's sort of the base of all of this. We need to start with looking at sensitive populations. We need to look at our children. So schools need to be wired. There's no reason to be using WIFI in schools. And now, that we know that wireless radiation is clearly associated with cancer, DNA damage, cardiomyopathy. We know this. There are serious legal issues with continuing to require this mandatory radiation of children in schools.

So schools have to be wired up. They really have to rethink device use in children for many reasons.

But once again, I bring this back to economics because I think that's ultimately what makes people listen.

Josh del Sol: That's the language.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Yeah. If you think about once again, how the science is disconnected from our policies and our practices.

We have a diabetes epidemic in the United States. Everyone knows that. So I can tell you in schools, kids are using laptops, they are using these Chromebooks. And they're being exposed to microwave radiation that we've have good science showing associations with diabetes.

We also have good science showing associations with oxidative stress. And hopefully, this isn't too technical for your audience. But the children are taking these devices and they're putting them right over their bellies. Okay? So the device when it's set for use on WIFI is emitting microwaves, right? So you're getting microwave emissions over the liver and right over the pancreas.

So why is that relevant? Because when you cause oxidative stress to the liver and the pancreas we know the mechanisms of diabetes, and the mechanisms of what we call NASH, which comes from fatty liver, which essentially is one of the top indications for liver transplants. It leads to cirrhosis.

So oxidative stress is a mechanism in the development of NASH cirrhosis. And then over the pancreas, the pancreas has very poor defenses against oxidative stress. So this is what we're doing to our children.

And then, we don't understand, well why do we have these diabetes epidemics? Why are our rates of NASH cirrhosis going through roof? Can I prove this? No, I can't prove it.

But we have our basic science. And we have to use that basic science that our grandparents' tax dollars paid for. And we have to actually use it. We could put it to really good use. But it's being disregarded right now.

Another issue that relates to schools, because we're talking about children now. Is that cellular antennae's should not be pointing at schools. Cell towers should not be on school property. They shouldn't be near school property. And schools should be low EMF environments. Because of what the science tells us.

So those are places to start.

Another really important intervention would be mandatory labeling of devices that emit microwave radiation. So you want to go and buy an Xbox or a PlayStation or a cell phone, these devices need to be labeled. A lot of people don't even realize that their video games are microwave transmitters. Their baby monitors, cordless phones. So they have to be labeled.

And there really should be a process of informed consent. Where if you're going to go buy it you should be reading some type of a document that says, "Microwave radiation has been shown to cause blah, blah." I won't go down the list. That should be the process of informed consent.

So at least consumers are able to make educated decisions. Because we know that not everyone's going to care. Some people are just not going to care. And they're going to buy the stuff anyway. And that's fine. But some people do care. A lot of people may care. Especially parents are going to care. Pregnant women I guarantee you are going to care.

But now they don't even know. People just don't know. So we need to enact policies that make it easier for people to make healthy decisions, and make it harder for them to make the unhealthy decisions.

So I think those are just some places to start.

But obviously, we shouldn't be rolling out 5G. We shouldn't be rolling out microwaves from space. This is highly unethical. And if you can't expose people to this in a lab, companies should not be allowed to expose people. This is experimenting on humans.

Josh del Sol: Really, quickly before we close this. I wanted to mention in the summit, Richard Leer talks about a new model that actually extends on the causation model that Dr. Martin Paul is bringing forward. Involving voltage-gated calcium channels, peroxynitrite. Richard Leer looks at the metascience, and he looks at in all of the studies and kind of compiles the studies. Oxidative stress, nitrative stress, mitochondrial dysfunction, DNA damage, and peroxynitrite and so forth. And he is helping to kind of create a new framework of understanding of how, what are the causes of these recent epidemics in chronic germless diseases?

And I know your work, your research touches on that too. Is there anything that you want to add in terms of reevaluating, looking at some of these epidemics that are kind of increasing? Autism, and Alzheimer's, and other neuropsychiatric conditions. All of these kinds of things.

What level of causation do you think EMF exposure actually has here in what's going on in our current health scenario?

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Well it's hard to put a number on that or give an estimate. But the way to research this would be to do what we call a remediation research, which is essentially applying the principles of building biology to lowering all of the EMFs that you can in the home, in the office, and then observing the person? You would do this in groups of patients with specific conditions.

Based on my clinical experience, and if you speak with other doctors who with building biologists and who do incorporate EMF remediation, we call it Environmental Modification into their practice. It's pretty incredible the responses that you can see when people are able to truly modify their exposures.

So we should be studying this in populations of people. And there are researchers who are interested in doing this. And so, that would be the only way to truly answer this question.

But the problem is that you can modify someone's exposure at home, but our occupational exposures are very problematic. If you look at the way, again this has to do with this disconnect between what does the science say and what this absence of regulation. As far as human EMF exposure.

So when someone goes to work, if you just look at the way wireless devices are used in retail, you go to Starbucks and see what people are wearing on their heads and their bodies. You look at police officers. They are wearing these wireless body cameras. They're wearing a walkie talkie. They're sitting in a squad car with a laptop. I'm assuming WIFI, I'm not sure.

So people are getting these massive microwave exposures on the job. Those are not modifiable. At last, until there's recognition of this in the occupational health community.

Also understanding that lowering exposures should increase worker productivity. For companies that self-insure, it should lower their healthcare costs.

But getting back to the example of police officers. They have to operate firearms. And they're in situations where their lives could be potentially

in danger. So we know that these heavy microwave exposures from different frequency devices, the walkie talkie, the body camera. We know that these exposures cause leaking of the blood brain-barrier, and they cause problems with cognitive function. With response time. This is what the science says.

So we need to be connecting the dots and really looking at our occupational exposures as well.

For sure, I believe that EMF exposure, this is the cutting edge public health intervention that needs to happen.

Josh del Sol: Yeah.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: In the coming years. This is what we need to do.

Josh del Sol: Yeah. We need to protect our police officers, and all occupations, and our children from microwave radiation in the classroom.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Yes.

Josh del Sol: And like we really need to protect our police officers here.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Yeah.

Josh del Sol: And everyone else. Also, the fire departments are, many involved, in saying no to having wireless cell towers and 5G transmitters on their property. Just doing an internet search would reveal many developments on that. They need to prevent their exposures as well.

So Dr. Sharon Goldberg, thank you so much for your time today. And just this conversation has been so rich, and detail, and fascinating about the science around microwave radiation, and millimeter-wave radiation.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: Thank you.

Josh del Sol: I just want to encourage if you're watching this please share this link. The link to this talk where everyone can watch it and stream it. Because this is how we reach towards this critical mass threshold. This is how we reach towards what Dr. Goldberg was talking about. Having the awareness so that different decisions are made in our society. Different decisions are made by car manufacturers. Where we hold our elected officials, we inform them and hold them accountable to do the right thing. So please share this talk.

Dr. Goldberg, thank you, we look forward to hearing more from you. I'm so grateful for your time in spending with us today.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: You're welcome. And thank you, Josh, for all of the work that you've done. And I loved *Take Back Your Power*, it was a really good film. Very eye-opening for me.

Josh del Sol: Thank you.

Dr. Sharon Goldberg: You're welcome. Bye.

Complete Regulatory Failure of 5G

Guest: Kevin Mottus

Josh: With us today on the summit is Kevin Mottus. Kevin, welcome, and thanks for joining us today.

Kevin: Yeah, happy to be here.

Josh: I'll just share quickly with our audience on your background. Kevin Mottus is a 2018 California Senate candidate and former House congressional candidate who serves as the Outreach Director for the California Brain Tumor Association. He focuses on the health and safety issues associated with the 5G wireless technology rollout. And has been traveling to Washington DC for several years, educating elected officials for health and safety to be restored in the area of wireless radiation exposure. So Kevin, first of all, thank you for the work that you're doing in educating our public servants. And just to dive right in, what's going on in that area? And how come there hasn't been more of a response to protect the public so far?

Kevin: That's an excellent question. I think it's an important thing for people to understand, who are in local areas, being told that there's nothing they can do about this; that they just have to accept these exposures. When legislators say, "We can't do anything locally," they point to two agencies and two organizations. And I want to talk about them because this is information that they have to bring back to their legislators and say, "Yes, there is something you can do about it."

The first thing people need to understand is we have a captured regulatory system and we have a failure to regulate. First of all, it starts with the FCC. Now the FCC oversees the human exposure standard guideline for wireless radiation. People need to understand, very

importantly, the FCC is a captured agency. This isn't just my opinion, the Harvard Ethics Department has done a report themselves and it was called FCC captured agency. And I'll give you the exact title they said how, "The FCC is dominated by the industries that is presumably regulating."

This is important for people to understand. This is a captured agency. The chairman is a former Verizon attorney, one of the newly elected commissioners, Commissioner Carr, used to work for a law firm that defended AT&T, Verizon, and CTIA from lawsuits. So literally, most definitely, the fox is guarding the henhouse here. And then we're asking basically, the wireless industry to regulate itself by putting the FCC in charge. The other thing that's very important for you to understand, you can go to the FCC website and see this, and I'll read it as a quote. "At the present time, there is no federally mandated radio frequency exposure standard."

People need to understand that there is no safety standard for wireless radiation. You have a safety guideline that is based on the recommendations from four non-government organizations that are highly dominated by the industry; that hold on to a long outdated safety guideline that only focuses on thermal exposures and actual acute burning, for short term exposures, not long term exposure. So people need to understand that.

Secondly, when the FCC is pressed on health and safety issues, and they are getting pressed on them now, they say, "Well, we take advisement from the FDA." Important to understand about the FDA, they do not have primary responsibility for these exposures; the FCC does. They're in an advisory role. That makes a huge difference. The other thing you need to understand is the FDA has done research, in collaboration with CTIA, the wireless lobby and trade organization, showing how conflicted and captured even the FDA is.

And you can look this up on their website, CRADA, Cooperative Research and Development Agreement. Okay, this is where they explain that they've made an agreement with CTIA and they did research regarding the mechanistic studies of how this damages DNA, and in terms of their exposure assessment studies. So the most important studies, in terms of this issue, were done in collaboration with CTIA. So when the FDA says that this is a safe technology, first of all, they're not doing any safety testing. And that's important to understand. And the studies they've done have been in collaboration with CTIA, and we shouldn't be surprised that they didn't come up with any concerning findings.

But let me read you off the FDA's website because this is important. "Under the law, FDA does not review the safety of radiation emitting consumer products, such as cell phones and similar wireless devices, before they can be sold, as it does with new drugs or medical devices." So this is in their own words. So when they say this is safe, I don't know what they're basing it on because they don't do safety testing.

The next thing to understand is, oftentimes people point to the FCC, then the FCC points to the FDA. And then they say, "Well, the American Cancer Society says this is fine, and there's not much to be concerned about." Let's talk about the American Cancer Society. First of all, it's not a research organization. It's an organization designed to take in funding to provide to people who have cancer, to help provide support. And what's very important for you to understand is, AT&T is one of the corporate partners of American Cancer Society. You also need to understand they have a global council, which advises them globally.

And there's 10 CEOs in this global council. Three of them are wireless related. Motorola is one of their global CEO advisors. Also keep in mind that their executives, some of them, come directly from the wireless industry. For instance, Wayne White, who's one of their executive vice presidents, used to work for AT&T, Verizon, Motorola, Alcatel mobile and General Electric. They've basically worked for every wireless company you could work for.

So when the industry points to the American Cancer Society and saying there's no problem, they are basically pointing back to themselves. This is important for you to know because they will throw this out. And whether it's legislators locally or if it's the industry themselves, or its media people who don't want to cover this issue, you need to be able to come back and say, "These are highly captured compromised organizations and agencies. And you need to look at the evidence, you need to know that people are getting sick from this."

The next organization they point to is the World Health Organization. And this is pretty fantastic actually, because the World Health Organization already classified wireless as a possible carcinogen in 2011. And what's interesting about this is since then, we've got enough scientific evidence that scientists believe and can clearly argue; that we have enough evidence for class one human carcinogen classification. Why is that important? Because if you classify it as a class one carcinogen, like cigarette smoke and lead, then you need to warn people about the harm and you need to minimize exposure; not maximize it, as we're doing now.

Important to understand is the World Health Organization, instead of listening to its own collaborative organization, the International Agency for Research on Cancer, which classified it as a class 2B carcinogen, they are referring to ICNIRP, which is a group of self-appointed, from industry; that is holding on to this outdated idea that there are only heating effects. And there are only acute burning effects. That anything below or before heating isn't an issue. So this is very important for you to know.

And if you want to know more about this, you can look it up. Anthony Miller, he's a medical doctor, research scientist, has been a longtime advisor for the World Health Organization, more than 10 years. He recently wrote a paper arguing the class one human carcinogen

classification, and providing the evidence to support it. And you can find this just by Googling his name, Anthony Miller, researchgate.

The other scientist that has come out very clearly in saying this is a class one carcinogen, is Lennart Hardell. And you can find his work and his paper, arguing for class one carcinogen, at Lennart Hardell, researchgate, also. He is an MD and a PhD. But what really defines and differentiates Dr. Hardell, is he's done the most research and at last time we counted it, 80 different studies looking at brain cancer and cell phone radiation specifically. So in this area, we have to believe he is the preeminent authority. He's arguing class one carcinogen and you can find him at Lennart Hardell, researchgate, for more information there.

He also wrote a paper and I encourage you to look it up, and I'm going to quote it really specifically. "World Health Organization, radio frequency, radiation, and health, a hard nut to crack". Where he basically explains how the World Health Organization has formed a subgroup called the EMF Project; that is made up of scientists that the industry uses to defend them from lawsuits. And going through and systematically dismissing the latest evidence and holding on to this class one. And to denying this class one classification or an increase to class 2B, which will be a probable carcinogen. And he kind of explains what's happening at the World Health Organization, and how they've been compromised. He personally went with group of scientists to talk with the World Health Organization. They weren't open to it.

But understand this about the World Health Organization, two thirds of their funding now comes from outside sources, and we have the documentation to show that. And behind the United States, the second largest funder is the Gates Foundation, from Microsoft founder, Bill Gates. We also found in the year that we looked, which was 2015, that the Telecommunication Workers Union donated \$800,000 and that Cisco donated another \$275,000. So again, when the industry points back to the World Health Organization, they're pointing back to a captured agency; they might as well be pointing back to themselves because they're ignoring their own collaborative group, which is the International Agency for Research on Cancer. Through the World Health Organization, and deferring to an industry control group, which is ICNIRP.

So people need to understand this and come into meetings, armed with this information to keep legislators from just denying this concern about health effects, and insisting that they do something. But the bottom line is this, there is no safety testing for wireless radiation. What we have current, for current phones, exposes a plastic dummy filled with fluid, not human beings themselves. And understand that that is not safety testing. Formal safety testing is usually done by a government organization. It involves pre-market safety testing. It involves post market survey to see if people are getting side effects. Are usually heavy users getting more side effects? Are people living near cell towers getting more side effects? We don't do that.

The other thing is, this goes through a very rigorous process, a very formal medical process. And it's usually done by again, a government agency like the FDA. Not the FCC, who again, is a spectrum auctioning agency that does not even have a health department. People need to remind their local legislators, the FCC does not even have a health department. And yet they're saying it's safe. And when they've been challenged lately, in terms of whether it's safe, they are not able to answer the question because they simply won't look. And they're using these different methods to step around, avoid the issue, and defer the issue of health effects altogether.

Josh: Can I just jump in here, Kevin? How do you see the tide eventually turning? In other words, people have been saying scientists, hundreds of scientists, and thousands of citizens have been saying for years to the FCC and other agencies, "Your standards are not up to date. They're not applicable." They're not looking at the science and they're just ignoring; they're just continuing in their agenda. How can there be leverage so that the tide actually turns, with regards to the corrupted agencies pushing through and enabling this agenda just to be rammed through?

Kevin: This is kind of a multi part answer but let me start with the beginning. It first starts with people demanding that they look at health and safety. And that's begun to happen. And people need to push on their congressmen to demand that there be safety testing. Demand that the safety guideline be taken out from underneath the FCC and given to the FDA and the NIH, in collaboration; or even better, the NIH and the EPA together. They need to demand this from their Congress members at a federal level. Although people like to work on a local level.

But it's begun to happen and it's because people are reaching out and pushing and people should push more. So, several congressmen have written letters to the FCC, very specifically, demanding answers in terms of health and safety. And let me tell you that the chairman of the FCC, again, who's a former Verizon attorney, answered back to them, but his answer shows the problem. And then we're going to talk about some of the questions he refused to answer; that the congressman themselves put forth.

So first of all, the FCC Chairman, Ajit Pai, would not call radio frequency radiation, radiation, he called it energy. And the industry and the FCC like to play this game. But if you look at all the scientific literature, that's what this is. This is radio frequency radiation. And really, it's got the same type of issues as other types of radiation, it simply works slower. But this is a big issue when you have continuous exposure. The other thing is, he said, "We're already doing testing." I heard him speak, just a week or two ago, and he says, "We're doing hours of testing." But what he doesn't say, is this is exposure testing. How much are people exposed?

Now, exposure testing and safety testing are very different. Safety testing looks at, how are you being affected? How is a person being

affected? So that's very, very different. The other thing is, he said, "If you would like, you can come and speak to our members of our engineering department." Now remember, he's relying on engineers with an engineering background, and the engineering department in the FCC, not a health department and not people with a biological background. Nothing qualifies them to speak to the biological effects, if they promised everyone that biologically it's safe. So he put that in his letter as well.

He talked about the EPA and how they rely on the EPA's recommendations. This is the first time I've heard this because the EPA used to have a department that was looking very carefully at this issue. And we have letters from the EPA director, and it was their air pollution section. And that's what this is; this is air pollution. It's in the air, these waves affect your cells and cause biological and health harm. And so therefore, it's pollution. And their air pollution department was looking at it and they had scientists paid to do research. And they saw what we're seeing now, once again, and this was 20 years ago, we're seeing increased cancerous effects, increased neurological effects, increased reproductive harm; increased immune system harm.

And we have a letter from their director talking about how the current safety guidelines do not address all mechanisms of harm. So it was interesting that he talked about the EPA this time because that program was defunded by appropriations in Congress and asked not to participate in any more EMF activities because they were seen as "of questionable value". So we would like to see the EPA more involved and funded to look at this issue. We'd like to see the NIH, that's recently done a study showing clear evidence of harm, oversee the safety guideline and exposure guideline, for sure.

The next thing is, he said, "Well, we refer to the IEEE." Now, the IEEE, in addition to ICNIRP, is an engineering organization. Again, they're holding on to this idea, along with physicists, that say only thermal harm can hurt people. He says, "Well, you know, we refer to the IEEE and the advice of the IEEE." Well, that's completely inappropriate, but he's hanging on to it. And then he said, "You can come by and staffers can come by and talk to our engineering department and see the testing we're doing." Now what's interesting with 5G, is currently with cell phones, we're using SAR and SAR looks at how much radiation is absorbed into the body.

Josh: Can you just define SAR?

Kevin: Yes. Specific Absorption Rate. It's not a perfect measure because it takes a picture in the moment, it doesn't take into account your exposure over time. And that is where our biggest concern is, but it's something. And it doesn't look at non-thermal effects. And of course, something happens to yourself before they get heated or burned. And that's where we see the impairment over time, and these very serious cancers and neurological effects. But we have that, and we have that

in place for current cell phones. And he's talking about the testing that looks at heating only.

What's interesting with 5G is they're not going to be using SAR. So the very inadequate look that we have and looking at absorption into the body that only looks at heat, we're not even going to be using that with 5G. Anything over six gigahertz, we're not using it. And why is that? Well, with 5G, the radiation and the waves become much, much shorter; down from several feet long, down to an inch to half an inch. They're very tiny millimeter waves, and they're talking between 24 and 90 gigahertz is what Chairman Wheeler talked about when he was pushing out 5G. What people need to understand is, the waves are not going to be going as deeply into your body, and through your body, like current waves do, and people need to understand they do pass through your body.

They're going to be more concentrated in the skin and in the eyes. But therefore, if all that radiation is concentrated in a very small area, you're going to have more intense effects, and you're going to have some heating. So they don't want to use SAR because they're not going to be able to stay under their own limits. And we have a scientist, Dr. Kim, from Georgia Southern, who has very clearly calculated that the SARs, if they use SARs, would be 30 times higher with 5G than with the current 4g. And that's very serious because your skin isn't venerated by all your nerves and if you heat or damage your skin, the most protective part of your body, and again, the largest organ of your body, it's going to affect all the nerves that are invenerated.

What's even more importantly, is if you have heating, even small amounts of heating, to the eyes, it's a very serious matter because the eyes are not vascularized like the skin, where they can cool if there's heating going on. If you heat the eyes, they're very vulnerable to heating, and you can have very serious effects.

So, what's interesting is, the FCC is saying, "We don't need to use SAR because the waves aren't going to be transmitting through the body, into very important organs of your body, it's only going to be concentrated in your skin and eyes." Which is kind of ridiculous, as if your skin and eyes aren't part of your body and aren't an important part of your body. But that's their logic for this, and it is absurd. And congressmen and local and state individuals need to call them out because this is ridiculous.

So we don't have real safety testing, we have a safety guideline that only protects against exposure. And then the safety exposure guideline, based on heating that we have, currently for phones, we're not going to be using for 5G. And what's very important for people to understand and make clear to their local legislators; the design of 5G is to take concentrated, focused beams of microwave radiation and shoot them at your phone. The old 4g created huge waves and your phone would pick up those waves as a radio receiver. But with 5G, it's very different, they're going to be very concentrated beams of radiation shot at your phone. And for this, the industry is saying we're going to have

tremendous power saving.

But understand this, if you hold your phone at your head, those beams of microwave radiation will be aimed at your head. And they're not going to be looking at how it heats your skin and eyes. This is a very, very serious, very serious problem. And it seems pretty obvious. And this is the design of 5G. So it's important for local people to bring this basic fact to their local legislators, to go to their congressmen and demand that real safety standards be implemented. And that we look at this, especially given the design of 5G that is aimed very closely at people. But let me talk about some of the questions...

Josh: Can I just jump in there really quick? So you're encouraging people to bring this to their elected reps. In your experience and based upon the responses you're getting, the reason why this hasn't reached critical mass yet, is it that elected officials are compromised via lobbying? Or is it that they just simply don't have the information yet? Or is it a combination of both?

Kevin: Yes, and I think before we finish today, I want to give people a comprehensive plan for what they can do to make a difference.

Josh: Please, yes.

Kevin: But to answer your question, the telecom industry spent \$92 million on lobbying last year. And people listening just have to ask themselves, how much did they spend lobbying Congress? And so they're being brought information that is skewed and inaccurate, and there's no one there to contradict it. And that's why it's so important. I believe with this issue that comes directly from the FCC, this program is being pushed by the FCC. And Congress that supports and approves everything the FCC does; that they need to reach out on a national level, they must reach Congress and the FCC. This is where the problem is. And Congress has oversight power and they need to exercise that oversight power.

Right now, what we have is congressmen and senators, questioning and pushing the FCC why they're not expanding more, why they're not putting wireless transmitters in more places. They are completely ignorant or they are ignoring the health issue. And that is not okay. That should not be allowed. We cannot allow that. People must focus on the federal level. I know it's frightening for some people, but there's really no reason to be frightened. These are your representatives. You can go see them in your local office or you can come to DC and talk to all the legislators. Every building is a public building. Every meeting is a public meeting. You have the right, you have the responsibility to participate. This is a democracy; we need to participate.

But let me tell you what some of the congressmen asked of the FCC and they failed to answer and let me tell you the congressman who did it, to give them full credit. It was Congressman Tom Suozzi, Congressman Peter DeFazio, and Congressman Andy Kim. They all wrote letters very

specifically regarding health and safety. And I wanted to point out, this is from Congressman DeFazio and this wasn't responded to by Chairman Pai. And the question was, "What scientific literature research has the FCC and FDA used to determine that 5G technology will not cause any adverse health effects in humans? Please cite specific studies and research conducted."

And interesting enough, when Senator Blumenthal in a Senate hearing, asked the industry, "What research are you doing to look at the health and safety issues of 5G?" the answer was, "We know of none that's being done." So the industry is not doing it. And for good reason they used to fund research, but they had a hard time controlling the release of the findings. And they know it's harmful, for sure.

Number two, "What gaps exist in the current understanding of possible health effects from 5G technology, as well as the possible effects of radio frequency radiation on the masses, at large?" Number three, "What effort has the federal government taken to educate the public, as well as state and local governments, about its research or radio frequency radiation and safety guidelines, as it relates to 5G technology?" The reality is, they're not looking at it. They're not researching it. They're assuming it's okay because it's not going to heat or burn you. They can't even assume that because there will be heating again. So this is just putting business priorities of people's priorities.

And what's interesting is, they say, "Well, for business priorities, we want to be number one with the 5G rollout for business purposes." But honestly, fiber optic all the way to the home, is up to 10,000 times faster than wireless, is more cyber secure, is more private, and can carry a tremendous amount of data. And in the case of an emergency, these wireless systems go down, they cannot run without power like landlines can and like fiber optic can. So we are really choosing an inferior technology. When we have fiber optic, which is now very easy to run, you can run it almost like speaker wire along our current phone lines, right into people's homes; we have a safer, superior alternative, but we're going with what they sell. Which is wireless, rather than our congressmen directing it all.

Josh: Let me just jump in there. Yeah, we have a conversation as part of the summit, with Dr. Timothy Schoechle. He explains how this is done with fiber and with wired. And he cites examples of how some cities have actually done it. And it's so straightforward; that the technology is there, and we just need to demand it be implemented. To team up with our local governments and help them regain control of their local infrastructure. So yeah, please continue.

Kevin: And like you're saying, this is an issue of industry directing government; not the government directing industry for what's best for the public. And if you really want to lay the foundation for the next economic revolution, you use fiber. Because what's interesting about 5G is they say, "Well, we're hoping to get speeds as quick as landline."

Well, why not just use landlines? And fiber is so much faster than even landlines. And we know there has been much money that has been diverted that was supposed to lay fiber across the nation, and has been diverted into the development of wireless. I'm sure other people are talking about that.

But let me talk about what Congressman Kim asked that wasn't answered by Chairman Pai. And I think these are important questions for people to ask. Number one, "What recent independent...?" independence is very important, "... scientific studies demonstrate the safety of 5G technology?" The independent part is very important because the industry is doing a lot of counter research. In this case, they're just staying away from this because it's going to be very hard to show it's safe. Number two, "Has the FCC or any other agency conducted research into potential long term health outcomes of repeated exposure to radio frequency, similar to those president hi band 5G cells? If so, what were the results of such studies?"

This issue of long term prolonged exposures, where the concern about cancer, neurological, immune system, and reproductive harm is there. That's what's been avoided in the science and absolutely needs to be done before we roll out this technology, not as or after we do it. Number three, "Have any 5G telecommunication service providers conducted studies in the long term health outcomes of repeated exposures to radio frequencies, similar to those present in high band five cells? If so, what were the results of such study?" Number four, "How are the FCC and 5G service providers working with local governments and municipalities to address citizens' concerns regarding 5G implementation?" Five, "What procedure exists for residents to file complaints with the FCC regarding the installation of small cell 5G sites in their neighborhood?"

So, the congressman have begun to ask the right questions. We need to reach out to all the congressmen. The FCC can no longer be allowed to get away with this. And people are being harmed. They are getting away with harming people. They're getting away with disabling people. And it's not an exaggeration to say that they're getting away with killing people, in the case of cancer; which has been clearly linked to wireless radiation exposure.

Josh: So, Kevin, let's go deeper into the science and the effects. Give us more of your background knowledge and the science and the effects. How do we know the scope of harm that is being caused here by wireless and now 5G?

Kevin: You know, that's an excellent question and it's important for me to talk about, I consult and communicate with doctors and scientists, engineers, and attorneys, every day. So cancer epidemiologists, physicists, toxicologists, cellular biologists, and attorneys that deal with this issue and the people who are getting harmed by it, on a daily basis. What's important to know about that is the FCC doesn't have any of those people. And they're the ones saying it's safe. Another thing about

the science, which is important in terms of advocating for yourself, is the legislators don't care about the science. They don't care about the science because they don't feel equipped to deal with it. And that's why they refer to these agencies that have been corrupted and captured.

But what can you tell them to show that it's very harmful? The first thing you can tell them is that there is \$1.9 billion worth of lawsuits regarding cell phones causing brain tumors. And you can look this up just by Googling Murray vs. Motorola 2001. This is important because the case would not be in the courts if there wasn't sufficient evidence to bring the case. The other thing that people need to understand is this has been in the courts for 17 years. So this is the MO of industry; drag this out and delay it. The other way you can prove that there are health effects and people are getting sick, is look at the Smart Meter rollout. Currently, and I'm going to say roughly half the states have some form of opt out.

But let's just say many of the states have some form of opt out. Why is that important? Because they've got opt outs for people to say no to these small wireless transmitters that are supposed to measure their heat, or their power, or electricity. They got opt outs by going through a process of going to their PUC or their commission and saying, "We have gotten sick." And there are hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of documented testimonies of people getting sick from very low powered, according to the industry, very infrequently transmitting wireless smart meters. And these formal opt outs are proof that people get sick from it, and they need relief from it. So that's a very important way to show there's a problem.

The other thing that's happened very currently, and its clear evidence that people can get sick... and you started off by asking questions about microwave sickness; that's what this is. It's microwave sickness. And people, all they need to do is go to Webster dictionary online, and Google "microwave sickness", and you have the definition right there; a good working definition. But importantly, recently, CBS and others covered the CIA's coming out and saying that the embassy workers in Cuba had developed basically microwave sickness. They were attacked by a microwave weapon. There was no heating or burning of these workers but yet they still developed all kinds of neurological problems; headaches, dizziness, and nausea. It wasn't just one person, it was multiple members of the family. This was all done below our safety guidelines, and this is microwave sickness.

What's interesting is, 60 Minutes did another episode, talking about that this is also happening in the Chinese Embassy and the state workers are reporting the same thing. So why might this be happening? Well, most likely, these communist countries are aiming a microwave weapon at these families to monitor their communications. And it will do that but there will also be side effects. We shouldn't be surprised because Russia has, according to an army review that we have, five times as much research on millimeter wave effects that 5G uses, than the rest of the

world combined. So we shouldn't be surprised that they're using this as a weapon.

So these are clear examples of how we can show that people are getting sick from this. And it brings up a very important point. And I'm glad you brought it up. It's probably one of the most important points. The way a lot of these organizations say there's no effects, they say there is no human health effects. There's no evidence of human health effects. What they're not saying and people are assuming is, there is no evidence of biological effects. There is clear evidence of biological effects. And mostly lay people think biological effects and human health effects, they're the same thing. But they tease and they step around the truth, by just focusing on human health effects.

The problem with human health effects, to clearly prove them, you have to experiment on people. And when you have clear animal biological effects, showing it can cause cancer and neurological problems, immune system problems, and reproductive harm, ethically, you cannot experiment on people and give them those effects, to prove it conclusively. So they are working, what they know is kind of a crack in the door. But understand this, there are clear biological effects from wireless radiation, along the entire spectrum of wireless radiation. And that human health effects are proven by these examples that I'm talking about now. And we are literally being allowed to be experimented on by the FCC and they're getting away with it, as it is now. So hopefully that answers your question in terms of the research. And before we finish today, I'm going to point your audience to some websites where they can get as many studies as they would like.

Josh: I just want to jump in there and drill down into that. These mainstream media reports even, talking about the use of microwave or millimeter wave weapons for spying, that have health effects; that governments are doing upon embassies and so forth, this isn't something new. This was discussed in Robert O. Becker's book, *The Body Electric*; was happening in the 60s, between the US and Russia Embassies. I believe he cites it was happening in both ways, both countries spying on each other; using these microwave weapons on each other. Tell us more about that. What have you been able to uncover about that? Does it look like they're using microwaves or millimeter waves? Or is there any additional information that you have on those stories that the mainstream media did not tell us about?

Kevin: These are good questions. Now, people need to understand, 5G uses millimeter waves, which are just small, densely packed, microwaves, and then there's microwaves. But if you go to a website that we've set up, focused on 5G, called 5ginformation.net, and people can reach me by emailing me at 5gisharmful@gmail.com, you're going to see a couple things. One thing is that we have a report from the army that looks at biological effects of millimeter waves, and they said those effects are very clear. And they said those effects, many of them, are

non-thermal, and they're calling into question our safety guidelines. This comes from our own army, looking at it; and they have every reason to want to not say that because they want to use this for their operations and for their weapons.

The other thing is, there was a weapon system developed called the Active Denial System that uses millimeter waves, and before they could develop this weapon, they had to research it. So the army translated all of the science from Russia particularly, that had the bulk of it, and looked at biological and health effects, so they could understand how this weapon is going to be used. And that is all in the possession of the army. And citizens should demand that their congressmen get information and access to those studies, and make them very public. This would be a very, very good idea.

The other thing you're going to see on the website, and you can Google it yourself, of course, if you Google "Navy Medical Research Institute 1972". What you'll see is that back in the day, when we had radar on aircraft carriers, Navy men reporting symptoms. This is a two part report; the first 20 pages of the first report defines 122 symptoms of basically microwave sickness, and talks about neurological, genetic effects, immune system problems, and then cite 6,000 studies that support these symptoms that they were coming up with in the Navy men. So when the industry says that there's no science or evidence of adverse effects, they are simply lying, and people can find it there; they can find it on our site. And it's important for people to know because a lot of these legislators have experience with the military, and they do listen to what the military has come up with.

So those are three sources of tremendous amounts of information that you can get. But the other thing on our site, which is important, is that as I said, they don't do pre-market safety testing, and they don't do post market surveys. They don't look around cell towers, if people are getting sick. We have a drop down that lists... I think we have 10 studies there from different countries where they've looked at cell towers and what happens around cell towers. And we see increasing neurological and cancerous effects, close to the antennas. This is important because with 5G, we're talking about putting antennas every 200 feet. So I think this is very, very important for us to talk about. So you should encourage your congressmen, to get the information that the CIA base their finding that these people were attacked by a microwave weapon. There was evidence that they looked at. There were findings they looked at. And that's your evidence that people are getting sick from wireless radiation and microwave radiation.

Josh: So, your website is 5ginformation.net. Correct? And what else would you say, as far as what can people do to protect themselves and their families from 5G radiation and wireless radiation exposures?

Kevin: Yeah, so let's get to the good stuff. People need to reach out and it needs to start on a federal level. They need to reach out to their

congressmen and begin a conversation. And it needs to be a very direct conversation that points out the serious problems with our safety protocol that hasn't been applied to wireless, but has been applied to lots of other agents on those World Health Organization lists. To protect us; that for wireless, has been exempted. So we definitely need to reach out. And the other issue is this, this is not about information. I know you don't want to hear that because you're disseminating information right now. This is an issue of power. Industry has power.

So we need power and we lack power. So where can we get that power? First of all, you can get power from spending money. The industry spent \$92 million lobbying Congress, I'm not asking people to 92 million, but I am asking you to impact Congress and to reach out to Congress. And the best way to do that is through a lobbyist. Lobbyists cost money but that's the way the system works. It's a pay to play system. If you ask anybody in DC, that's the case.

So get a lobbyist. There are excellent lobbyists out there, they know the ropes; they've had relationships with these Congress people for 20 or 30 years. They have relationships with the party that can get them access. We don't have access, we have access to very low level people in their offices. We need access to the members themselves. I speak to the members themselves, as we're going to and fro from committee meetings, when they're going to vote; you can speak to them personally if you come here, and that's a great idea. That's a great way to spend your time. And you can find the list of committee meetings posted publicly.

How else can we have power? Okay, the next way we can have power is by our vote, and when I say our vote, it matters that you're going to vote against them and tell them, "If you don't address this issue, I'm going to vote against you." That's not enough. You say, "I am an organizer," and that's the way you should present yourself, as an organizer. And say, "I am going to organize my community against you, unless you address this issue sufficiently because it's most, most seriously important." So they listen to organizers who can organize the votes.

They'd rather have you working for them when it comes election time. Certainly not working against them. But make it clear, "This is my issue. This is bottom line important to me. I will organize against you. I've already begun." Show them your email list, show them your phone list; talk about all the people you've talked to. If you go door to door, say, "I'm going door to door." They are scared of people going door to door. They respect their foot soldiers when they run for office because they go door to door. If you're going door to door, that's great.

What else can you do that will have a powerful impact? Go around cell towers that you have now and look for symptoms. Start documenting people with it because it'll be there. Increased cancer around cell towers that are already there, increased neurological effects; start documenting what they won't look at and go to those city councils and say, "People

are currently getting sick from this technology. And now you're going to expand it and put it everywhere and near my home. That's not okay. These are their names. This is their sickness. This is how far they are from the cell antenna." I think this is very effective.

The other source of power is lawyers. Again, they cost money, but we need to lawyer up. The lawyers are the ones that are helping pass laws and implement laws to keep this unfair harm of our citizens going. So we need lawyers to argue with it and stop it. So we need to lawyer up and we need to bring in our friends that are attorneys and legal clerks and work the legal avenues we can. And I think clearly people are being harmed by this. How much they're being harmed, we can argue, but they are being harmed. And if you're harming people, and it continues, that is a criminal offense. And people should handle it that way.

Josh: let me just jump in there. We are, in the summit, talking with a lawyer from Australia, Ray Broomhall, who's had success in actually not only preventing but removing hundreds of small cell sites. He uses the criminal process and he uses the medical system as well, like a doctor's authority. From your perspective, specifically, do you have any suggestions or guidance on legal mechanisms, for example, criminal negligence or class actions? I know class actions typically have been getting tossed out. We've been looking at commercial administrative liability actions. Can you offer us any specifics there, in terms of what you see being potentially fruitful?

Kevin: Okay, I'm not an attorney and I'm not going to give legal advice, but I think people do need to get legal advice. And the harm is absolutely there. And the science with the National Toxicology Program study, making a causal link between cell phone radiation and clear evidence of carcinogenicity; I think we have the scientific basis to absolutely move forward. That was just one of the more recent studies, there were many studies before that. And I know other scientists are talking about those other studies.

And what's also important to understand, the Italian Supreme Court has already made a causal connection between cell phone radiation and brain cancer; brain tumors. So they've already done that. And what's very important, and I'm glad you brought it up, is that this is pollution. And the insurance industry... and this is a good example of, how do we prove that this is harmful and people are getting sick? The insurance industry has classified wireless radiation as a high risk agent. And this is important because they've looked at the science, that's their job. And they've done risk assessments.

What the FDA has not done and should have done for the MTP study, is then do a risk assessment to then extrapolate these biological findings to human exposures. They failed to do the risk assessment. But the insurance industry has looked at the science, has done a risk assessment and has classified it as a high risk agent. And then they have excluded it from coverage by classifying it as a pollutant. And I think

this is important because I'm looking at a brochure right now, which is actually from Verizon, called Long Live Your Phone, which is ironic, your phone's going to live but we're not. And in it, it says that, "We do not cover our phones from damage from all these external forces, including pollutants."

But what's interesting is, even in Verizon's own brochure, they define wireless by all its terms; wireless radiation as a pollutant, but let me read it to you. This is from Item Number 16, it says, "Pollution, the discharge, dispersal, seepage, immigration, or escape of pollutants. Pollutants means any solid, liquid gaseous, or thermal irritant, or contaminant; including smoke, vapor, soot, fumes, acid, alkalines, chemicals, artificially produced electric fields, magnetic fields, electromagnetic fields, sound waves, microwaves, and all artificially produced ionizing and non-ionizing radiation," and, "non-ionizing radiation, and or waste."

This is really what is happening industry wide. But I like to use Verizon's own brochure for insurance for their devices to point out that even in their own insurance, they classify it by what it is; a pollutant. And we should handle it like a pollutant. And the EPA should be regulating this like a pollutant and we should be minimizing it like a pollutant. And we should be educating people on how to minimize their exposure to this pollutant. So I think with the insurance industry classifying it as a pollutant, this can also help us in terms of protecting ourselves from this criminal harm.

Josh: Who's actually insuring then, these wireless carriers because they're not being insured, right? Lloyds of London and other insurance giants have publicly stated, "We don't cover wireless products." So are they even insured at all, like what's going on there?

Kevin: And that's very interesting. My understanding... and again, I'm not an insurance expert, is that the secondary insurers aren't willing to insure on these health effects, biological and health effects. So therefore, the companies have to self-insure. And that's important for investors to know because that opens them up to tremendous liability and possible costs in the future. And that's exactly what they say in their annual reports. But people using phones have no idea that they're protecting themselves, and they've classified it this way. But they need to know, legislators need to know. It has to start coming out in the media.

And the industry has intimidated the media, by threatening to withdraw their media dollars and their millions and millions of dollars off and they're not willing to do that. And it was funny, I was talking to a reporter who used to work for the Huffington Post, and he said, "You know, they couldn't stop us from reporting on it. So Verizon bought Huffington Post, and that's how they stopped us." So people need to understand, the industry with \$1.9 billion worth of lawsuits and billions of dollars behind that in terms of lawsuits, they're really willing to do anything and spend any amount of money to keep this, the truth about wireless radiation exposure, quiet and silenced.

Josh: So, thank you. Thank you, Kevin, for all of this information. I mean, I just need to... I feel I want to shift gears here and like, ask you personally; I mean, you've been on the ground and on the airwaves for several years, educating people in positions of power and others about these matters. Now, what drew you into this area? What gave you the motivation and the inspiration to dedicate a vast portion of your life to get this message out?

Kevin: I had people very close to me personally and at work, who developed cancers and tumors as a result of their exposure. And they were very healthy people with healthy habits that developed tumors in the site of their exposure from the antennas. And when I started researching the issue myself, I found thousands and thousands of studies. And I just had to think, "Why haven't I heard about this? Why didn't these people know? We could educate people on how to use wireless more safely. We could demand that the industry makes safer products." And they easily could.

We could use wired fiber and landlines for a majority of our communication and data use, which is really what 5G is about, data use; and use wireless to a minimum and locate cell tower antennas as far away from human beings as possible. That's the safe vision. Fiber to the home, with wired connections to your computer, and your keyboard and your mouse. A wired phone and then when you leave your home, you use wireless to a minimum and locate the cell antennas as far away from people as humanly possible.

This is the smart home. This is the smart community. And by the way, it's much, much faster. And by the way, landlines and fiber, they have zero latency. They're talking about increasing latency for 5G here on the hill and speed and latency; zero, I mean, they are super-fast. So this is definitely the way to go. The industry has gotten away with harming and killing people for long enough. And with 5G, we're talking about maximizing people's exposure, rather than minimizing it and it needs to stop.

Let me mention some websites people can go to for more information. You can email me at 5gisharmful@gmail.com. You can go to the website that I set up for five g issues, 5ginformation.net. I go to saferemr.com; that's a website managed by Joel Moskowitz at UC Berkeley School of Public Health; saferemr.com. The bio initiative report or bioinitiative.org looks at 3,600 studies and reviews them and puts them all in one place for easy access. People should look there. Environmental Health Trust, ehtrust.org, has put up a lot of great information and videos people can access there.

Their sub site, parentsforsafetechnology.org, a lot of people have enjoyed. One is talking about, children especially are very important. And for local people who are trying to fight 5G transmitters locally... and before I get to those, mdsafetech.org. This is a site set up by medical doctors to educate other medical doctors; mdsafetech.org. People

should look at this site almost first. But two sites that really focus on local issues and how to push back, whatis5g.info; scientists4wiredtech.org. And mystreetmychoice.com, which is completely focused on local issues and how to push back against 5G; mystreetmychoice.org.

These are resources people can find tremendous amounts of information, realize they're not alone and arm them to push back on what is absolutely a grave injustice that is continuing. And you asked me the question, why did I get involved? Why have I spent years of my life working on this, dedicated myself in every possible way? Because this is truly unjust. This is unbelievable that this continues in this country. And that the FCC in cooperation with the FDA, the American Cancer Society, and unfortunately wrapped in the World Health Organization, have been allowed to work around and sidestep these biological effects, and health effects that are affecting people right now.

And we have testimonies from every state in the nation. Innocent people, professionals, doctors, lawyers, accountants, technicians, computer specialists, chiropractors, social workers, truck drivers. You name it, we have people that have been harmed, disabled, and whose lives and proper civil liberties have been infringed on by this technology. And it's been allowed to continue due to the undue influence of industry, here in Congress, and with the FCC. So this is where we need to focus our efforts. We need to exercise our power, in terms of spending money, in getting lobbyists, in terms of spending money and getting lawyers, and arming ourselves with attorney representation.

And in terms of taking this to the courts for what it is; a criminal matter. And for exercising our right as citizens to participate in our democracy, and exercise our ability to organize others and affect the vote of these representatives. These congressmen run for office in the house every two years; they are always worried about votes. They are always worried about votes. We need to exercise that concern, and our senators, we need to push just as hard. They have the staff to look at this in depth. The Senate has been woken up. I have focused my efforts there. The House needs to be continued to be educated. You can do it. You must do it. If you want to protect yourself and your families from this clear environmental and health hazard that is causing clear injury. And that's the way it needs to be said to our citizens. And will increasingly do so with 5G and antennas every 200 to 400 feet, emitting high density wireless radiation without our consent. And with science clearly showing biological harm.

Josh: Kevin Mottus, thank you so much for your strong words of encouragement, your action over the years, and your guidance and for spending time with us today; to get us up to speed and to encourage us with what we can do. Thank you so much for joining us.

Kevin: 5gisharmful@gmail.com. Join the efforts to stop this absolute injustice.

Regional Governments Standing Against 5G

Guest: Raphael Mahaim

Josh: So we're with Raphael Mahaim today. He's the Member of Parliament in Vaud, Switzerland, who is most responsible for leading the charge to get the official moratorium against 5G in his Canton or his region there in Switzerland. And, Raphael, welcome to The 5G Summit.

Raphael: Thank you very much.

Josh: So you've gotten involved in a discussion and the debate that led to the moratorium, and before we ask the events that that led to that, I want to first of all ask; what are your reasons and concern for getting involved in this discussion and around 5G personally?

Raphael: So as a member of the Green Party, I would probably say two things, two main elements led me to get passionate about 5G. First thing is the possible consequences on Health and Environment; radiation is the main concern. We are now having time to seek documentation; scientific evidence about a possible risk. I'm not talking about fear, about undocumented risk. I'm talking about very serious people saying that there could be risks. Personally, I'm not an engineer. I'm not a scientist. I just try to look around and see what people say about that. So that would be the first concern. And the second concern, which I also believe is very important, is related to the energy consumption and direction Telcos are taking in selling, you know, connected phones. But not only connected phones because connected phones is, let's say obvious now, but connected watches, connected refrigerators, connected cars, connected trampolines.

That's what I saw a few days ago. And I'm really concerned about those connected objects which may, generally speaking, also lead to massive energy consumption, which is in my perspective, given the climate change. And the challenges we have to face in this regard, which can be concerning and can be questioned. I mean, I'm questioning this. Do we need those connected objects? If yes, for which purposes? For whom? Yes, I believe some companies do need high speed internet. I do believe some researchers, some technical schools do need very high speed internet. But I'm really wondering whether everybody needs a connected car, the connected refrigerator. And frankly speaking from what I know of the topic that I would rather say no at that time we have other priorities, other needs, other social questions to address. And then that's probably the two main reasons to health risks and possible risk for the environment.

And on the other hand, this question about our name, it's really a matter of society. Where do we go, what do we want? What are our needs? And of course, how can we address climate change and such challenges.

Josh: Yeah, good. Thank you. Well, you're a PhD in Environmental Law from University of Freiburg. You have a law degree from University of Lausanne. And you're partner in a law firm in Lausanne, RM and Associates. So you come from a very strong background in terms of law legislation, how we can affect positive change, and how we can have real solutions rather than false solutions or maybe solutions that distract society or bring us down a non productive path. Tell us, with what's going on in there with the moratorium in Vaud and Geneva. And I think there are at least four Cantons that have had other past moratoriums or something. How big of a conversation is it is 5G at this time in Switzerland? And if you could maybe bring us up to speed what led to the moratorium that you spearheaded in Vaud?

Raphael: Avery good question. So let me first start with some explanations as a lawyer, because as a lawyer, and I'm mostly active in environmental law, building law, planning law. And what I saw those past months is a massive number of applications for building permits for antenna for 5G specifically. And this has been done without any certification, without any coordination. And as a lawyer, we are used to very complex procedures for building permits. I mean, if you want to build a little house in your garden to store your bike or whatever. You need to go through very complex procedure and it takes time. It has to be certified, coordinated with other possible permits that would be requested in the same area etc. And for those antennas that the mobile network operators want to build in our region, it has been done without this coordination, without these certifications.

So in the last month, there have been literally hundreds of those applications for building permits not all coming from the same

operators. So they are really in a very harsh competition and they are not coordinated in a way that for example, they say, "Okay, I will put up an antenna in this village, you will put up an antenna in the other village." So they're just applying for building permits. And for example, in a small village with no special needs for high speed internet, as there could be up to I don't know 3, 4, 5 possible antennas, there would be permits that are requested from the operators. So that's has probably been the first element that led to a strong reaction typically in those in those small villages where people are just saying, "I'm not sure I want an antenna on the church of my village. I'm not sure I want an antenna on the school or just besides the school where my kids go to school."

So this was probably started end of last year, beginning of 2019. And then interestingly came a massive advertising campaign from the operators. Important to note that Roger Federer, our national hero, you know, tennis has been one of the guys being involved in those advertising campaign. So we could see Roger Federer's picture above him in every street in our cities saying 5G is coming, it's fantastic, you will have more and more internet, more speed etc. And this is exactly the time where people started to dispute this evolution to contest to say, "I'm not sure we need this, I'm not sure we needed it that way. I'm not sure it has to be so fast, it has to be so uncoordinated." And that started to be very concrete in our French speaking part of Switzerland. It started with a petition.

So a simple citizen started to gather signatures from people who were worried about 5G, and it was a very big success. Unexpectedly, I think in several weeks we got really several, even hundreds of thousands of signatures, which is very rare for such a small country as Switzerland. So that was probably in March and April and that led by us. I mean, some politicians and parliamentarians to wonder whether we should really try to react on the political level. And that's what we did indeed. And we were the first to react to the Green Party of my hometown, for several reasons because it is a big canton. So there were many of those applications where many antennas were being discussed around cantons. So it was really a big discussion coming on newspaper, etc. So we thought it was a good time to really ask some questions about this technology, about the way it was being brought in, about the way it was uncoordinated and uncertified. So that's what we did. We thought it was important to really act at that level.

And maybe one last comment on those last months; interestingly at the national level, official authority, the Swiss Federal Office for the environment ordered a study on possible risks for health and the environment. And that was at the end of 2018. And despite this, despite the fact that they are still waiting for the results of this study, some first building permits were delivered for antennas. And we thought that was really ridiculous because on one hand, you say, "Okay, we need to study

the risk, we need to think about what we are doing, and you know the precautionary principle, which is a very important principle in Swiss law.”

So we need to be careful. Precautionary principle on one hand, on the other hand, we are delivering hundreds of permits for those antennas all over the country. So we also felt there was a problem here with one authority saying, “We have to be careful. We have to do things with scientific evidence, to coordinate everything.” And on the other hand building permits being delivered in uncoordinated and uncertified way.

So that was the start and then we came with this -- It's called the resolution in our Parliament, with this resolution asking for a moratorium. And that was the whole debates until when should this moratorium apply? What are we asking for? And we agreed with other parties because, of course, not all of the parties were exactly aligned with that debate we were trying to have. So we agreed with the major parties that we needed the moratorium at least until this first federal study give some results. And that will be probably at the end of the summer, this fall. So this moratorium that was eventually adopted by the canton and parliament, asked to freeze all those building permits until the study gives some scientific evidence, scientific results about possible health risks, for example, caused by 5G. So that's where we are now. And that's the whole story behind the 5G moratorium now in our canton.

Josh: Very good. Is it a similar moratorium that was also passed in the canton of Geneva and the other two? I'm sorry, the name escapes me right now.

Raphael: Yeah. Of cause, don't worry. I mean, it's a very similar. We could enter into some legal details, but it's basically the same idea. Building permits should not be delivered for the coming weeks and months until there is more scientific evidence coming from this study ordered by the Federal Swiss Office for the environment. So it's very similar. I believe it's not the exact same formulation wording in the Geneva. Basically it's saying the same thing.

Josh: Okay. So moratoriums are saying no building permits, no permits for installing small cells for 5G related infrastructures, correct?

Raphael: Yes. And maybe if I may add one comment on this; those moratoriums came most cases in those cantons you mentioned before, came from Parliament. And of course Parliaments are here to pass bills, law and not necessarily to deliver permit or freeze the delivery of building permit. So in most cases but what happened right after the Parliament passed those moratorium, what happened is that the members of the government said, “Okay, we agreed to freeze those building permits, because of the votes in the parliament and also

interestingly, because we are lacking some of the methodology to measure radiation and to have scientific confirmation that one antenna does not harm or is not a health issue, for example.”

The methodology to measure, to calculate those radiations, we actually don't have it for the new dynamic 5G antenna. So we are waiting for this methodology, for those instruments coming from the national authorities. And until we do have those instruments, this methodology, we will not deliver building permit anymore. So that was one more argument that was used by the government after the votes in the parliament to freeze the building permits for antennas in those five or six cantons where there has been more challenge.

Josh: Okay, good. So in April of this year, Vaud became the first Canton to pass that moratorium. And then about a week later we saw, I believe it was the Swiss times, a couple of major publications that industry is preceding anyway. They just flipped to switch on 5G, they just went live anyways and they intend to blanket I believe it was 90% of the country by the end of 2019 with 5G infrastructure, even though the moratoriums were passed. Can you tell us like how is it that that happened? I mean, is this an attack on the rule of law? Or what what's happening here? What's the best way? Because I actually had somebody write -- I wrote about this on our website; on Take Back Your Power. And a commenter sent me an email saying, “No, no, you don't understand how the government systems work and the different levels of government and all this stuff.” So please, let me and the viewer know what the deal is there.

Raphael: So first thing to say those moratoriums has been passed, voted in, let's say five or six cantons, and we have in our country about more than 20 cantons. So theoretically and legally speaking, in the remaining cantons there has been no discussion, no moratorium. I mean, the operators, the Telcos are good to go. There is nothing that stands in their way in terms of obtaining building permits for antenna, that's the first thing. The second thing is that unfortunately, many permits had been delivered before those votes. In the first month of this year, there have been those hundreds of applications for building permits for new antennas. And some of them were delivered before the moratoriums were voted because we -- Shame on us. We did not react quickly enough, but I mean, that's the way it is. And some of those permits were delivered before the political discussion.

And third thing to say; the limit for radiation coming from those antennas are regulated at the national level. So it is true to say that seeing what is forbidden and what is not authorized, from a legal perspective, this is the power of the national level, of the national authorities. So by voting those moratoriums, we have not changed those federal provisions about limits for radiation, about what is authorized, what types of antennas are authorized, etc. The only thing we have done

is to say we are freezing the building permit process because this is the power of the canton. The captain, or even the communes are delivering the permits.

So it is a complex situation. But we could summarize it by saying; we did not change the law related to 5G antenna. The only thing we did -- and of course, it's already something. The only thing we did was to say please be careful, please think about what we're doing. So at the canton level stop delivering building permits for antennas at least until we know more about the technology, about potential risks and about the issues I mentioned before. So that's the situation if it is clear enough for the viewers, and that's a good thing.

Josh: That helps. So just one more question on that; when that moratorium was passed, did your canton actually stop granting more permissions to Telcos?

Raphael: Yes, because one of the members of the government also came to the parliament and address this issue during the debate discussion in the parliament. And confirm that her services, her people in the lower administration in the coming weeks and months, will not deliver those permissions and building permits for the Telcos. So it has caused those effects in our canton. But of course, it is in a way temporary. We are waiting to see what comes next, and especially when the study that was ordered at the national level will give some results. The moratorium might be cancelled or changed or modified or we will have a new discussion definitely in probably two or three months from now.

Josh: Yeah. Okay, good. So over in here in the United States, of course, the industry admits they've never done any safety studies. There are no studies to prove that 5G is safe and they don't plan on doing any studies. They are on zero budgets for that. Meanwhile, the independent science like you said, there are huge things to worry about it, especially in the millimeter wave spectrum. I mean, at 60 gigahertz, there's a study that says that's the oxygen uptake. There's a specific frequency range that has to do with the human sweat ducts and the operation there, which is more significant than you might think and of the functionality of our bodies. And there are tests that indicate how the bacteria can morph into a different type of bacteria, potentially changing the human microbiome even.

Meanwhile, that's the independent science, but industry is not doing their own science. Here it's hugely corrupt, Raphael. It's just amazing. And I know in Europe with ignorance, it's very questionable there that the independent science is being honored. But I wanted to ask you; how confident are you in the federal report from Switzerland being unbiased and being considering the actual health effects on the people?

Raphael: That's an excellent. And to be very honest, I'm not very confident. So I will also want to see of course, what the first results are, but whether those results are scientifically solid, or whether we need more. And if we do have to ask for more independent scientific research, we will do that. Actually, we've been doing that for several years now. The Green Party among others has been asking for more independent research on that. Actually, it's interesting to know -- I know a few professors at the EPFL, which is our technical university in Lausanne, it's quite famous actually. I know several professors working there who really tell me, you know, we know there are some issues, we know there are some problems and some of our colleagues have made research on that and those results are in a way not used as they should be.

They're not using the scientific literature and also by federal officers, federal authorities as they should be. So we keep going, we keep on the fight and we will continue to ask for independent results. And yes, your question is very relevant. I'm not certain that study ordered by the Federal Office will give convincing evidence in a way or another. But of course, if it does indicate that there are some risks and that we have to be very careful, we will also use that in the sense of the precautionary principle to say, okay, then let's put very strict limits. Again, I'm not an engineer, I'm not a specialist, but what I do know is that we will need some very strict regulation to prevent those risks from materializing.

Josh: Yeah. And then with regards to the safety studies you mentioned, I mean, over here in North America and many other countries that they don't look at the non thermal effects. The science has outdated the official government agency safety limits. So here it's like 600 to 1000 micro watts per centimeter squared. And [ichner] I think is quite similar. But doesn't Switzerland have a much lower, much safer threshold for microwave radiation limits?

Raphael: That's a very good question. And to be very honest, I'm not sure I could give you the accurate answers just like this, but that's what they keep saying. And apparently from what I understood, it is true to say that thresholds are particularly low for some length of ways, but for others it's not the case. So apparently we are being better than the European Union, for example, for some parts of the spectrum, for other situations and other risks, we are not as good as the national parties say. So that's something I'll have to study very thoroughly in the coming weeks and months because -- but well, of course, I don't have any influence on that because it's all regulated at the national level. So that's also why it's a discussion I did not participate in so far. But we will have to address those questions and we will have to discuss the threshold to see whether there are really as cautious as the National Party is saying they are.

Josh: Yeah. Good. Everyone watching, I just want to thank Raphael for

coming on. It's about 10 o'clock at night at his time, he's burning the candle at both ends. So thank you, Raphael. A friend of mine in Europe sent me -- it looked like a picture of newspaper stand in Geneva. And it looked like the front page of the Geneva paper was all about 5G, the fact that they're installing anyway. And you just explained how they can find the loophole to do that. I asked this earlier, but I just want to quickly get your dive in. How big of a conversation piece, how big of an awareness piece is it there? How many people are aware -- Even percentages of the population?

Raphael: Yeah. It is and it as a very big surprise to me. It is a very important conversation. I would say at the time now we are speaking, it's probably as big conversation as time of change would be in our country. There has been a poll published I think a two or three weeks ago, which confirmed that more than 50% of the population is concerned about 5G, is worried about 5G, about possible risks for health.

And again, there is not one day without the newspaper article about 5G, about the new antennas, about scientific evidence coming from abroad or from our universities in Switzerland. So I would say it has, over the past month, a very important conversation in our country. And it will be a very big political discussion in the coming weeks and month. And again, it is a bit of a surprise because end of last year, there was the first advertising campaign that was coming over the country, some first reactions in some parties in some organizations. But it was very, very restricted, limited to some interesting people. And then it kind of spread almost to the whole population, I would say. So yes, very big conversation and a major concern in our country, especially the French speaking part of Switzerland.

That's maybe a one funny comment to make as you might know, as the viewers might know, we do speak four official languages in Switzerland. The most important being German first and then French second, then Italian comes third. And sometimes political discussions or discussions in the population are very localized in one part of the country and are not equally important in all parts of Switzerland.

So this discussion about 5G has been very important in the past week and months, especially in the French speaking part of Switzerland. And some cantons in the German speaking parts of Switzerland kind of looked at us saying what are those people talking about? We're just not aware of what's happening. So it's now coming slowly, also the German speaking part of Switzerland it came later for some reason I cannot really explain.

Josh: Interesting. It just goes to show -- I mean, whatever area of influence in communication you have, you need to speak up, you need to share the information. You know, walls eventually will come down,

but we -- I would say that there's a great need to do so in a timely manner because of the money and the motivation involved on the industry side. So with Geneva, Geneva is home to considerable, I guess -- It's one of the power centers of the World Health Organization.

And then also within Geneva, within Rome, for example, within some other cities, there's certain neighborhoods that have really took a hard line against any kind of 5G tower or small cell deployment. Can you talk to that a little bit? Is this the case of those who have more power and have more wealth, and influence standing up for themselves first and then protecting their own first? You know, meanwhile, less affluent countries or regions or cities might not be protected. You know what I mean? Is this kind of like the start of a potential class war?

Raphael: Very interesting question too. Honestly, I don't know. What I felt very, very strongly here in Switzerland is that this debate was also made possible by our culture about the democracy. As you might know, we do have a very strong democracy in Switzerland. So we're voting about four times a year about many different topics. For example, last year, we voted about whether farmers who dehorn horn their cows should receive subsidies. You know, such very specific questions being discussed and then lead to popular votes in Switzerland. So there is this culture of political discussions of democracy, and I believe that what the operators have made wrong in this whole 5G story is that they really did not respect that very specific Swiss culture about addressing the issues you know, preparing things slowly, giving the time to the population to prepare, to react to possible changes, etc. So that's probably one explanation about the reactions.

Now to come back to your question; honestly, I don't know. What I've experienced here is that most of the reactions came from the small villages, from small community with people who really had the impression that operators are not paying attention to their needs, to their fears, to their concerns, to their questions. They're just coming, requesting a building permit, applying for a building permit and then building their antenna, again, as I said before, on the church, newer school, etc. So these reactions coming from small villages, small communities have been very strong. And whether it came from powerful communities or regions or not, I don't know. That's not necessarily what I felt those past weeks. But open question, interesting.

Josh: Yeah. Good. What are your thoughts on smart meters? I know that in some countries they're like, for example, Austria. I understand there's a mandate to install on everyone. I don't know the situation in Switzerland. The big controversy in France called Linky there, and of course, the UK and probably most countries. What are your thoughts on smart meters in general and how based upon -- what you understand, do they connect with the 5G plans?

Raphael: So my opinion on that is that, there might be a need for smart meters for some very specific people or industries or companies. But whether it should be all around the country for everybody -- And again, I'm skeptical here. It's about the same argument I tried to put forward when it comes to objects connected to Smart Objects. First question, the question of the need. Because again, the industry has massive financial interests here and does not question the needs of the industry that just creates the needs or makes you think there is a need where there's no need. So this is the first question I would prefer. Do we need this? Do we need those connected objects? Do we need those smart meters? I've to come back to your question. And frankly, I would rather say no. At least not how they're selling it right now, and at least not in the very uncoordinated quick and disrespectful way they're trying to develop this. So that would be my theoretical answer at that time now and we will see what comes of course in the future. But let's be careful, that will be my idea and let's not be too hasty.

Josh: Yeah. How do you see these events in Switzerland? Also was it the Minister for environment in Brussels, her statement against 5G and saying we won't treat our people like guinea pigs there. And I think Russia as a country said that they're not going to transfer licenses from 4G to 5G frequencies. I've yet to get the details, but my understanding is Russia is taking right now a very hard stance against allowing just 5G or wherever. And in the States, even there's something like at least 20 cities, and probably much more by now that are passing laws and ordinances to basically limit the deployment of small cells, which are the basis of 5G; to limit the distance or has set a minimum distance away from residences or schools, for example, 1500 feet you know, 300-400 meters or something like that.

But people it seems like really are watching Switzerland, they're watching Brussels, they're watching these sort of these power centers. And these countries where they have a lot of international respect for not getting involved in wars and having precautionary principle and so forth. How do you see what's going on there affecting -- perhaps inspiring change also in other parts of Europe to start.

Raphael: I really like this idea of us having a role to play in this whole discussion not because we are better than the other countries, not because we have more independent researchers than the other countries because it might not be the case. But because we are among the richest countries and we are in a good position to question those deployments of the 5G technology. And if we do that, then it probably means that any country can do it as well. So if we can afford in a way to question this, given the fact that we have very powerful industries, very, very important universities -- If we can afford those political discussions, if we can take the time to think about what we're doing, then I believe we can also play a role in the whole discussion worldwide in a positive way.

Not to rush into technology we don't know yet, because of the risks, etc. Let's take the time to think, to limit, to regulate, to do things in an intelligent way. And I believe we also need that at every global level, we need to do things in a more intelligent way. I mean, climate change is another concern we might want to address in a very serious and clever way too. And this is not what we have been used to do in the past decade. I would say we're just going very fast into new technological developments because the industry tells us there is a need here, you need to need to develop this. I say no, and I'm very happy Switzerland can contribute to emphasize those important discussions. We need to have about our future, about our development, about our people, and about our environment

Josh: So the people that are watching this, whether they're in Switzerland or in Australia or United States or wherever, what can they do to -- because it seems like we have to join forces here. We have to actually get involved in support of our local governments or regional governments, and then put the pressure on federal governments to stop this, to realize we're all in this together. You know, there's no nobody who gets a free pass for not being zapped by this technology or not being affected by the wasted energy or the surveillance. How can we support those who are in positions of gate keeping or local regional power who want to do the right thing here? What can people do?

Raphael: I do believe nonprofit organizations will play a very important role in the decades to come. So there are many organizations, for example, in our country who have been concerned about 5G, and we have an agile population and also the politicians about 5G. So join such an organization, give some time and work with those people who try to fight for their rights and to just defend the either the environment, or population health, etc. So that's the first thing you can do. I would also say as a politician here, as a Green politician, there is always a possibility to join a party which also addresses those issues and helps the decision takers to understand what is at stake here, because that's what we do as a Green Party.

Obviously, we don't have the power to do everything we would want to do for the future of our country. But in Parliaments, in local governments, in the cities, in the communes, we do have the power to have some impact on the political discussions which are being for example, which people have heard about 5G or about other environmental issues. So that's a second possibility. And of course, third possibility, which is very, very important in Switzerland. I mean local fights as petitions against 5G project. For example, here in Switzerland we can oppose to a building permits which is being delivered and then, for example, ask the court to say whether the building permit is in accordance with the federal and cantonal law. So there are many ways you can also try to slow down the deployment of 5G technology at the

very local level. So that would be hard way to help and to join the forces.

Josh: You know, there's a website here in the States called *telecompowergrab.org*. And then there's another one; environmental health trust. And there's several websites that are talking about -- they're giving support and resource to local governments to pass these ordinances that I mentioned. You know, part of it is you can't know small cells within a certain distance of people basically. And the second is, local governments charging what they're calling recertification fees. So using their local authority to require the industry reps, the operators to come out in person and re-certify every year that this technology is safe and it's functioning properly within the legal standards and charging, you know, they can charge whatever they want. They're using their authority to say you know, this is harm to us and we're going to charge.

So based upon that, they're seeing sometimes some operators will just withdraw their applications completely because it's not profitable in that case. So it's another unique strategy. I don't know if they're doing the same thing in there.

Raphael: Yeah, I fully agree. And I gave earlier the example of those operators applying for building permits in the same village. Three or four operators wanting a permit for a new 5G antenna in the same, let's say 500 people village. It's an absolute nonsense. And having people fighting against that will probably reduce the number of antennas at least from 4 to 1, or maybe possibly to zero. So yes, we do have those leverages which helped slowing down the deployment of this antenna

Josh: So you mentioned earlier, Raphael, that with the awareness right now in Switzerland, and it will be increasing in other countries and regions. It's like on a par with the conversations about major environmental issues. I just want to switch gears kind of in this conversation to talk more -- I guess, bigger picture, or what does it relate to. You know, it seems like humanity is in kind of a crisis right now. And we're seeing different aspects of it from different issues and matters and problems in our world. We're seeing it on the personal level, we're seeing how people treat each other even. It's like, we're feeling this compression.

From your perspective, is there a conscious awakening happening in humanity, like we're seeing the yellow vest movement in France and Belgium and other places, it's expanding rapidly. But we don't even hear about it here. It's not even on the news. Facebook is basically censored. But from your perspective, Raphael, is there a positive thing that's happening, like a conscious awakening that maybe you know, this crisis is just part of that process?

Raphael: Yes. I strongly believe there is something that's happening

now, and I think it's very positive. It's probably because people are starting to see that we have to act collectively for our future. And we have to stop thinking about only ourselves, and about our industry and about our very short term profits. So I do believe there is awareness about long term concerns, long term issues. Time it is of course the most important of those issues. You know, very interesting two weeks ago, you've probably seen that on TV there has been this big fire on Norte Dame in Paris. I don't know if you followed what happened the days after that big fire, because that was the most interesting thing from my perspective. Of course, the night it happens, everybody was sad saying, you know, it's very important monuments in Paris which has been going down, etc, etc. The day after that happened, some very rich people in France promised they would offer millions of Euros to rebuild the Norte Dame, which I mean, why not?

But interestingly, let's say in the days after that -- now, people are starting to say, "But hey, if we can get so much money in a few hours to save a church or to rebuild the church. Why can't we have those millions of Euros for even more important purposes, typically, environmental crisis, climate change." And I believe that is also showing that people are starting to understand that we are facing major issues, major challenges, and we have to join our forces, as you said before, and we have to make our governments understand that there is more at stake here than on the church. Although, of course, I do believe that was important to rebuild Norte Dame. But the point is, it shows what's beyond those very local and legitimate concerns about a fire, for example. There are more and bigger concerns. And yes, this awareness is coming. Yes, 5G is part of it.

And maybe one last comment on that. I believe people are starting more and more to question technology. Technology is in a way fantastic. I mean, it allows us to speak now as we do. We are 10,000 miles away from each other, we are speaking, we're having a very interesting conversation. This is technology. This is fantastic. But on the other hand, technology also means the Fukushima disaster in Japan. And also means 5G and its effects on health. It also means waste of energy and oil being spilt all over the world for stupid reasons. So people I believe are questioning technology, because they see that technology will not bring happiness. And we need more for our future than simply industries selling technologies and selling new things, new needs, with new happiness that should be simply coming from technology. So yes, this is a very important movement we are seeing. I believe and I hope it will bring some hope for future and for the common future of mankind basically.

Josh: Yeah, thank you. Well said. I agree we absolutely need to draw a line in the sand, take a committed resolved approach that new technologies have to be vetted and proven safe before they can ever

be released upon the people and even into the marketplace. The precautionary principle is very crucial to uphold. You know, that's like a doctor's first oath. First, do no harm. The doctor has that responsibility, because their job is to help people and preserve their health. It should also be applied to industry and the executives there who stand to profit because what they are doing is demonstrating harm to health. So we need to -- I think as people really just get woken up, which you are helping to do with getting committed, and you're taking a very important role in leadership in Switzerland. So thank you, Raphael.

And I also want to just encourage the viewer and also Raphael relating to how people can connect with their governments. That's something that our group feels very passionate about. So we have made it available for people to quickly and effectively send an email, a tweet, a phone call to their elected officials. So the people if you're watching this, go to our website, you'll see exactly how it's set up for you to do so efficiently. Because like Raphael, there are elected officials everywhere who want to be part of the solution that they need to know.

At some point, Raphael, you came into knowledge about the harm of this technology and about the actual science. And it was probably someone else that cared enough to share with you. Yeah, go ahead.

Raphael: Let me add something on that because I really agree fully with all of this. And if I may add something as an elected official, I do not have enough time to have documentation about all the environmental issues I want to address, I want to work on in the parliament I'm working in. So I need that information from people because I cannot myself obtain that information on my own. So that's another way to say what you said a minute ago. We need help. We need help from the people, from specialists, from scientists, from organizations, from you guys.

And we need information as elected officials. Because if we want to be part of the solution, we need information, we need evidence, we need the scientific results. And all of this cannot come from us alone. It has to come from you, from the people as well.

Josh: Absolutely. Well said. So yeah, if you're watching this, go to our website, do that action. Send that email, reach out to your elected officials. It just takes a few seconds. And then we're going to be part of this together. We're organizing the tribe of those who really care about this world and each other coming together. So do that now. Anyways, Raphael, thank you again for your time and your energy and your commitment, and for talking with us today.

Raphael: Well, thank you for the invitation and for that great conversation. Thank you, Josh.

Communities Using Fiber Optics Instead of 5G

Guest: Timothy Schoechle

Josh: With us today on the 5G Summit is, Dr Timothy Schoechle. Dr. Schoechle is a communications technology expert. A Ph.D. with an international consultant in computer engineering and standardization. A former faculty member at the University of Colorado's engineering college. And a senior research fellow at the National Institute for Science Law and Public Policy.

Dr. Schoechle's works "Getting Smarter About the Smart Grid" and "Reinventing Wires, The Future of Landline and Networks" are uniquely positioned to help provide a roadmap for real solutions to the problems associated with the hasty and untested deployment of 5G and small cells.

Dr. Schoechle, thank you so much for being with us on the 5G and Beyond Summit today.

Dr. Schoechle: Thank you, Josh. It's a pleasure.

Josh: So, Dr. Schoechle, what is 5G? And what are its stated intentions or stated objectives?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, 5G means the fifth generation of cellular telephone network. Roughly speaking, every ten years, the industry has come up with a new generation of cellular phones. And this is the one that's being introduced now. It's not ready yet. It's really in its earliest stage and prototype essentially. It's being tested in a couple of cities. But there's really no such thing yet. The technical standards aren't finished. And the spectrum hasn't been allocated yet.

Josh: Okay. And what are the claim benefits of 5G? How is industry

pushing this through and getting the support?

Dr. Schoechle: Well the goal is, as the industry states, is to have higher speed connection and less delay in the message response. So, that when you push a button, there is a certain delay and what they want to do is cut that down. They want to minimize it. And they have promised a lot of new applications that range from being able to use this for the Internet of Things, whatever that is, the autonomous vehicles, and virtual reality. But I think inevitably it's going to be faster video and particularly more ads.

Josh: Okay. So, are there other perhaps hidden real reasons that maybe different than what we are being sold? What are the real reasons of 5G, if they are different than what you just said?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I think if you look underneath all of this, you find that they need to sell more phones, they need to sell more chips, and they want to collect more data. That's what the industry is really about. And if you look at the statistics on the sale of smartphones, it's really backed off in the last couple of years, very dramatically. Even Apple computer, who has made a huge amount of money on this is still seeing a decline. They have a two year now decline in sales, particularly in the developed world. They need a new generation to get people to buy a new phone. That's basically the bottom line. You have to buy a new phone, build more chips, and find new ways to get consumers more addicted to this service.

Josh: Yeah. So, it's money, control, and profit. Data of course as you mentioned.

Dr. Schoechle: Yeah. And they promised all these applications I mentioned. But really it boils down to advertising. It is the primary function of the whole network. It's delivering ads to you. And pinpointing you, targeting you, and collecting on data on you. So, that those ads can be better targeted. And that's what 5G is going to be about too.

Josh: So, in addition to data collecting and advertising more directly, I guess, with more granular data. What are your concerns about 5G? And about the direction that the wireless industry is going?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, there's a number of concerns. I guess, for one thing, 5G and 4G are kind of wedded together in a way that isn't true of the earlier generations. Because 5G doesn't even promise to do voice service. So, to have a smart phone that has voice communication, it will have to be both. In fact, the 4G will be used 4G LTE it's called, long term evolution. Which means ten years. It is about coordinating the 5G. And then the 5G will be the actual high-speed download, data download part. It will be managed by the 4G.

So, there's another important factor though is the 5G uses a whole different or will use, or least is promised to use a whole new frequency range that is very new. And never been used for this before or for much at all. It has unknown characteristics. And that is what they call

the millimeter wave, which are gigahertz. The range and propagation characteristics are so different from the frequencies presently being used down around one gigahertz. To under one gigahertz to nine hundred megahertz. The 5G frequencies will be way up into the twenty, thirty gigahertz and they will be much shorter range. Instead of a three to five mile range, they will have only a few hundred feet maybe. As a result, they will have to put in more cell towers or cell sites.

So, they came up with this idea of the small cell. Which is the idea of putting a cellular transceiver in every lamp post. Maybe as close to a hundred feet or less. In every neighborhood to saturate basically the entire environment with these millimeter wave frequencies in order to get adequate coverage for people and certainly for any devices in your vehicles or moving objects. So, what is much different about it? In order to do that, they could not afford to license all those cell towers if they had to go pay for it. So, what they did is they got laws passed, at least half of the states, to preempt local regulations. So, that the industry will be able to get access to the public right of ways to put these things on every street, lamp post, or where they want, park benches, buildings, anything. Without having to really pay the full cost. And then externalize that cost onto the community.

Josh: Are these the ALEC laws that you speak of? Or is this a different set of legislation?

Dr. Schoechle: There were really two strategies. One was to get the ALEC Organization, which creates model legislation. They put forth model legislation and I think it was adopted in over twenty states so far to enable this, to preempt local regulation.

Josh: And that's the American Legislative Exchange Council, correct?

Dr. Schoechle: Right, the American Legislative Exchange Council, which is a libertarian think tank that creates model legislation on many, many topics. But this is one of them. And then as a backup for that, they got the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate the same set of rules at the national level to preempt local regulation. Because of the chair of the Federal Communications Commission is a guy from Verizon. So, you know, that's their agenda.

So, that is being challenged in Court. And these laws are being challenged. Everything's being challenged right now. It's up in the air. Because when people finally woke up to the fact that this was happening or starting to happen, there's been quite an uproar that has emerged. And then there's a whole a different dimension to it. Aside from the preemption of the rights of local communities to regulate the health, safety and environmental quality. Is this issue of the big questions around electromagnetic radiation. And we know that the existing cell phones, there is a potential hazard there. Because research has just come forward in the last couple of years. It has been around a long time.

But some recent research has really reinforced that. And then those

concerns. And then there's the added fact that the 5G is even yet in a newer also employs, not just the old frequencies but new frequencies too. They are a completely mystery as to how they behave and what they do in the biological effects of all that. Health effects are completely unknown. So, it's a mass experiment on a huge population. That is being put forward here.

Josh: What's your take on, earlier in 2019, Senator Blumenthal was grilling reps from the senior representatives from the wireless industry who basically admitted in that Senate Hearing that they haven't done any testing on the health effects of 5G frequencies and they don't plan to. There's no budget. They don't plan to assign a budget. And they're proceeding anyway. What's your thoughts on that? And how do things kind of get to that point?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, in the past, everyone has deferred to the FCC emissions limits. But the problem is those are so far out of date, decades out of date. And they were based on old issues around radar, microwaves, and heating of tissue. But in recent years, there's been a huge body of evidence that it's not the thermal effects or the heating effects that are important. That there are other effects that have to do with non-thermal effects, non-ionizing radiation effects, that may create a health hazard.

But the FCC has absolutely no capability or even interest in studying medical issues, biological issues, or epidemiological issues. They're not quick to do that. And don't plan to. So, the FCC is kind of like lost in the woods here. And they don't really know what to do. And then they don't have any staff to deal with it. So, it's a big question. And the industry is trying to sweep it under the rug.

Josh: So, there's the data harvesting, the mass increase in data harvesting that the 5G plan is really associated with. There's the health and environmental effects that we don't really know about. But they are proceeding without having those tests. Meanwhile, the independent testing is indicating there's very likely a problem. And then there's the passing of laws that you mentioned. Both at the federal level, the FCC, and at the state level with the ALEC laws.

You quoted in your recent paper, "Reinventing Wires." You said, "The Internet has become one of the defining technologies of our society. It is our central medium for commerce and communication. And more importantly for our public discourse, engagement and democratic governance. However, it has been hijacked by the commercial motivations that have come to redefine and constrain the availability, quality, content, and media have high speed access in the United States."

What is the danger? What is kind of the pathway that we need to be aware of and maybe take action on of this hijack? Can you just kind of paint a picture for us with your decades of experience in leadership within the communications industry? This being hijacked by commercial

interests that seem to be just passing laws and seem to be just going ahead even without any testing. What are the dangers of that? What are we looking at?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, the original concept behind the Internet was something much different than what we have today. And believe it or not there was a time, about 1995, that it was completely non-commercial. And there as a debate at the time about whether it should be commercialized or not. Or whether commercial activity and advertising should be allowed on the Internet. Then the government at the time decided to just basically productize the whole thing and let it go. It was a government owned and operated network. And we've seen it evolve now. It's almost hard to imagine kids growing up today with their smart phones, that wouldn't have any inkling that that was ever true.

What I mean by hijacking is by far the primary business model of the Internet is advertising. And that's far from the original concept. It was communication. I don't know what can be done about that or anything could be done about it. But there are some really excellent books coming out now. Scholars are looking at this. Books like, *Anti-Social Media*, is one of them. Another one I just got is a book by a Harvard Law Professor called, *Surveillance Capitalism*. It's about a concept that this business model when it's morphed into this Frankenstein machine that is taken over. And these Gargantuan corporations that have unbelievable political power and wealth, is reshaping our whole society.

And you know, here again, I'm not sure what to do about it. But one element that I have addresses is that it's creating this disparity between the rich and the poor. The people that have access and the people that don't. And my feeling is that they all ought to have access. And it should be basic access, not based on access to wireless phone industry. But basic access through optical fiber networks in every community. At least that evens the playing field a little bit. And it's not so as intensive or focused on the commercial purposes. But some of the other purposes that are more important to cities and towns can be incorporated into it.

Josh: You mentioned, triopoly instead of a monopoly with what's happening. As we know this 5G deployment and planning is happening worldwide. But in the United States, you talk about a triopoly. Can you just share with us your perspective on that? What is the triopoly and what are the threats of having such a thing in place?

Dr. Schoechle: Yeah, I think you make a good point that it's different in the United States and everywhere else. But the one difference is the completely privatized system we have here, in virtually everything from electric power to communications.

But the triopoly essentially, back in the mid-eighties we divested the telephone system, the Mob Bell System because it was a monopoly. And it had prevented technical innovation and preserved high prices. It also preserved, you know, high standards of performance. But more

importantly, it prevented innovation. So, the idea there was to break up that monopoly and get innovation back into the system.

Well, that worked. But unfortunately, what has happened since then and particularly with the Telecom Act of 1996, the restructuring of that. In the name of innovation, they completely unleashed wireless and at the same time they throttled back the wired networks. The old networks and any kind of new networks that were hard wired. At the time, it was a copper based network, copper wires. And now, it's all based on optical fiber. But the fiber going to your house is regulated differently than the fiber going to the wireless services you get.

So, wireless basically got a free ride. And so, all the Telecom companies converted themselves into wireless companies. My paper, "Reinventing Wires", talks in some detail about how all that happened and what the sequence of events was. But basically, it restructured the industry with a completely un-feathered, unregulated capitalism that resulted in the reconsolidating the Bell Companies, to create a new triopoly that is even more powerful than the old Bell monopoly. And the triopoly is Verizon, AT&T, which are really the remnants of the telephone Mob Bell System. Plus, the cable industry. It's all morphed into one huge triopoly that dominates internet access in this country and maintains artificially high prices, poor service, and constrains any kind of innovation.

Josh: I wanted to ask, where do you see this whole driverless car aspect of 5G going? It seems like an incredibly ambitious initiative to have driverless cars controlled by wireless signals and radiation. And I know, I've already seen news reports about crashes and things going wrong. How do you see this whole thing unfolding?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I'm very skeptical about it. There are two aspects. One is the driverless car itself or the autonomous vehicle. And then the other is the use of 5G. There's a fundamental problem. It sounds nice to talk about an autonomous vehicle. But if you really think about it, why do you want one? What is it for? What is it good for? Is it just another way because this is a fad and that it's another way to sell integrated circuits? And so, cram electronics into cars? To collect data on people that can be monetized, in one way or another. Or collect data on whatever. Is that what it's really about? Why do we need an autonomous vehicle? People like to drive their cars.

And you can come up with scenarios where they can sit back and read a newspaper and get ferried around, sure. There are a certain number of people that might like that. But I don't think it's a market. I think it might be a fleek market. And then the technical challenges around it are in incredibly huge. It requires precise mapping of every square inch basically where the car might go. And keeping it current. Not just mapping it but keeping it current. Because the car can't drive down the road where the bridge has been removed. And the car does not know that. But the economics of it don't make any sense to me. Who are going to buy these cars? Why would somebody buy them?

You hear about Uber all the time. "Uber, oh they are going to move to self-driving cars." But the basic business model of Uber is about externalizing the cost of the labor and the car onto the labor force. It's basically taking advantage of the labor force. What they call a sharecropper model of labor, post-slavery. In other words, it's even worse than slavery because the workers have to not only feed themselves, pay their car insurance, and maintain their car.

And then they chisel down the workers to the absolute minimum that they will stand before they quit. That is the business model of Uber. The benefit to Uber was that they didn't have to buy the cars and they didn't have to maintain them. If they go to autonomous vehicles, they would have to do both of those things. They wouldn't have the benefit of the labor shouldering the costs of their fleet. So, why in the world would they do it? Well, it's hype. It sounds good to the stock market. It's about selling stock.

Josh: Castles in the air.

Dr. Schoechle: It's about selling stock to the stock market. And going public like they just did. And people are getting a little bit antsy about that because they look at what happened with their stock offering price. Same thing with Lyft.

Okay, we will translate the issue of the autonomous vehicle market overall. I think that Google really started this by frightening General Motors, all the other car manufacturers, Toyota, and everybody into thinking that the car of the future was going to be able crammed electronics crammed into a car. They all had to get on that bandwagon, or they were going to get left behind. And they didn't understand that bandwagon. Google did.

And the Silicon Valley guys understand selling chips, software, and apps. They know how to do that. So, they frightened the car industry into joining their club, into their bandwagon. And it's like a giant Ponzi scheme. They keep upping the ante and so now everybody's on this quest for the autonomous vehicle. But nobody really knows what it is needed for.

Josh: Yeah, exactly. So, 5G, autonomous vehicles, Internet of Things, potentially Internet of People, the way that these corporations are seeing this, and AI. Right?

Dr. Schoechle: That's mostly right. And AI is a similar thing. AI is just another word. It's a wine in new bottles. It's like the same story. We've had that term, AI around since I started in this business which was in the 1970s when I got interested into computers. It was about what we called AI at the time, I guess. But AI today, is a buzz word. It's a way of hyping stock. And all it is making computers and algorithms that run in computers. It's nothing new. There is some new stuff I should say that neuro network is really the cutting edge of AI. That's a whole discussion in itself where that may or may not go.

Josh: It seems like this could really, I'm starting to see this. This whole thing could be the next bubble burst.

Dr. Schoechle: Yeah. It's mostly, that's what I think it is. It's a bubble. And it's mainly about investment in the stock market. And positioning startup companies for stock offerings. At some point in the future and Silicon Valley hyping its wares to the rest of the world. And, I think there's a skepticism that has just emerged in the last year, or in the last few months more.

If you look at it, the people are starting to wise up a little bit about Silicon Valley and the big corporations like Google, Facebook, Amazon, and Apple even. Apple is probably the least onerous or the least offensive of both that I have named. But at least the CEO of Apple has tried to give us some misgivings about all this. And he's written those down. But the other guys are just getting the money. And Zuckerberg is the epitome of the go get the money. You know, just get the money. And tell them whatever they want to hear.

Josh: Now, your papers, both of these significant works that you've done. First the, "Getting Smart about the Smart Grid" and "Reinventing Wires". They get into actual solutions. And you are touching on them there with wired networks. Help us understand. Because I think there is a perspective that wired networks and landlines are sort of antiquated or somehow no longer useful. Correct me if I'm wrong, but in the early 2000s there was a huge investment and there was a build out that was starting with fiber optics, with high speed wired networks. That was sort of hijacked as well. Help us understand, what are some of the major discoveries and ideas that you are helping the world really solve this problem with 5G within your published work?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I call it "Reinventing Wires" because when I say the wires, I mean both copper cables, particularly Ethernet is the technology that we all use on copper, mostly. But we have the old telephone DSL networks and stuff like that. And then the other thing is fiber. And optical fiber has come to be the dominant means of sending information. Even for cellular networks. There's this illusion, I think, that people have that their cell phone is somehow talking to the cloud directly. And they don't really know how it works, it just works. They don't realize that cell phone is going the last hundred feet or the last mile if you will, or the last maybe maximum of five miles, to a cell site that is then connected by optical fiber to a global network. And that's how it works.

What I'm advocating is simply that the bottleneck in that system is the wireless part. But there is one thing about wireless that is so handy. Wireless is good for things that move. And so, if you are going to move, it's very handy. Otherwise, if you are not moving, then you get a far better performance and better service by having a wire. Instead of just running those fibers to all these cell sites, let's make sure that fibers go to everybody's house and everybody's business. Then it will be a fair

comparison. There's a movement that the triopoly has constrained the development and they diverted all that fiber construction to their cell sites.

There are some huge lawsuits now over that because they've expropriated billions of dollars. They should have got their rate payers paid for their phone service that should have gone to upgrade their service. And it did not. It went to upgrade the cell sites. What I'm calling for is a new movement that's well underway for every town, city, and community in the country. To build out their own fiber as they would their own sewer system, their water system, and their streets. And they need fiber to everybody as well. Because it's a necessity of modern life. You can't file job applications. You can't get any public documents without it. And why should we be dependent on a proprietary wireless network to do that? Because the fiber networks are not proprietary.

Josh: Talk more about the benefits that will be gained by doing that? By wiring to the building level?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, everybody would be able to get this high performance access in their home and then you could work at home. Because you could have symmetrical service with fiber. You can upload stuff just as fast as you download it. So, the older systems of DSL and cable systems don't provide that kind of symmetry. Mobile systems don't either. They are built for downloading ads, movies, and things like that. They are not built for symmetrical service. So, the nice thing about fiber would be that you could have a server in your house. You could run a business out of it. And your business would work better.

And the other factor is that there's a lot of automation coming. Particularly, let's take the example of energy management. It's an area that I work in a lot and that has to do distributed solar and storage. We could convert our entire energy system off of coal and fossil fuels to solar energy and with storage batteries. But it becomes very important to be able to control the flow of electricity in a local community in real time basically. And trade that power back and forth to optimize the performance of a distributed system like that. We call solar microgrids. But they need high-speed communication to work and optical fiber would be ideal. And, interestingly enough, a lot of the fiber systems have been installed around the country.

And particularly our neighbor next door here, Longmont, Colorado, has the electric company which is owned by the community. They have also installed optical fiber there to every customer. So, the customers can get, not only electricity, but they can also get internet. They have over fifty-five percent subscription rate to that and those customers can get gigabyte internet access, symmetrical service for \$49.00 a month. You can't beat that. It's like having indoor plumbing, right?

Josh: Yeah. So, you talk about in your previous paper, "Getting Smart about the Smart Grid", the solutions that you bring forward. You've

termed, instead of a smart grid, it's a wise grid, right? Can you talk a little bit more about that? And in particular, include if you could, the metering side of things? What kind of utility meters would we need to have? What would you recommend making this locally controlled solar integrated, new energy technology integrated wise grid most effective?

Dr. Schoechle: Yeah. Well that's sort of what I was just talking about a little bit. If you have a power grid and a parallel fiber optic that links everything together. It's not just metering that you have to do. You need to control the flow of the energy. In other words, every building needs to have some type of intelligent hub or gateway that controls the flow of energy within the home. And balances the generation [inaudible 36:04] storage of energy on the premises. And then communicates with neighboring premises through the local distribution grid and the fiber network to balance that flow within the community. And the whole community can achieve, overall, extremely high levels of penetration of solar energy by doing that.

Josh: Without smart meters though, right?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, the metering is kind of an interesting problem. Because originally the meters were for the purpose of regulating the controller and controlling the use of energy on the premises. And then, maybe once a month they would be read by a utility company. But they have the cart in front of the horse and the utility industry discovered they could make a lot of money on the smart meter network by installing a completely redundant wireless communication network. It didn't need to be wireless. It made more sense than the original prototypes of those meters that were developed back in the mid-nineties, early nineties, that were really hardwired and through the telephone network. They discovered they could make more money by selling an extra network. And it was a wireless network. And it's really about the money. Because the utility industry makes the money off of capital return on capital assets. So, the meters become a big money machine.

When in fact the meter really ought to be part of a home control system that is working entirely on the premises. And then connect. It could possibly send billing data once a month to a utility. But it doesn't make sense how it's set up now where the utility has to suck out the data on a fifteen interval basis which it doesn't have any idea what to do with. And then send you a monthly bill. And then they sell the data to somebody else, for some other entirely different purpose. It doesn't make any sense.

So, what I'm trying to do is get this back to what the original concept of the smart meter was. As part of a system that is for premises control of energy. Premises based controlled went to somehow the illusion was used to sell the smart meter idea that there wasn't going to be some giant computer in the sky that could monitor everybody's toaster. And somehow control the flow of energy. Which it cannot do. And they have no interest in doing that.

Josh: So, in the solutions that you have mapped out. Is a digital meter still required to do that home level of control? Or can it be an analog meter with the appropriate technology that doesn't suck data out as you put it?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, people want the analog meters because they don't have radios in them. They're not radiating microwaves. You don't have to have a microwave transmitter on your house. In fact, the modern equipment has meters built into it. Like a solar inverter is measuring the amount of power that's being produced, that's coming off the solar panels, and the amount of power that's going into the house. There is nothing wrong with doing that if you are using that information locally to control the flow of energy. A digital meter is just fine because it's not a radio. The issue here is the radio transmitter, turning it into a microwave transmitter, a radar transmitter. Why do we need that? We don't. It's completely useless, redundant, and counterproductive.

Josh: So, we know that smart meters were installed to surveil people and collect data. And they don't even know how to really use it. But in most cases, although some it's being monetized. And you don't know who it's going to. We know that, you know, you said earlier, we talked about 5G basically very, very similar thing. Data harvesting, control, profit, in the name of convenience.

So, my question is this. What is your understanding of how smart utility meters and 5G infrastructure are planned to work together? Or are they not planned to work together?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I don't know. I mean, I would assume that they'll try to milk that cash cow too. The utility industry, they need to make money. So, if they can money off of it, they will do it. They have to get the regulators to let them get a way with it. The data doesn't need to leave the premises. The data is needed on the premises. In fact, the premises need data from the network, from the power companies. Not vice versa. The power company doesn't need data from the premises. The premises need the data from the power company about the price of energy at any particular time. Or what they call demand charges, demand response issues. The flow of data, they have it backwards right now. If you need any data, that's what it would be needed for.

And I think that the idea behind using fiber network to control the flow of energy is actually one of the cutting edge areas right now. There is a technology called transactive energy which is the idea of basically real time, local trading of energy. You know, like short five minute interval basis between homes and buildings in a distribution grid. That could be done. And it could make that distribution grid very efficient. And nobody needs to collect that data and sell it. It's data that is just held on the premises and minimized. There is no need to send data off into the electric company or into the larger grid. It's something for local grid management.

Josh: Yeah. So, in your wise grid solution. Help us get an understanding for the level of effectiveness of solar energy production and energy storage? You know, where is it at right now? And where is it developing too? Like is it viable in terms of large scale transition technology?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, we've seen huge changes in the last year or last two years. In terms of the price of solar panels and the price of solar energy. And also, we have seen not quite as far along yet but it's getting there too. It is changing at the same rate, is the battery storage and the technology behind that. Well, the solar panels are already competitive with any other kind of electricity. Wind and solar are probably, we are seeing proposals around here for just buying solar power from large wind farms and larger solar installations down in the one or two cent per kilowatt hour range which is unbelievable. When, you know, coal and other conventional sources are up to eight or ten cents in some places or more per kilowatt hour.

So, solar is already competitive with any other source of energy. The issue around solar of course, is storage. And so, if you pair solar storage with solar, then you've got the perfect solution. The storage is still very expensive and that the performance improves dramatically in the last couple of years. And it will continue to improve because they use the same kind of battery technology in electric vehicles. And there's a huge effort going on there all over the world to improve that. So, the economies of vehicle battery storage will also accrue to the users of stationary batteries in homes, buildings, and even in local grid operations. So, it's competitive at this point. Solar and storage are competitive with natural gas and are far better than coal at the present time.

Josh: I live close to Seattle. And so, what would you say about this? You know, we don't get three hundred days of sun like you do in Boulder. So, how viable would that be in cloudier climates?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, one thing about Seattle you do have a lot of hydro. And that's one other aspect of it too. Because it can be made to work together with the same electric power grid. Although that hydro is larger scale. I tend to feel that the smaller distributed technologies are going to be better than highly centralized ones. But you already have all that hydro, so there it is. And there's a lot of wind available to in that part of the country.

But to answer your question about the solar, it just takes more of it, if it's not so sunny. Here in Denver area, we have average of three hundred sunny days a year. You don't have that many in Seattle. So, you need more solar. But Germany has gotten a reputation for being one of the most solarized countries in the world already. And they're certainly not any sunnier than Seattle. So, it can be done, just takes more of it.

Josh: So, with wind production and to a lesser extent with solar as well. The technology by default seems to be basically as such that it produces

either magnetic fields and/or dirty electricity, voltage transients, and so forth. Have you had a chance to look into any technologies to mitigate or to make safer solar, especially wind I would suppose, in terms of that concern that people have?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, the technology is available to do that. It's just that, it costs a certain amount. And people that build that equipment, if they don't care about it, they are not going to build it. The new inverters that we have, the new inverters for homes, some of them can be extremely clean. They don't generate any dirty electricity. They actually clean-up the electricity. Some of the older equipment, is pretty noisy. Basically, what you call dirty electricity is the electrical noise that is created by sloppy, cheap electronics. If you take care to design the electronics properly, like some of the manufacturers have done. It's very nice. It's very clean. And you know, the same thing can be said about LED lamps and compact fluorescent lamps. They tend to have real cheap sloppy power supplies, badly designed. Because the people designing them didn't care. If people care. Then they can get this stuff that is properly designed.

The big windmills same story. The electrical problems around those are significant but can be mitigated with the proper designs. I don't tend to be a fan of big wind farms because they required transmission. That means building transmission systems and those create all kinds of radiation and noise. And they cost a lot of money. It is capital intensive. We are seeing an opportunity here to morph the electric system from a hundred year old centralized capital intensive structure to a new decentralized distributed consumer electronic mass market structure. And those kinds of products can be designed to be user friendly.

Josh: And so, by communities, local governments, and individuals getting behind this kind of technology. Not only are we literally bringing our power back into our own hands. And out of the hands of multinational corporate interests. But we're preserving this, like you said, this surveillance economy, right? Sorry, we are preserving our rights from being kind taken over by let's say a surveillance company on the back of a smart grid, 5G network, Internet of Things.

Dr. Schoechle: Yeah. Here again, I agree completely with that. And my philosophy is basically around smaller sometimes is better. They are usually better because it doesn't entail these institutional structures and capital structures that are so politically uncontrollable. If we can favor localized governance and localized distributed technologies, then we'll be much better able to shape our environment in a desirable way. When stuff is controlled by big corporations, you don't get any say over what they do or what they design. And smaller markets work better. When any market gets too big, it becomes out of control. And dominated by corporate interest.

Josh: I'm going to maybe put you on the spot a little bit and ask your specific preferences around some technologies in just a moment. But

you were talking about it is possible, if there is a motivation to do so, to clean up dirty power or voltage transients from wind production, from solar production, that technology is available. It just needs to be an awareness brought to that market and the producers. And then it can be cleaned up. We actually have someone in the Summit, Terry Stoughton. Our audience will be very interested in a specific technology that he has developed. He has in place for quite a long time that are getting specific very positive results with reducing dirty power and also reducing people's utility bills.

So, my question is with regard to storage or energy production. A year or two ago we were hearing a lot about Tesla's power wall as being the new market. The cream of the crop for the commonly known and available product for storage energy. Is that a product that you would recommend? Are there more advanced products out there now? What are you most excited about in terms of energy storage and perhaps if you want to talk about specific energy production? Specific brands? And feel free to name specific brands or companies.

Dr. Schoechle: Okay. Well, that's an interesting question. And relating back to the issue of clean power and dirty power, there is a real opportunity with this kind of distributed architecture storage and small inverters, you know like home level equipment to go to DC power. Or to create a market would be developed for transitioning to more DC appliances which is the cleanest kind of power. So, you know, people don't realize it but if you buy a new dishwasher or some kind of major appliance, it already has a DC motor in. It is DC powered inside. They just run it off an AC power system because that is what is available. But if the market were to develop for DC and it was commonly available, then they would cut a lot of costs out of major appliances by not having to do that conversion. The cost would go way down.

The other aspect, the solar system is inherently a DC coupled system. The solar plus storage that I'm talking about. There is kind of a debate going on in this battery industry and inverter industry over whether we are going to use high voltage batteries or low voltage batteries. I tend to favor the low voltage. A forty-eight volt battery system is a standard that has been around for many years. That was pioneered by Thomas Edison, the idea of not going over fifty volts in a power grid. He really developed a lot of the battery technology that's even now finally coming to market.

But the power wall, from my understanding, for efficiency reasons. And it's running at a much higher voltage because the solar system is cheaper to wire them up so that they produce high voltage DC. But the problem is that is extremely dangerous, and it creates a system that is not consumer friendly. You are not going to go messing around inside a power wall because it's extremely dangerous to work in those voltages, particularly with DC. But with forty-eight volts you could go buy forty-eight volt batteries anywhere and put them in. Consumers can do that.

That is something that is quite accessible to consumers and the new inverters that serve those, companies like Outback, Snyder Electric, and Magnum. Those are basically low voltage DC systems that still work with solar panels, fine. But they convert the high voltage DC into low voltage battery power. And then they work with that in the premises.

So, then you have a DC power bus that's available. There are new products coming out for lighting for instance. Lighting systems that are low voltage DC. All of the appliances you are using, your phones, your computers, everything is running on low voltage DC. That is what they work on. So, if you put a power supply in the wall, it's a 110-volt power supply. It's converting everything to low voltage DC. So, the new standards that I talk about in my paper for building wiring, using ethernet where you can transmit data around the building at the same speed as the fiber coming in. A gigabyte per second if you want to. Copper is able to do that. And not only that, the new versions of ethernet that are coming out now. And the standards committees that I work in, we are working on that right now. The technical standards to support that are new versions of USB that include ethernet and will deliver DC power over the same wire.

So, you can have wires in your house that deliver not only gigabyte data but also power. So, instead of data over power, it's power over data and power lines. So, plug your smart phone into a charger in the wall and it would get both data and power to charge the battery out of the same plug. A new version of USB.

Josh: So, if it's power over data, rather than data over power. Such as the, what is it called? Not power wall. But you know those technologies where you run Internet through the electricity lines in your house. I've tested that and that creates terrible dirty electricity. Terrible voltage transients.

Dr. Schoechle: Yeah, different versions of that for years and years. I've worked with it a lot. And that's not the solution. But the new one is the way to go. It's the power over data.

Josh: So, there is no dirty electricity problems or voltage transients in that solution, right?

Dr. Schoechle: No, it's completely shielded and works fine. It is delivering DC.

Josh: Okay. I also want to say is a transition technology, I don't know if you've heard of MOCHA. A multi-media over coaxial alliance? People watching this can go on Amazon and look this up. MOCHA 2. Tim, I've actually set this up in about four homes. Have you heard of it, first of all?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I've heard the name. But I can confess. That I'm not up to speed on MOCHA.

Josh: Well, what you're doing is the real solution. And so, this is a transition technology that actually has an adapter between your wired

router and the TV cable system throughout your house. It actually allows the internet to be transmitted and be available in every room that has a TV cable outlet. So, that is actually in this house. And I've set up a number of houses. That is a very viable transition technology that I would definitely recommend.

So, I want to get back to the 5G problem and your wired solutions. So, the question is this, it appears to be, Tim, that this is a battle between local governments and the people needing to actually team up with their local governments to preserve local rights. To preserve even individual rights like we are talking about with these locally controlled, home controlled technologies. And against, you could say, the FCC or big corporate interest that are controlling the FCC.

So, when this was first announced yearly this year, I think, it was reported that more than three hundred local governments across the United States were threatening legal action against the FCC. Because we are going to have people sharing this with local government reps. And there's going to be elected officials watching. What would you say to local governments that are really at that place of, of saying, "I see the value in this? I see the importance of this conversation. But really, I'm not sure about this legal battle. I'm not sure about going against big corporate interests or the FCC." What would you say to maybe encourage local government officials that are in that process of figuring out the best way forward?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I'd say you have to stand up to them. They have to get some courage. And realize that they are there to represent their constituents. They are there to represent the people that live in their community. That is their job. And if they can't do that, they need to step aside and let someone else do it. Rather than say, "Oh, our hands are tied by the Federal Laws, the FCC, or even state laws." Get them changed. You have to fight to change this because as you might use the phrase, "Take back your power." You know you have to take it back and that may not be easy.

People may have to do a lot of work to make that happen. At the end of the day, all political power is local. It starts out being local. It's the city council level, it's at the county level, and if democracy doesn't work at that level then it's not going to work anywhere. It has to start there. You have to fight with every tool that you can find. All of these cities and towns have bound together. There are statewide organizations of cities and towns that could represent the interest of those. And their charge is the public right of way. Local governments control the right of way and it's their responsibility to protect the health, safety, and environment of people that live there that they represent. That is where you have to start.

It requires a lot of lobbying to change state laws back to where they were, undo these ALEC laws that got done while we were all sleeping or looking the other way. We fight the FCC. The Natural Resources Defense

Council I think filed one of the suits there. And I know that many municipalities joined that suit. There are organizations in Colorado, it is Colorado Communication and Utilities Alliance. It represents many, many towns and cities in Colorado. They joined the lawsuit with the NRDC. So, that is going forward. I don't know the status of it right now. But it's basically to undo what the FCC has done. And there are also laws being brought forward in Congress. People make a racist issue with their representatives and we will see if democracy really works. But what else have we got?

Josh: It's on trial right now. Democracy's on trial, right?

Dr. Schoechle: Absolutely. This is a test. The corporation as an institution, that is the root of all this. The way we have allowed the corporation to become, what I call the Frankenstein invention of humanity is the corporate ration. It is the machine that's out of control. It's very efficient and effective technology. That form of organizing human activity. But it's completely out of control. And it was allowed to go out of control. And there are things being proposed now to bring it back under control. Everything from anti-trust enforcement, a great book now by Tim Wu. I don't know if you have heard of that, but he talks about revitalizing the enforcement of the anti-trust law.

There is a big editorial in the New York Times just last week by the co-founder of Facebook saying that they should break it up. And that is exactly what Wu was talking about. So, we need to get the people elected that will make that happen. There are many other aspects of corporate governance. Corporations, I think they can be salvaged but it needs some work. There is a thing called a B Corp that we could move to. It's a nascent movement, mostly breweries that I know of. But it's an efficient way of making a more benign corporation with things that can be done. It just takes local action to start with.

Josh: Local action and political will, right? In this context, how important is it that the people communicate and educate their elected officials in this?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, it's vitally important. Because the elected officials they are really swamped with issues all the time. I know some of the members of the city council here and they have hundreds of pages of stuff they have to read. They don't get paid very much, if any. They don't have any staff. And they have to make the decisions. What ends up happening is that the counties, state, and city governments end up being controlled by the bureaucrats, the managers, and not the election officials are so strapped for time. So, anything you can do to make it easier for your legislators, for your elected officials to get up to speed on things and help them. Anything you can do they appreciate. And then of course, they are swamped. The old saying, "The squeaky wheel gets the grease." So, you have to be the squeaky wheel if you want to get their attention.

Josh: Yeah. So, we're advocating for people to do a simple action along with thousands of others wherever they live and educate in a grounded scientific way, in a solutions way to their elected officials. So, what are your thoughts on this general strategy, Tim? People teaming up with our elected officials to pass an ordinance against FCCs power grab. So, retaining light of citing in local government.

And whatever legal process emerges as the most effective that cities are using, in addition to cities actually taking steps to control, develop, and build out the local infrastructure? The local wired fiber infrastructure to the building level? And let me just ask for that building out, I guess, a part B to that question is. And how would you recommend cities allocate funding to do that? So, what do you think of the strategy first? Fighting legally big brother and at the same time creating a roadmap for building out wired and safe solutions?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, the first issue, I think, as they say, it just takes getting to know your local officials, your elected officials, first of all. And getting to know them. Being able to go meet with them. Have a cup of coffee with them. And don't assume they are in the pocket of your opposition. Just be upfront with them and tell them how you feel. And make sure your friends do the same thing. Actually, I think they'll appreciate it. Don't assume that there is a conspiracy. Don't assume that that everything is wired against you. Just assume that you need to say it enough times so that they get the message. Keep in mind that they are very busy.

Now on the other issue, what was that?

Josh: Like at the same time, you know, taking a stand against the corporate ties, centralized control, and for local, they are actually building out the solution. So, laying the groundwork for the wired solutions to the home and so forth.

Dr. Schoechle: Right. And one of the things is that it's well established that cities and towns put in sewer systems for their people, and the water systems. In fact, in some parts of the country that's been ironically that's been a problem. Why can't we have clean drinking water for everybody. That's the most basic function of a town, of a government. The next step somewhere along there is going to be getting internet access for everybody there.

Unfortunately, while we were sleeping, I guess, back in 2005, ALEC went around and got at least twenty states to pass laws that prohibited municipalities from building fiber networks or any kind of communication stuff. So, in preference to corporations, private corporations. They got their agenda. Well, we have to undo that stuff. We have to go back and get those laws abolished. They did the same thing recently with the small cells. But this was just about fiber, getting fiber networks. In Colorado, fortunately, there was an opt out that cities could go if they went to the ballot box. They could opt out of the damn

thing. But these corporations will try to cement their monopolies if they can. And that's what they have done.

Now some of the states, as I said twenty states or so have that problem. The FCC actually overruled that. The old FCC overruled that but then it got stopped in Court. So, there was a court battle. But the FCC was on the correct side of that issue in trying to enable broadband fiber in Chattanooga, Tennessee. I mentioned this in my paper. I described the whole battle. But that stuff has to be undone.

And then particularly companies that own their electric power system already, can do this very quickly. Chattanooga, Tennessee was an example of a municipal power system that then put in optical fiber network.

A few years ago, it was state of the art. The new state of the art is Longmont, Colorado, which is a city of about a hundred thousand people that has probably 50,000 customers that have electricity and now potentially optical fiber. They can now move that system to an advanced distributed power grid if they want it. You know, the solar is catching on all over Colorado. So, we realized what the crisis is with the climate change issues, fossil fuels, and pollution. I think it's just amazing what has happened just in the last year in terms of cities in Colorado adopting a hundred percent renewable energy goal for their community.

Josh: And laying the groundwork with these integrated fiber solutions like Longmont, was it?

Dr. Schoechle: Right.

Josh: And basically, laying the groundwork for them to take back their control, take back their rights, and actually protect their people at the same time in the long term of these big corporate interests.

So, my next question is, have you identified a funding plan or roadmap that financially local governments can do this? They can assume the responsibility for building out. Like how is it being done? What do you recommend to local officials?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, the cases that I just cited. I think Chattanooga was able to do it because they got a large federal grant that helped them. They still had to provide a lot of the money, but it really got the thing going. And likewise, Longmont got some federal money to initiate that. And some of the rural electric associations that I know of in this region, in Colorado, New Mexico, got some funding to put in optical fiber with their electric power systems. But bottom line is the municipalities have the power of taxation. And they can do bonding.

An example is our neighboring town of Fort Collins. Which decided that they have owned their own electric power system for some time. The problem is it is mostly based on coal. But they are trying to figure out how to transition that into solar. They made the decision last year to do a bond authorization for about \$150 million to build out optical fiber

along with the electric power grid. So, that they could then do the same thing Longmont did. That is a bundle of money, but it's not beyond their means. And the payback it's been shown, it has been in place a number of years in Chattanooga. And then, and it's too new in Longmont to have any statistics yet.

But in Chattanooga, they were able to show that the return was a billion dollars in the first of few years in terms of local business. How to revitalize the entire economy of the city. You can see how having that kind of infrastructure could revitalize the local economy particularly in this era that we are going to conventional ways of doing business and conventional work patterns. Work and employment are changing to where there is more and more responsibility on individuals to fend for themselves or work at home.

They call the giga economy or whatever. Communications becomes even more important than it ever was before. And, that even then the businesses work better if they have good communications. I think that kind of investment by communities in doing bonding to support a fiber construction would be paid off. Each one has to take the courage to do that.

Josh: Yeah. And local governments also have the power to do, on the other hand, to make it more difficult for large, the triopoly, to take their zoning rights away, to take their deployment rights away. In other words, they can do things like recertification fees. I know that on the Environment Health Trust website, Americans for Responsible Technology, Telecom Power Grab, and a couple of other websites, they are actually laying out.

Have you seen this, Tim, where they are actually laying out sample legislations, sample ordinances, that issue recertification fees to the wireless providers to make it unprofitable or highly less profitable for them to deploy small cells everywhere. And secondly, they are passing ordinances to set minimum distances. I think it was fifteen hundred feet if I remember correctly. As an example, minimum distance from cell sites, residential, or school areas. Any thoughts on those sets of powers that local governments do have?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I think that's right. I heard other people mention that. And I have to say, I don't know. I'm not completely up to speed on what those options are specifically. But I think that is their responsibility to do things like that. The local government can and should do that to basically represent the interests of their citizens and controlling the rights of way. The environmental issues around that, they are a tremendous responsibility.

Josh: Yeah. And then recently the California Supreme Court upheld its opinion. Either an opinion or a ruling. That basically affirming that, in this case San Francisco, or any local government has more power than we've been told that it has. In context of the 1996 Telecommunications

Act. They are different ways to interpret that. And what seems to be emerging is that it's not entirely accurate to basically be under the opinion that local governments have no power because of Section 704 of that Act. So, that was actually upheld on the local government side, just fairly recently in 2019 in California.

Okay, that being said. Just moving towards wrapping up this really fascinating conversation, which we have kind of covered the gamut here. And I'm really just interested in how you can powerfully bring solutions in several different areas at the same time, Tim. Thank you for that.

I just want to kind of get your closing thoughts on what we're seeing here is the need that we've identified for local interests, local people, communities together with their local governments. To basically come together and take a stand, individually and collectively, at the local level to create something new, right? Because if they don't, then the big power is just going to continue that narrative. Just in closing, would you have any other suggestions that would help the viewer to kind of encapsulate or frame the heart of the message here?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I think the things you're pointing out are excellent things. And one of the things that can be done to take advantage of that, of those things you mentioned, is better communication between cities and towns. We have some experience here in Boulder and in Colorado of cities learning to work together and collaborate. And to trade the knowledge that they've gained. Because they all share a lot of the common problems. A lot of their problems are unique to their community.

But then a lot of them are not. They have a lot of common solutions. And some of the stuff you just mentioned a few minutes ago, is in the category of sharing information, experience, and even sometimes legal costs will make it easier to do. And actually, give them the courage. When they see that they are just not off by themselves having to fend for themselves. But they have colleagues next door that they can work together with in other communities.

I think there are a number of those organizations forming around that are focused on different topics. That is a way to go for local activists to learn what the landscape is and make sure that their public officials are aware of it.

Josh: My last question. Are you optimistic about the future? And if so, what are there any other keys in order for the people to unlock a positive future?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I don't know. I have to be optimistic. Because I don't know what else to do. I guess it is part of my nature anyway. But I think there is always a way. One thing is, look at every situation. One thing that I learned early on as an entrepreneur is that look for the opportunity at every catastrophe. There is usually some other way to take advantage of it.

Josh: Well, Tim, thank you so much for joining us today on the Summit. We encourage everyone out there to check out those two seminal works of Tim's. "Getting Smarter About the Smart Grid" and "Reinventing Landlines and Wire Technologies". So, Tim thank you so much for joining us today.

Dr. Schoechle: Okay. Well thank you very much, Josh.

Debunking 7 Myths About 5G

Guest: Trevor Marshall

Josh: Trevor Marshall, thank you for having this conversation and talk with me, joining us here about 5G. Tell us a little bit about your background.

Trevor: Well, let's see. While I was at high school, I was a radio amateur and I used to use radio waves to talk to all my friends. And I used microwaves back then in 1965. I set Australian record because I was originally Australian before I migrated here. I said Australian long distance records for the 600 megahertz; 576 megahertz band, which is exactly why we're talking about T Mobile here of 130 miles to send a voice transmission over that.

I used to monitor the satellites. I was only 10 years old when Sputnik went up, but I still heard this Sputnik beeps on the shortwave radio. And then by the time the first handset went up in 1964-65, I had a lot of antennas in my backyard listening to the satellites and trying to understand what it was all about. And decoding the telemetry and that sort of thing. So I don't have a fear of satellites because I know them, and I know the technology.

And then I lectured at university until 1978. 1978 I transferred to the University of Western Australia and started doing clinical research. I studied for my PhD which was in diabetes, trying to mathematically figure out what was the cause and effect of diabetes on an individual. And then in 1982, 37 years ago, I came to the States, and I've been working here in California ever since on a variety of things. We were working with [Inaudible] Photonics on the very early scanners, the SPECT

BT scanners that they were developing in Japan. A number of other scientific things. And then, in about 2001, I started to work seriously on the molecular research, and we made a breakthrough on understanding and treating chronic disease. We have about a dozen peer reviewed papers on that at this point. And so that's where we are now. It's sort of all coming together.

Josh: Would you consider yourself more of a doctor or technological engineer or a scientist?

Trevor: I'm all of those. So I'm interested in what to do, which is a technological engineering bit. I'm focused on the science, because there's so much non science out there both in medicine and in 5G. And then the medicine, I've given speeches at many, many conferences around the world. You can find them on my YouTube channel; youtube.com/Dr. Trevor Marshall. So I'm interested in them all. I'm having a great time.

Josh: How do you see 5G? What's the nature of it? What's actually happening here? What's true and what's myth, help us to really crystallize our understanding of 5G?

Trevor: Yeah, everybody's idea of 5G is a little bit different. And it doesn't matter where the carrier is or consumers. We really don't know exactly what people are saying when they're talking to us about 5G. I see 5G as a Trojan horse. When we go back a couple of years, Google was doing some work with their high flying balloons; the Google loon project. And the first of the satellite constellations that were going up to bring communications to the whole of the planet was being mooted. And I think the carriers that providing our cell phone services now realize the threats that these new methods of delivery offered. One of the biggest threats is that they offer a lot more bandwidth, because they use the higher frequencies and millimeter waves to deliver signal rather than the microwaves that are currently in use.

Therefore, there's a lot more information that can be put on a carrier. They pause strains that are used to modulate data onto a carrier can be a lot faster, a lot more data can go across. And way beyond the limit of what the terrestrial telcos can manage with their current 4G build out. And they wanted to be part of this whole thing. They wanted to make sure they had secured some spectrum in the millimeter wave band.

And the lobbyists started working on the politicians and persuaded the politicians that it wasn't good enough just for the satellites, who have a line of sight to us. In microwave transmission, it's very important that you can see the other end of which you're transmitting to, because anything in the way will attenuate the signal make it get weaker. So the satellites can use very high frequencies, because they have a line of sight

between the satellite 350 miles up and the earth. Whereas the cell tower that's sitting half a mile or a mile away from you at the moment, may not have that line of sight. It has houses in the way, it may have trees, and it may even have undulating ground.

So they decided that -- they'd make sure at least that they had some of this bandwidth preserved. And they went to the FCC, the FCC has run the options, as you know, for the 27, 24 and 37 gigahertz band and is about to run them for 49 and possibly higher. But they've secured themselves some bandwidth at a very low price compared with what they paid for their microwave bandwidth.

The next problem they had is the cost of the towers. It costs quite a lot; \$25,000 a month is not unheard of for a telco to put a tower on private property or industrial property in one of our smaller cities. I'm not talking about the bigger cities, which are a special case, but the smaller cities, the metropolis. And they really can't build out the metropolis heavily enough when they're having to pay that amount for the towers rental.

So they came up with this idea; well, why don't we put all of our antennas on the street, then we can put them on street lights. And we can force the local councils to give us those street lights for next to nothing. And the rental that they're paying on those streetlights is next to nothing. Several hundred dollars a month is fairly typical. So it's a huge change, which allows them to build out, essentially, free of charge.

So the next thing they decided to do was to do it quickly. Because Elon Musk with his first batch of satellites, which is already up there, is threatening to go online as early as the end of 2019 for the first ring of satellites and into 2020 for the full ring of satellites. The full coverage of the United States and indeed the world potentially. And then Amazon also is putting some satellites up. And Google still got its balloons, which are active in some areas of the globe at this point.

So the telcos, if they're going to cling on to their business model that they've used for so long, they're going to have to compete with these new sources of internet because the satellites will be faster. In fact, Elon Musk is claiming that his satellites will be faster than Fiber laid on the ground because the speed of light in fiber slows by about 50% as it travels through the fiber. And that gives him the up and down time bars which he loses when he's going up to a satellite.

So it's very interesting the way things are shaping up. But in terms of 5G, what is 5G? Well, it's an evolution. What happened was, the telcos went to the politicians, and with their lobbyists said; look, we need to increase the amount of data going to people, increase the speed of data. And because this Internet of Things is being built out, we need to be able to

support a lot more consumers than we currently have. Because their coffee kettle is going to be sending back signals directly to some central server and they need to be connected just like people do with their cell phones.

Josh: Smart Home, smart meter etc.

Trevor: And then they thought, "Oh wait, what about smart cars, or there's a lot of consumers there. So let's start talking about smart cars as well." And 5G sort of evolved. I've watched it over the last couple of years. And what we have now is a mishmash. Everybody is rushing to market. They haven't been able to make it pay it incidentally, because people are not prepared to pay extra for the service and most homes service pretty well now by cable and fiber anyway. So there's nothing to stop a person getting "5G router" to put it in the corner of their home connected to the fiber and get the 5G speeds right now before any build out occurs.

Josh: Now, I wanted to just jump in there and ask you; what does it mean when we look on those who have Wi Fi turned on in house, we look on a router it says 2.4 G and then 5G. What does that mean?

Trevor: That's a different 5G.

Josh: Yes.

Trevor: That means 5 gigahertz, that's a Wi Fi standard. So it's a 2.4 gigahertz/ 5 gigahertz, 802.11AB it's what it is called, technically.

Josh: Okay, so that does not mean that 5G is in your home. I just want to clarify that because it seems like some people are under that impression.

Trevor: Yeah. Now it doesn't mean 5G is in your home. Although some telcos and T Mobile are ones that sticks in my mind advertising, they will give you a 5G router to put in your home if you're a subscriber. And they would prefer that you put it near the windows so that all your neighbors can get it as well. There's all these subtle build out going on to try and grab for the market, the land based telcos see slipping away from them at this point in time.

I mean, why is it slipping away? Nobody thought that Musk could put up 60 satellites on one rocket, and that they would nearly all be functional. It was just unbelievable. And then for the satellites to be positioned, they actually have motive power in them so that they can position them. It's just a step in technology nobody expected.

Josh: Now, what's the difference in the level of risk compared to the

terrestrial 5G; the 4G being evolved into 5G on the ground and the 5G satellites? What's the truth as we kind of step into clearing out some of the myths and really crystallizing a clear understanding?

Trevor: Okay. So at the moment, most of us have got a cell tower say half a mile away on average. Just say 3,000 feet away, just over half a mile on average. And that tower may be anything from 40 feet to several hundred feet high. And the transmitter at the top will be putting out effective radiated power somewhere around 1,000 watts, give or take a bit. And that means that people in the vicinity of the tower are not going to immediately fry like eggs. So about 1,000 watts typical power from a tower. So then, let's now take the situation of what we're faced with, which the government is mandating that towers be built at the end of your driveway, every second driveway. Then you're talking about a distance of, let's say, 30 feet from a house.

So you've got 3,000 to 30. So the signal now is that much closer, hundred times closer. But the way that signal goes out, it goes out as a sphere, goes out as a cone. So it drops off in strength as the radius squared, rather than the radius as a distance squared. So that 100 times distance means 10,000 times in relative signal strength between the signal in your home from the tower half a mile away, and the signal in your home from a tower at the end of your driveway. And 10,000 times is a fairly significant number.

Nobody really knows how much power going into the small cells yet, because they're still starting to deploy them. But my guess is it's going to be somewhere around 10 watts or about 100 times less. But that's still going to be pushing 100 times the current level of exposure of radiation into people's houses. And yet people are being made sick right now by 4G from the towers. And there are plenty of studies to show that even the earlier generations 2G and 3G cause increased sickness within about 300 meters of a tower. It's measurable with studies. So everybody is going to be now in that region where they're subject to risk for sickness due to radiation.

Josh: How does that compare to satellites?

Trevor: Satellites are 350 miles away. And I have actually computed all the numbers but I can't pull them out of my head in terms of how many feet 350 miles is. What it means is, by the time the signal gets to the surface of the ground, it is very weak. Just strong enough for a cell phone. Normally with 4G, the signal around your house is -- I'll take that number again, 10,000 times greater than it needs to give you a good cell phone signal. The signal strengths tend to be logarithmic and 10,000 is 40 db. And you know, it's a difference between what a cell phone comes up at five bars and the typical strength in a suburban environment these days.

So when the signal from satellites get to the ground, it's just enough to give five bars on a cell phone with a properly designed antenna out outdoors. Now how much attenuation they'll be in roofing materials and things we don't know, and that has to be seen. Basically, outdoors is a known quantity, it can be calculated, the signal strength is very low. It still has an effect on biology because biology turns out to be exquisitely sensitive to electromagnetic radiation. But the effect is much less than we currently have with 4G.

Josh: So it still has also an effect on total surveillance planetary wide. I mean, that's one of the ground concerns perhaps of the satellites.

Trevor: Yeah, it does, but it doesn't allow close location. The cell phone towers at the end of your driveway allow your telco to know within about one yard, within three feet where your phone is in your house. So they can see when you get up in the morning and your phone moves from the bedroom to the shower, for example.

And then they can see when it moves to the kitchen. A complete pattern of your daily behavior can be logged at that level of precision. The satellites can't get any location or precision at all really. They can get some GPS signals from the phones perhaps if the GPS is getting into the home. Although the satellites will see every signal on the planet, they can't locate those signals accurately.

Josh: Not accurately, knocked down to the several feet or perhaps even inches that small cell towers and even through your neighborhood could. What about with satellites, doesn't your phone also need to communicate back to the satellite when your phone output has to be higher?

Trevor: Yes, it does, but it can be directed up away from the head. The designs that I've seen from Sony and some of the other people who have actually been working on 5G phones. Samsung just started. Sony has been doing it for a while. Basically the phone is a little bit longer. So it sticks above the head. And then there's a directional antenna at its top, which points electrically. Does it change physically, but it still changes the sensitivity electrically at the satellite.

Josh: And what happens if you quickly turn the phone sideways or if you're using it sideways or any number of things could potentially happen there.

Trevor: Yeah, it's a different ball game altogether, you're not going to get the signal. Small amounts of movement it can compensate for, but not like --

Josh: I'm talking in terms of radiation though if it's pointing upwards, if

it's really emitting upwards. And what happens if say you put your hand in front of it or you turn your phone sideways or anything like that?

Trevor: Well, like all millimeter wave; the true 5G shortwave signals, it will be attenuated almost completely by a hand or a human body or some other water based medium. Anything that's got water in it will absorb all the signal. So you know people are the obvious thing that have water in them and if you get between your phone and the 5G tower, then you've lost the 5G signal.

Josh: So what frequencies are comprised in 5G? is it all millimeter wave? What are we talking about here?

Trevor: No. They're now taking their 4G frequency bands and repurpose them to send out the 5G power saving signals and go to 5G, but the frequencies is still the same. 678-900 megahertz is the key bands because that penetrates inside houses and inside buildings. And that is the way that the ground based telcos have been marketing they're aware, instead of marketing as when you get home, then you'll of course connect to your local router which is sitting inside your home. They say, "No, we'll put out a powerful enough signal to get through your walls." And that's why the signal some 10,000 times larger than it needs to be inside the average home, because many homes fairly well shielded, and they need a larger power. That's how they build out their network.

Josh: So what happens with, for example, kids playing in the front yard?

Trevor: They're being exposed to the signal that's coming in from the tower, which is, as I said, going to be 10,000 to 100,000 times greater with the small cells build out on the street, because the kids are going to be 20-30 feet away from the smoke cells, very close indeed.

Josh: And what is the science say about that level of risk?

Trevor: The science says that the level of risk right now is too great. And you can see it. There are people just in our locality here; people giving testimony at the local city council. 50 or so people that I've seen there in the last few months that are desperately ill, and their physicians just can't help them. There's no drug that will offset the sickness. It's really debilitating for those people who are sensitive to the current levels. And as this intensity goes up, as the radiation goes up, more and more people will start to be affected by that radiation. Some people are not going to be affected at all. Most people are going to be -- now I should say most. There was a study out a month ago, which said that about 30% of the population in the United Kingdom is mildly electro hypersensitive.

So they're going to be getting problems in about 10 years from the chronic diseases that we've been working whether it's well. And those

chronic diseases developed slowly, and at some point they'll become overwhelming and be diagnosed, but it's about 10 to 20 years out is when they typically appear.

And I'm talking about the autoimmune diseases, arthritis, cognitive dysfunction, encephalomyelitis, chronic fatigue syndrome, that sort of idiopathic or unknown chronic disease condition. And then some will be immediately affected. Some will only be affected when they get near to towers and they feel their skin start to crawl, which is very commonly happening now with the smaller cells, because people are getting much closer to it. And they suddenly finding, "Oh wait a minute. I can feel something. I feel like my screen is crawling."

And other people have different symptoms of course, but you know, there is an instantaneous effect. Then there is a longer term effect on your immune system, knocking your immune system down, therefore, making us susceptible to chronic disease in the 10 to 20 year time frame. And then there are some people who may not have any impact at all just like with smoking. I just use smoking as the example there, not everybody dies of lung cancer.

Josh: So you're saying that all this is science based. How many studies would you say show an effect from the kind of radiation we're talking about with 5G?

Trevor: None. And the reason I say that is because nobody has ever tested post 5G signals for biological activity. They haven't even tested post 4G signals for biological activity. But with 4G, we can point to the people who are being made deal and their physicians, the doctors that can't help them. So we have some data of 4G, we have none on 5G because it's not deployed. It's going to be worse. How much worse? Hard to tell.

Josh: People are basically Guinea pigs; being treated as Guinea pigs by the wireless industry that we know has co-opted the government.

Trevor: Yes, we're all in voluntary subjects in a huge experiment.

Josh: Okay. Now, you mentioned there are no 5G studies; industry admitted that they're not doing any studies. They admitted that in a federal Senate hearing in early 2019. Now, how many studies are there just in wireless radio frequency electromagnetic radiation in general those indicate harm for approximately the levels that we're talking about of exposure?

Trevor: Countless studies. 10s of thousands of studies going right back to the First World War. And even before that, the early pioneers, for example, died of immune disease. Marconi died of a cardiomyopathy

of the heart; unknown heart disease condition. So it goes right back in the First World War when the ships were being fitted out with first short transmissions. People were becoming ill from that. And then in the Second World War with radar, was very much worse. And radio operators were known to have a high incidence of sickness. And then as TV and FM radio stations were built out, and AM radio stations became more powerful, then we also see that there's data coming in from them on sickness as well. Now most of the studies have been done in a lab to get controlled conditions. And therefore they don't use post waveforms.

There are quite a few that have tried to simulate 2G, and very few that have tried to simulate 3G with post waveforms. But you know, basically, you can't do a study unless you do a study. And as you say, the industry is not doing studies on 5G, they never did it on 4G. They almost got away with 4G. If you think about it, step back and think about it. And what we're talking about now, should have been talked about when 4G was brought in, but it wasn't. And so in some ways 5G is an Achilles heel that will come back, because now we're all aware that there is something going on there that not all of us are going to be affected immediately by it. And that there's really very little knowledge of what that effect is going to be in the long term.

Josh: So people have basically been kept in the dark about this whole story because it hasn't been talked about in mainstream. Governments are telling us it's safe. How can it be that there's only --

Trevor: No, no -- the California Department of Health estimated back in 2002, that 3% of the California population was being affected by electromagnetic transmissions.

Josh: Okay, but we're not hearing about even that, right?

Trevor: No, because it was suppressed. Professor Moskowitz at Berkeley University had to sue the state to get them to release the documents that they had prepared 10 years ago, telling people to be very careful how they use their cell phones. And even then the industry forwarded through all the courts that no, it's perfectly reasonable for a retailer to put up a sign saying, This Might Harm Your Health. The industry wouldn't allow that. And they use every means at their disposal to slow down the dissemination of knowledge to the consumer.

Josh: Does this 5G agenda have what you might say is an Achilles heel?

Trevor: Yeah, people are talking about potential risk now. And they weren't before. It's very widely talking. You and I are talking, but they're also talking in the local newspapers. And that's a big deal, very big deal.

Josh: Okay. Now, just one of the other myths, help us to understand;

what does it mean when you see 5G on your phone now.

Trevor: Depends on your phone. There's software in your phone that decides what it's going to put on your screen. And if you're a T-Mobile customer, then when it sees signals in the 600 megahertz range, which is a very well known frequency range that it can be modulate with the algorithms for 5G, then it'll put 5G on the front panel. And that'll be a bit faster than 4G, but not that many times, maybe five times typically faster.

Josh: So not necessarily does it mean that it's emitting millimeter wave frequencies like super high 24 gigahertz.

Trevor: Exactly.

Josh: Not necessarily does 5G on your phone mean that?

Trevor: No, it doesn't. 5G primarily is a method of transmitting the data on the signal, method of modulating the signal. The amount of spread spectrum there is from the data that's on the signal.

Josh: What are the carriers' plans though, and the satellite carriers' plans for millimeter wave frequencies that you know of?

Trevor: Sony has some technology which will be released. I'm sure they'll probably license it to Apple, I would suspect. Apple has been doing some work on millimeter waves. And Samsung now has formed a new division to deal with millimeter waves and satellite communication. But what we're seeing right now is really 4G+. If this Trojan horse called 5G hadn't been so effective in persuading the politicians to make it easier for towers to be put up through our residential areas, then that'd be talking about 4G+ rather than 5G.

Josh: So the biggest concern that you have about 5G or like you're saying 4G+ is the fact that instead of cell towers being located a long distance away. In most cases, they're every 2 to 5, 6 7 homes, right?

Trevor: 250 feet every 2 to 3 homes, typically. 250 feet is what the FCC put into its regulations, which is crazy, because Verizon says that it can send 2,000 feet and they're planning for 2,000 feet. But the regulations have already been written that the towers can be put in every 250 feet. So that means when kids are playing in the roadway, or people walking down the footpath, they'll only be getting signals from towers near them, but also very, very strong signals from towers a little bit further away. And remember, 300 yards is the level at which health effects have been reliably detected by a number of studies, big studies.

Josh: So 300 yards is a distance at which we know that there's serious

health effects. And now it could be 20 to 30 feet in front of your house, and your kids could be playing in front of your house; highly susceptible to this vastly increased amount of exposure.

Trevor: Well, as I said, if you take a 30 foot distance to the small cell and compare that with a 3,000 foot distance to the tower half a mile away, which we have now, that's 10,000 times higher radiation level that kids are going to be subjected to.

Josh: 10,000 times, because like you said --

Trevor: Hundred times distance squared.

Josh: The law of inverse square, in terms of radiation exposure, okay.

Trevor: Yeah.

Josh: So, Trevor, assuming that we in the summit and everyone else bringing awareness can get the word out in a significant enough way. Do you see is this a solvable problem, are there solutions being piloted. How can we solve this problem?

Trevor: Every one of our attendees in this seminar needs to go to their local city council and find out what the city council's attitude is to allowing these small cells to be built in the residential areas. Many cities including my own, have written a blank check for the telcos, they can put them anywhere. And that is just disastrous. So some cities, particularly up in Marin County, in Northern California, have said no, not at all. You're not going to put any towers, any small cells in a residential area. Because that's how it's always been for 37 years. In our city, it's been now build out in the residential area and suddenly they're doing it, instantly doing it overnight with hundreds of towers being erected at a time.

Josh: What are your thoughts on the wired solutions, fiber optic to the home and to the business as Timothy Schoechle is bringing forward?

Trevor: The best way is wired. I have two connections here. I have a fiber to the house, which was put in by Verizon and I've got a coaxial cable modem which used to bring TV but now brings high speed internet. And it's as fast as you could want, much more effective than trying to do it with wireless.

Josh: And do you see opportunity for city councils and local governments to take control of their infrastructure and follow the example of these pioneer cities and provide wired right to the buildings, right to the homes as an alternative to 5G?

Trevor: Oh, absolutely. The forward looking cities such as ours used to be, have already done that and deployed fiber, which is the best. But you know, cable is pretty good too. And repurposing the cable TV, repeaters, and telcos to handle internet is not a huge task.

Josh: Yeah. If we don't take action on this, let's say just talking about humanity as a whole. If we don't take action on this, how big of a problem do you expect this to cause.

Trevor: Professor Martin Pall said that this is a civilization ending event. We know that people are sterilized by holding their cell phones in their pockets of their trousers, or their purses, for example. We know that that's reduced sterility. Overall male sterility has dropped 25% in the UK. So, that and then the sickness that is going to arise. Our health systems are just not capable of dealing even with sickness from past exposures, let alone future exposures. When I started diabetes research back in 1978, the incidence of diabetes was very infrequent. But it's just gone straight up from that time around the 60s and 70s, to where we are now. And it's got so bad that the RAND Corporation did a study in the United States of US adults. And they found that 60% of US adults are taking prescription medicines for one or more conditions, and that 12 and a half percent have five or more conditions.

So these this is a real problem facing us in the world now, but certainly in the future -- in terms of just the health of the population. So Dr. Martin Pall raise the flag, a lot of people criticize him for doing that, but I support 100%. He is 100% correct that this could be a civilization ending event.

Josh: And he's saying that based upon the scientific studies, not based upon some --

Trevor: Based upon the scientific knowledge here, because scientific knowledge comes from studies, as you would understand them, which are controlled studies where you have a group that's not exposed and a group that's exposed. You can't do them anymore, because everybody is exposed to electro smog. So you can't do a controlled study anymore. But that is what people think of when they think of studies. But you can also do it in other ways by exposing individuals, by taking individuals away from the radiation and putting them in Faraday cage environments or remote environments. There are a lot of ways that you have to do the studies in order to get something that's scientifically reasonable and scientifically based. That's different from what you would think of as a study.

Josh: What sort of benefits can be gained by someone to mitigate or reduce the electromagnetic radiation within their own home?

Trevor: They can try and keep it out of their home. You can use the graphite painting; the graphite paint on all the external walls, you can use low energy glass that reflects out the radio frequency signals fairly well. You can use a metal roof which is a big factor, big hopping factor. But beyond that, there's not a lot you can do and the signal was still creep through the cracks because the body is so exquisitely sensitive. As an individual who is electro sensitive, you can wear shielded clothing, which will give you some degree of protection, but nothing that can reverse this effect.

It is just so profound because when the molecules in our body become damaged, the body has to repair them, and the body repairs them on its own time frame. And that means it takes days.

Josh: This is why it feels so good to take a nature vacation to get in the woods, whether it's on a daily basis for a little bit or just go off grid for a while. After a few days, you just start feeling better. So Trevor, thank you so much for joining us. What would you share in closing?

Trevor: Everybody needs to go to their local council and find out what is the situation, has the council allowed these new small cells to be built in residential areas. They must stop the small cells being built in residential areas.

Josh: Excellent. Trevor, thank you so much and we'll be chatting again shortly.

Trevor: Okay, thanks, Josh.

“Clear Evidence of Cancer:” The \$30M NTP Study

Guest: Ronald Melnick, PhD

Josh: Joining us on the summit is Ronald Melnick, PhD. Ron, thank you so much for joining us today.

Dr. Melnick: Glad to join. Thank you.

Josh: Can I call you Ron or Ronald or Dr. Melnick?

Dr. Melnick: Ron is what my friends call me.

Josh: Okay. Well, thank you. I’m going to read your bio in a moment for our audience, but you basically did the design and you lead the \$30 million national toxicology program study on wireless going back about 20 years is when it was first initiated. So you have firsthand account. This is going to be very powerful information from somebody who actually did the actual science, we’re going to get his perspective on the studies, on the science, on the safety standards and on 5G. So very powerful interview here. I’m glad to be sitting with you, Ron.

Dr. Melnick: Yes, just a point of clarification, please. I lead the design. I retired before the studies were completed. I did participate at the peer review of that study.

Josh: This was 2018.

Dr. Melnick: 2018.

Josh: Okay. Great. Thank you for that clarification. So Ronald L. Melnick,

PhD is an independent consultant and was a senior toxicologist for 28 years in the National Toxicology Program or NTP at the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, part of the National Institutes of Health. Leading the design and interpretation, as he mentioned, of numerous toxicity and mechanistic studies on Environmental and Occupational Chemicals. He led the design of the NTP study \$30 million project for toxicology and carcinogenesis studies of cell phone radio frequency radiation in rodents.

Dr. Melnick has served on numerous scientific review boards and advisory panels, including those for the EPA and the WHOs, International Agency for Research on Cancer or IARC, which classified radiofrequency radiation as a possible carcinogen in 2011. And Dr. Melnick also spent one year at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy working on intra agency assessments of health risks of environmental agents.

That's a significant background and it's very good again to be speaking with you on this. So let's dive into this, and I want to understand and just give our audience a clear understanding of what is the NTP study that was funded by the government, how big was it in scope, and what was your role in it?

Dr. Melnick: I wonder if I should even step back a little bit further for the audience who may not know what the National Toxicology Program is.

Josh: Please.

Dr. Melnick: Okay. So the National Toxicology Program began in 1978, where the Secretary of Health Education Welfare at that time, thought it would be best to combine the various agencies in HEW, which is now DHHS, into one toxicology program where each of them were conducting their own toxicity studies. So the National Toxicology Program is actually a combination of multiple agencies. Right now that includes the Food and Drug Administration, CDC and National Institutes of Health with NIEHS being where the program is headquartered. So it began out of a cancer bio-assay program that was being conducted at the National Cancer Institute, and that eventually moved down to Research Triangle Park in North Carolina. And that's where I spent my 28 plus years at the NIEHS national toxicology program.

Josh: Okay, great. Thank you.

Dr. Melnick: Okay, so the national toxicology program also accepts nominations for studies from multiple sources, any source. They can come in from agencies. Typically the major sources of nomination are the National Cancer Institute. It may be Occupational Safety and Health.

It may be EPA, maybe even FDA, as well as citizens or unions or any group. The nominations undergo review and eventually, those that are selected come under the guidance, not individuals within the National Toxicology Program. Okay. So then, cell phone wireless radiation came into the National Toxicology Program from the FDA; Food and Drug Administration.

Josh: Okay. That's what commissions this major study?

Dr. Melnick: They requested it.

Josh: Okay.

Dr. Melnick: They wanted us to conduct animal studies in order to assess whether there is a risk to humans from cell phone radiation. Because exposure guidelines that existed at that time were based on thermal or heating damage to tissues from short term exposure. And they felt that it was important that we try to understand whether or not there are long term health effects that might exist from non thermal exposures, so trying to reduce the heating effect. As most people know, this is microwave radiation.

If you're exposed to high level, it causes heating. That's why we eat our foods in microwave ovens, but at lower levels, where you can minimize the heating effect. And that's what cell phone radiation is. Are there health effects that might exist in the absence of that heating of tissues?

Josh: So you're looking at possible effects that occur at levels far below the threshold of what it's required to heat the tissue, which is what the standards are based on.

Dr. Melnick: Yes.

Josh: Okay.

Dr. Melnick: I can tell you a little bit about the standard if you're curious.

Josh: Please.

Dr. Melnick: Okay. So the standard was developed as a result of exposures. This was done in monkeys, where monkeys were exposed to this microwave type of radiation. And there was a dose, which I'll try to explain, which was 4 watts per kilogram. It's just a numerical value at this time, just to keep it in mind, which the body temperature did not increase by one degree centigrade. So that became the target for cell phones exposures. The value 4 watts per kilogram was divided by 50 to say that this would be a safe dose for whole body exposure to humans. And 4 divided by 50 is 0.08 watts per kilogram.

Okay. But there's another standard that goes into that, that is for the whole body exposure. The other aspect is local tissue exposure. So, over a one gram part of tissue, the exposure would be 1.6 watts per kilogram. These values are called specific absorption rates or SARs. And if you look into a cell phone, where there's a link, I think it's under general information towards regulatory standards. You can find out what is the permissible exposure or emission from your cell phone that has been tested. So that's standard is 1.6 watts per kilogram. These numbers become important because they're involved in the design of experiment.

Josh: Okay. Now, can I just ask why is one number, you know, far more stringent of a threshold for whole body exposure, and then the number goes much higher for a specific point exposure?

Dr. Melnick: I'm not sure exactly why. The whole body, as I said was based on a temperature rise, whole body temperature rise. I think if you're exposed to walking by a cell tower, for example, or you're close to a cell tower, your whole body is exposed. But if your whole body is exposed, it's that tissue level which may see a higher level as long as your whole body is within that limit. But I want to explain one of the things about that, is the importance between the 1.6 and 0.08 because this is very important. Because the NTP studies were focused on the 1.6 watts per kilogram and the reason was, where the antenna is, the antenna is emitting the cell phone radiation. For example, if this was an antenna, if I held it next to my head. So this was a cell phone, if I held it next to my head, the tissue that is being heated is the tissue that is right next to the antenna.

So what I'm concerned about is that 1.6 watt per kilogram in that tissue. If I divide that by my whole body weight, because now linking it to my ankles, my calves, the rest of my body, that would dilute out the fact of the exposure to the local tissue. So there's a local SAR of 1.6 watts per kilogram, and a whole body of 0.08. In designing the NTP study, I was most concerned about the 1.6 watts per kilogram because that is the permissible exposure.

Josh: Got it. Okay. So you're on the 1.6 watts per kilogram, which is based on the SAR standards, the specific absorption rate standards. What is the permissible threshold for microwave radiation from a cell phone pertaining to the tissue next to it, so that's based on just the heating standards. Okay. So please continue.

Dr. Melnick: Okay. So the experiments that NTP did we're in animals, and you cannot measure SAR in live animals or in people. There's a modeling effort that goes into that. So the cell phone itself when it comes up with a value is based on the antenna next to a simulation fluid, a fluid that has properties similar to tissue. And from this that modeling effort comes up with and evaluate. And it depends on how close the antenna is to the tissue. Because the further away the antenna

is the decrease in the power by a square of that distance. So if I double the distance, the antenna from my head, the power level is one fourth instead of one half. Okay. So the NTP does studies in animals, and why do we do studies in animals as opposed to people? Okay, well first of all --

Josh: Ethics.

Dr. Melnick: That's one of the reasons. Another reason is that many of the process of disease occur similarly in animals as in humans. Every known human carcinogen is also a carcinogen in animal studies that have been conducted properly. Okay. Another reason is that there's the issue of confounders when you do human studies, that, you know, you're exposed to one source, but then there's other environmental exposures that also occur. Was it due to the particular source that you're focusing on or that was a contribution from other confounders? With animal study, we can very carefully design a study to quantify and really measure that exposure in the animals.

And then lastly, if there is an effect hopefully, the regulatory agencies would make use of that data to reduce exposures to the extent that we're reducing risk, because cancers can have a long latency. And it may be 30 years before we really know whether or not something is safe, as opposed to an animal study which you can conduct in much fewer years.

Josh: Okay. Was it a 20 year study, correct? And was it with 2G and 3G radiation? Can you just confirm?

Dr. Melnick: The study took about 20 years, but it was the actual chronic study of the exposure of animals. Because it's a multi phase study, the animals were actually exposed in the cancer study for just over two years.

Josh: So two years of collecting data, is that right?

Dr. Melnick: Two years of exposure. I can go through a little bit in terms of the various steps in the process.

Josh: A brief overview, please. Yeah, that would be helpful.

Dr. Melnick: So the actual exposure for the cancer is two years. But in terms of design of the experiment, and this is where I was leading this effort, comes in terms of; how do we do an animal study with cell phone radiation. You know, obviously, you may see cartoons with little cell phones on animals. But in reality, we needed a way in which we could expose animals to the radiation without disrupting their normal lives. There had been some studies which had been done on this type of radiation.

And at the time, we felt that this was inadequate for understanding whether or not there was an effect. At the time that the study was conducted, there was the assumption and this is important that the only effect from this type of radiation would be heating, because this is non ionizing radiation, it doesn't break chemical bonds.

So we wanted to challenge that hypothesis, is there an effect that is not due to heating? And if there is such an effect, can we collect enough information for what we call dose response analysis, so that we can sort of quantify the risks, because an animal study is relatively insensitive. We're dealing with typically 50 -- this one, we had 90 animals per group. But in a study of that sort, you don't reach statistical significance until you see at least a 5% increase over the control rate. Now, 5% rate in the human population would be epidemic.

So animal studies are typically done at much higher exposure levels than humans experience. And through a dose response analysis, we try to estimate what is the risk at lower levels. So, obviously, 10% risk is unacceptable, but what is acceptable? Is one in 1,000 risk. We're considering 250- 300 million people in the US have cell phones, one in 1000 is a lot of people. What about one in 100,000? What about one in a million?

These become difficult questions in terms of what is the acceptable risk. It's something that actually the Supreme Court addressed in the 1980s. What is acceptable risk? I don't know if you want to hear their conclusion.

Josh: Sure. What did they say?

Dr. Melnick: Okay. They punted a little bit. It said, if the risk is less than one in billion, it's insignificant. If it's greater than one in 1,000, it is highly significant. So they left a big gap between one in 1, 000 and one in a billion. EPA adopted one in a million. OSHA; the Occupational Safety and Health Administration adopted one in 1,000, which is quite different. But in any case, we want to know what is that risk because if you understand the risk, you can then make efforts to try to reduce the risk either through modifying the device or taking other precautionary measures.

Josh: So before we get into the findings, I just want to confirm; this was a 2G and 3G technology, is that right? And was it with mice or rats or what animals were used?

Dr. Melnick: Well, we use mice and rats. The main effects were seen in rats.

Josh: Okay.

Dr. Melnick: And it's basically to 2G. But a lot of the 2G is still relevant to 3G, it's just fast. So in terms of designing this study and this is why it took a long time. I contacted engineers and physicist at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, because a different group there had helped us in terms of wire radiation; the very low frequency radiation. And I spoke with an individual there, his name is Perry Wilson, and we started discussing this concept of reverberation chambers.

And we tested the feasibility of doing an experiment in a reverberation chamber. You know, a reverberation chamber is a room that is like a big microwave oven. And within that room, you have an antenna and the antenna is emitting the radiation. And then within that same chamber there are paddles, of which the radiation is actually bouncing off in all sorts of directions. And over short time, it creates a homogeneous environment of this radio frequency radiation.

So we wanted to consider doing our experiments of animals in a reverberation chamber. So we needed to demonstrate that you could create a homogeneous environment such that animals located in one part of the room would receive the same radiation level as an animal in a different part of the room. It took a while to develop this. We then interacted with a group in Zurich, Switzerland. And we got involved in modeling the nature of the absorb dose in animals and in their specific tissues when exposed in reverberation chambers. So they developed this modeling effort to quantify at the frequencies that we used, what would be the level of absorb dose. So the frequencies that we used were two frequencies; 900 megahertz and 1800 megahertz, because these were the center of the frequencies used for cell phone communications.

Josh: Is that 2G and 3G respectively?

Dr. Melnick: Yes. I believe that these are still being used. Yeah, the 3G and -- I'm not sure. I think 4G is also. 5G is going to be very different. 5G is much higher frequency.

Josh: Yeah. So let's dive into the findings now. What did you discover?

Dr. Melnick: I just got to do one more --

Josh: Okay. I'm a bit impatient, but I'll let that go. Because you're establishing a very important foundation here before we get into the finding. So please, continue.

Dr. Melnick: That's what I'm trying to do. So if you recall, we wanted to do this, what we consider heating wouldn't be the effect. So we did what we called a thermal pilot study, in which we exposed animals to various power levels. And had temperature measurements taken because we wanted to keep the body temperature rise to less than one

degree centigrade, because that's the basis for the cell phone regulation guidelines. We found four rats, instead of 4 watts per kilogram, you could go to 6 watts per kilogram.

That ultimately became the highest exposure that we used in ours. As I mentioned a little bit before, when you're doing a toxicity study, you typically go much higher, and you do a quantitative risk assessment and extrapolate down to lower. But we couldn't go higher than six, because six would start to create the heating effect. Okay. So the first thing to do was to establish what the highest level is.

We also use to modulation which have been in use. One is GSM, which is Global System for Mobile communications, widely used in Europe. And I believe two of the networks in the US; I think it's AT&T. I'm not sure if it's T-mobile or not. It's GSM. And the other was the CDMA which is a Code-Division for Multiple Access. These are modulations that allow many individuals to get access to the network. So we included both GSM and CDMA in our studies.

So to increase the power of the study, we increase the number of animals. Typically an NTP study has 50 animals per group. When we went to the chronic study, we increased it to 90, and the highest exposure now was 6 watts per kilogram. We also use 3 watts per kilogram, and one and a half watts per kilogram. So essentially dividing the dose in half, such that if there was an effect. It might be possible to do a dose response analysis for a quantitative risk assessment. And for rats to increase sensitivity, we included rats from pregnancy on through delivery, and then two years. Okay, a typical NTP study is two years after their two years, starting at around six weeks of age.

Let me just explain one other thing in terms of the reverberation chamber, because I think it's also important. In a reverberation chamber, the animals are free roaming in their cages, which was important since previous studies had animals constricted in tubes during their exposure. Also, in previous experiments, animals couldn't have access to water, and therefore the exposure periods were limited to two hours per day.

We wanted to increase that exposure duration since we couldn't increase the exposure dose. And we worked out a way in which animals could receive water during the exposure. Now you can't just put a bottle in there, because the bottle of water would absorb the energy and heat up. You can't shield the bottle and just have a super tube. Because the animal would -- that water would also heat up and you could get some sparking between the animals when they're drinking.

So built into the design, there was an automatic water system with a little choke on it so that the animals could get water without the tip of their head exposed to the radiation. The study went on for two years

after delivery. And in rats, there were multiple effects. Some of the effects that were observed were increases in Schwannomas of the heart. Schwann cells are the cells that create that myelin sheath around the nerve. That was one of the types of tumor effects in male rats. The other was a glioma; this is a brain tumor was also observed in the exposed animals not in the control animals.

So, we had four rats. We had a control group, exact same chamber. The stirrer was present. There was even an antenna there, but there was no power deliver to the antenna. The other groups under the exact same condition had various levels of power delivered such that during the course of the study, we could maintain one and a half, 3 or 6 watts per kilogram for animals. So as they grow, the exposure intensity could increase, but the actual SAR dose was remaining constant.

Josh: So you discovered the findings were Schwannomas of the heart, is that a malignant tumor?

Dr. Melnick: Yeah.

Josh: And then gliomas in the brain, is that correct?

Dr. Melnick: That is correct. In addition, when looking at effects in terms of making a decision, how strong is the evidence? They are an uncommon tumor that you don't see very often in control animals, takes a little more precedence over something which has a high background. So when you see small number increases, but if it's against an uncommon tumor that you hardly see in them in the program, that has much more relevance.

Josh: And is Schwannomas and/or gliomas uncommon?

Dr. Melnick: Yes, these are uncommon.

Josh: You mentioned that the Supreme Court said between one in 1000 and one in a billion, somewhere in that gray area is, like say the threshold OSHA says one in 1000 increase. And another, EPA says one in a million. What are the numbers in terms of the NTP study? How much did it increase in those two cancerous tumors?

Dr. Melnick: Well, you can only answer that question if someone will do a risk assessment with the data, and that hasn't been done. The intention of this experiment, it was a nomination from FDA so that a quantitative risk assessment could be done. And if quantitative risk assessment could be done, that information then would be provided to the FCC who sets the guidelines. And the intention would be to develop health protective guidelines as opposed to guidelines based on the assumption that it's been reduced and there's no heating effect. The quantitative risk assessment has not been done.

Josh: In other words, the FDA who asked for the study to be done, it got done. There were significant findings showing increase in cancer, the cancerous tumors. And then what happened? It just got dropped, or what's been the impact of these findings? And are you satisfied with the impact that it's had?

Dr. Melnick: Well, I'm not satisfied. That's for sure. Because the FDA said we can't apply this information to humans.

Josh: Why?

Dr. Melnick: Well, they didn't give a reason. They just made that statement. The director of radiological wireless devices just made the claim. This is not applicable to humans, which actually makes no sense since FDA nominated it, so that we could do a quantitative a risk assessment for humans. So FDA is essentially shirking their responsibility and did not fulfill the intention of their nomination.

Josh: Now, you wrote an article in the hill last November in which you said; the FDA reason that "Existing exposure guidelines are based on protection from acute injury, from thermal effects of radio frequency radiation exposure, may not be protective against any non thermal effects of chronic exposure." And you said, "By adopting this new position and ignoring the NTPs results, the FDA is, like you said now, clearly shirking its responsibility of assessing the impact on human health and radiofrequency radiation."

So we could go in a couple of different directions here, but just the understanding. The significance of that understanding that approximately \$30 million was invested to see if cell phones cause cancer at or below the allowable levels in rats. And the answer is that there was a significant increase in Schwannomas of the heart and gliomas in the brain. And then they just dropped it.

I guess, I want to ask the question, like why do you think -- now we're getting into speculation here and we know that Harvard Ethics Department has written about the FCC is being controlled by industry. But the FDA, we've heard in other conversations various things about them. What's actually going on and how significant of a thing is this, Ron? The study was done it showed cancer and then they just dropped it. Help us to frame this here?

Dr. Melnick: Well, I can't tell you why they decided as such. All I can say is that they decided at this point, or as far as I know, not to do anything about this. This information was actually available in 2016 when the NTP released some of the partial findings because of the potential impact of these findings on the general population. The tumors in the heart and tumors in the brain were known in 2016. It could be that they don't want

people to think that their cell phones pose a cancer hazard. Maybe they have other reasons, and I can't say whether or not the industry is having an influence that is certainly a possibility. But seems to me that from a public health perspective, what you want to do is understand the risk, quantify it and do something about it. Promote precautionary principles, at least for people.

You know right now many of the sites, they make the statement; if you are concerned, you can do this. Well, as a general citizen of a person who uses their cell phone, they may say, "Well, if the FDA isn't concerned, why should I be concerned? If the FCC isn't concerned, why should I be concerned?" To me, they should have at least said, "This is what you should do, because of these results while we are determining the risk." This would put a little more pressure on the industry to reduce the amount of the emission that's being delivered from the phones.

Now the industry has done some improvement over time on their cell phones so far. As I was mentioning before, it's the location of the antenna which is emitting the radiation. Where that is located makes a big influence in terms of the dose that is received by that local tissue. So the antenna has been moved from right next to your ear to the mouthpiece. So it's lower, and it does provide a little bit more distance. But it depends on how people use their cell phones. To me, at least provide certain recommendations, just sensible recommendations. People are texting more, which is good, because they're not holding the phone next to their head. Do people know that when the signal is weak -- and you can see this on your phone, the number of bars. When the signal is weak, the phone is trying harder to maintain good communication. So it's emitting more power than when you have a strong signal.

Josh: In some cases it's thousands of times more. I've actually tested it with my corn and electroshock meter. It's shocking on how much the radiation from your phone goes up if you have only one bar or even two.

Dr. Melnick: Right, most people don't know this. And the FDA should be promoting this kind of information as opposed to just saying, we're going to ignore it.

Josh: How else should the FDA and the FCC respond to and use this NTP data? What should they be doing?

Dr. Melnick: They should be doing a quantitative risk assessment. We should be able to work through what are the exposure levels, which would be exposure and duration of exposure that are associated with a cancer risk of one in 100,000, for example. If that is a risk, if people knew that their risk was say, one in 1000 for speaking an hour a day, a year. And I'm just making up numbers. If they knew that their risk now was

one in 1000, by holding a cell phone next to their head for an hour a day. They might say, "Well, I don't want to accept that risk." And they would do something.

There's another aspect for children, which I'm also concerned about, because the radiation penetrates further into the brain of a child, and the brain is more susceptible to tissue damaging agents in a developing brain. But there are many toys that are being developed for children, which are of a concern because the children don't know whether they look the phone, or a different device which is similar. That should be limited. If you don't know the risk you -- it's hard to understand how people will react. If they understood the risk and FDA make recommendations, for example, we're working to try to reduce the emission level. But in the meantime, take these recommendations.

You know, when you're on an elevator, and you're down to one bar, maybe that's not a good time to be on the phone as opposed to just disturbing other people who are on the confined space with you.

Josh: Yeah, it seems to be a liability, isn't it? I mean, maybe this isn't your expertise, your area of expertise. And in considering things like this are reasons that the industry and government is doing this. But it seems like if they were to say when you're on an elevator or when you have one bar, don't put the phone next to your head, then that would work. That could -- maybe from their perspective, they're concerned about causing a panic. But really, they're concerned about liability once this thing reaches a certain level of threshold. Like, isn't there a reason why Lloyds of London and certain large insurance outfitters don't insure wireless companies products?

Dr. Melnick: I hadn't thought about that. But it makes sense.

Josh: Yeah, certainly. So you've done also some -- Please.

Dr. Melnick: Let me just mention -- there were a couple of other effects besides the tumors. There was also a disease of the heart called cardiomyopathy. It's a disease of the muscle tissues in the heart, which showed a very clear dose response. There was DNA damage in the brains of rats. And a number of mechanistic studies have been done since the IARC evaluation in 2011. And might be providing clues in terms of why there is now observable DNA damage occurring in brains. In addition, as I mentioned, the rats were exposed during gestation in uterus, and there was a reduced body weight of the pups.

So there are other effects which appear to be going on. And basically, when you see these types of effects, we now know that that first assumption that the study was designed to challenge, that assumption is wrong. The assumption that the only effect can be heating of the tissue

is wrong since we tried to control the temperature effect to the extent possible. Seeing multiple effects, we can't rely on assumptions now we're talking about wireless devices.

Josh: Yeah, very good. And you know, in the early 70s, Zory Glaser put together for the US Navy research there 2300 studies with five pages of effects from microwave radiation at various intensities, it must be said. But I mentioned that in my film; Take Back Your Power. Now my question is, so you looked at several effects and you noticed several effects from this NTP study, what about all of the other possible effects that weren't looked at? And you can surmise that this type of exposure of microwave radiation affects life, affects biology in multiple areas. So I just want to turn focus to your role, you have done considerable work with the IARC panel, the WHO.

Dr. Melnick: That's right.

Josh: And I wanted to ask also; what impact did the NTP study have on IARC? And also, could you summarize briefly your role of work that you've done with the IARC panel?

Dr. Melnick: Okay. Well, the IARC panel met 2011. So the NTP data work available. Okay. At that time, the IARC panel, you probably know, came up with a determination that radio frequency radiation was possibly carcinogenic to humans. Now, this IARC has a certain type of process that most people probably don't understand, aren't aware of. They invite people from worldwide to come to Lyon, France, to prepare what they call a monograph. It's basically a book, and for the cell phone radio frequency radiation as with chemicals, they divide the people into four groups. One group looks at the exposure and emissions. One group looks at the animal cancer studies. Another group looks at the available human studies or the epidemiology. And the fourth group looks at mechanistic information that was available at that time.

IARC had sponsored what was called a multinational evaluation of cell phone radiation under the name Interphone that had big impact on the discussions at the IARC meeting. In addition, there were a number of studies done by the Swedish investigator; Lennart Hardell, who had also reported numerous studies in which they found increased brain cancer risk, which were glioma tumors. They also found Schwannomas of the sheath of the nerve near the ear, which shows a concordance between the NTP studies and the human studies. At that time, the animal studies were considered limited. There weren't adequate studies in conventional models. There were a couple of what they call initiation promotion studies or co carcinogenic studies which showed a positive effect, but it was very limited. So limited -- IARC has terms. Limited means that the information wasn't convincing in animals.

The human data was also considered limited. And the reason for this is that there are different types of human studies that have been conducted. One is case control study. A case control study is one in which you, for example, have people who have a particular tumor or have died of a tumor, have a particular type of cancer. You look at this population, and these may be hospital based. And you match the characteristics of that population with a population that doesn't have that type of cancer. So you match them by gender, by age, maybe other factors.

The Interphone study and the studies by Hardell were case control studies. The issue that came up at the meeting was case control study might have a bias, because you're now asking people or their descendants on the use of the phone by the person who has the cancer. And they designed the questionnaire to try not focus on just the one issue. But there may be a bias in terms of a person saying, "Oh, yeah, he used the cell phone on that side of head and that's where the tumor occurred."

So there is that potential bias. The other kind of study are what are called cohort studies; you looking at a large population and you're trying to see within that large population is the tumor rate higher in those who use cell phones more compared to the population that doesn't use cell phones or uses it much less. These kinds of studies were negative, but they have big problems in terms of the classification of exposure.

So for example, if you're looking at a large population, you know, thousands and thousands of people, they sometimes go to their phone records. A phone record may not actually reflect the use by the individual who has the subscription to that phone. So the cohort studies were negative. The case control studies, the Interphone, at the highest exposure level were positive, as well as the Hardell. The IARC panel came to the conclusion then that the information for humans was -- the term limited, limited doesn't mean not have an effect. It means that there was a causal interpretation, is credible. But you couldn't rule out chance bias or confounding to a reasonable extent and therefore it was left at limited.

So when you have a limited human, limited animal, the IARC puts that together as a possible human carcinogen. A limited human and sufficient information in animals would be a probable human carcinogen.

Josh: So is there a movement among scientists, the scientific community to reclassify radiofrequency radiation as either a 2A probable or a group 1; a definite carcinogen.

Dr. Melnick: Well, there have been more studies by Hardell as well as

others. In France, there's another positive study for gliomas. There's a nomination process that goes to IARC for studies being requested that are evaluated in the near future, they do these in five year intervals. As far as I know, the radio frequency radiation was discussed and it is in the plans for a reevaluation. I don't think it's fair to say, a push by people to call it known or push to call it something, because it's an evaluation process in which -- in the case of the 2011, there were about 25 people. There's judgment involved in all of this. You know, I have my own belief in terms of where it might fit right now, but others might believe differently. It's a scientific debate among the experts at the meeting who come up with a conclusion.

Josh: Okay. This is really good. I want to cover some more ground here as we move towards wrapping up the conversation. So really quickly; you mentioned that the FDA is shirking its responsibility by acknowledging and responding to the data of the \$30 million NTP study, is the World Health Organization also shirking its responsibility here?

Dr. Melnick: I think they're going through the process. It takes a while to bring together all of that information to get a panel. So as far as I know, it's on schedule. I don't know if it's scheduled, but it's in the plan for the next five years interval to reevaluate radio frequency radiation.

Josh: But meanwhile, switching to 5G now, industry is pushing the deployment of 5G as we know in the United States and around the world without having done any studies that show safety and without even a plan to do any studies. I am pretty strong in my understanding that that's because they know they're going to find if they look closely enough, they actually do a study. So how big of a concern is it to you that this is happening, and if so, why?

Dr. Melnick: Well, I can tell for multiple reasons. One is, as you just said, we're bringing back the concept of assumption without data. There's the assumption, "Okay, this will be safe." And we should have learned the lesson on radio frequency radiation used for cell phones, that assumptions are not necessarily in the best interest of public health. So I say there needs to be a demonstration of safety as opposed to just a declaration of safety. In fact, there was a Commerce Committee meeting on 5G in February, and Senator Blumenthal raised this question. And was looking for assurance that this was safe, and he was told, "Well, there's no consistent evidence of harm." But no, there are no studies.

So obviously, if you have no studies, you can't show evidence of harm. But you also can't validate the assumption that it's also safe. So to me that is a problem. The other issue is the antennas. The way the 5G works, they don't transmit very far. They don't transmit through structures. And therefore they're going to be located in neighborhoods, very close to each other. From what I hear it's in the range of 200 yards

to 300 yards maybe apart for an antenna which will be on a lamppost, not far above ground, so that people just walking in their neighborhoods -- If you're in a city walking by lampposts, you're walking near these antennas, which are emitting this type of radiation, for which we know little about its effect. Now, the 5G doesn't penetrate the body to the same extent that the radio frequency radiation does.

Okay, and they talked about -- okay. So it's absorbed mostly in the skin. But when you're out -- remember I was talking about confounders. When you're out in the environment, you're exposed to more than just 5G radiations. You're exposed to UV radiation when on a sunny day. So if UV radiation is involved in the development of melanoma, what happens when you now add 5G radiation and UV radiation together?

Now we can say or we're going to assume no effect, or we're going to test that hypothesis and demonstrate that there is no effect. What about your eyes? When people are walking by near these antennas, is there any risk to eyesight? Any damage? I don't know the answers. But no one can tell me that they have the answers because the experiments haven't been done. So yeah. So I'm concerned that when we expose something across the general population, without understanding risk, or the health effects, I would be happy if there were no health effects. But I'd be happier if I knew that there was evidence demonstrating no health effects, as opposed to just claim it.

Josh: Yeah. And so we know from Devra Davis and others that we're talking with in this summit, that there are independent studies on millimeter wave radiation that do show biological effects to a very serious degree, in some cases. And there is an indication that the effects could be penetrative into the body. One study is about the sweat ducts and how the sweat ducts could act as helical antenna to transmit that energy into the body and cause effects deeper in. And Martin Pall also talked about another mechanism, that millimeter wave can cause effects deeper.

So yeah, very concerning, obviously, here situation. Let me ask you, just as we kind of wrap up here; What would it take in your perspective to shift the paradigm, the way that things are done from industry free for all, claims of safety with nothing to back it up. And they're just for profit, just pushing, ramming it forward to either, you mentioned precautionary principle, like isn't recognized in some other countries in Europe, or the weight of evidence principle. Maybe talk about that, and what do you think would be required?

Dr. Melnick: Well, it's a tough situation right now because 5G is also political. And in the political environment in which we exist, we're in competition with the Chinese, and they're going to develop 5G, and we got to beat them to it. The politics is also controlling what's going to

happen, denying local cities. Their opinion in terms of whether towers are placed within their community, you can't do that. This is something which they're just saying, it can be done, it's safe, and we're going to do it. I think the science needs to be done. Because the characterization of 5G isn't even complete. We don't even know when we say 5G, what is it that be transmitting from those antennas exactly? What are the characteristics? All we know is it's 5G, it's going to be high frequency.

How do you test something when you don't even have the characterization of what you're testing? So to me, what would be best would be rather than getting into these; this is safe, this is harm. Bring the industry and the scientific community together to say, we want to deal with this issue. We want to be health protective. What should we be doing in order to know that we're not increasing health risks by the implementation of these new antennas in neighborhoods? So it becomes this side versus that side. And when the politics favors one side, they win.

So when the FDA says we're going to ignore the radio frequency radiation study of the NTP. There is no pressure being put on them as far as I can see, other than myself and others speaking out against it, to do something. But the government has remained silent. And if they were to do something and show the risk, that might raise concerns for the industry, or the government, or the--- SCC. If RF poses a risk, what are we doing with 5G? And they don't have an answer.

Josh: Yeah. So we really need what you're saying, the next step in responding to this incredibly important study that you design. The NTP study is a risk assessment by the FDA.

Dr. Melnick: That's a first step, with a simultaneous recommendation in the meantime, to take precautionary steps.

Josh: And include 5G frequencies, and they need to expand the focus, do the science. And for that to happen, that needs people power. Like you said, it's you and several others speaking out against them. But we need to have people putting pressure on these agencies that are run by commercial interests, unfortunately. And also liability actions to hold them accountable, there needs to be accountability and a liability.

Dr. Melnick: Unfortunately, the way our system works is when the regulatory agencies don't act. Decisions get made in the courts, and it's litigation, which sometimes forces an issue that is ignored by the government. And this has happened for a number of chemicals. And I'm not involved in litigation on radio frequency radiation, but I understand it's in process for people who've developed brain cancers. To me, that's not the way in which health protection should be accomplished. The better if the government, scientists and regulatory agencies and the

industry work together, saying we don't want a problem. How can we avoid it?

Josh: Thank you. Dr. Ronald Melnick, thank you so much for your time today and your work over the years as a scientist and for helping us to frame and contextualize this problem and gear towards solving it. So thank you again.

Dr. Melnick: I do hope that there's some solution at the end. And by the way, is one other person who -- I don't know if you've interviewed or whether he would be interviewed, is have you spoken to Senator Blumenthal? Because he raised the question and never got an answer. Has he gotten an answer since then? Is he pursuing it? Because like, we were discussing before, it's people rising. Once you have a senator that adds a little bit more strength, then individuals who understand a little bit of the science. It would be interesting to hear Senator Blumenthal answer some questions from you.

Josh: We haven't been able to establish connection with him yet, but that is a very good idea. And yeah, we haven't heard back yet basically.

Dr. Melnick: I'll be the joint.

Josh: Thank you.

How 5G Sites Are Being Blocked and Removed

Guest: Raymond Broomhall

Josh: Joining us on the summit today is barrister at law from Tasmania and Australia, Raymond Broomhall. Raymond, welcome to the summit.

Raymond: Thank you for having me, Josh. It's a pleasure.

Josh: Now, I'm so excited about this interview. Actually, we're doing this in two parts. The content you are bringing is tremendous and empowering for people and really regulatory, because you have created and have implemented a legal process in Australia and Tasmania. And that can be done in other countries that has resulted in hundreds of small cells sites and 5G installations being either prevented or removed, is that correct?

Raymond: It is thousands, not hundreds.

Josh: Okay. Excellent. I just wanted to understand it because I don't want to overstate anything. I want to really just be clear, because this is really, really big news. This is a huge part of the summit, is this process. I'm so glad to be able to -- First of all, in part one, we're going to talk about the results. We're going to talk about the theory, we're going to talk about the applicability and surrounding conversation about this process. And in part two, we actually are going to dive in 22 step by step points. Ray prepared a three-page document, we're going to go through step by step how you do this legal process. So yeah, let's dive in. Ray, I'm going to just read out your bio, so to give the audience a bit of background on you, and then I'll stop talking and then you can talk. How's that?

Raymond: Sounds great. Okay.

Josh: Go ahead.

Raymond: As we sign, Australia should be right mate.

Josh: Should be right mate. We were just talking about that before the call. Anyway, I need to go to Australia and New Zealand. It's definitely on my bucket list. So, Raymond Broomhall is a licensed and practicing barrister in Australia and Tasmania. And he's getting results dealing with 5G and stopping it, which is what we're going to get into.

And Ray specializes in out-of-the-box legal approaches, he's in very high demand throughout the world for his work specifically on electromagnetic radiation issues and small cell installations, and getting results there. He is considered to be one of the leading legal advocates in this field. So Ray, tell us about the result before we get into kind of the theory and overview. And then in part two, as mentioned, we'll do step by step walkthrough. Tell us about the results you're getting with this legal process?

Raymond: It's been a bit of a journey. And I guess the penny drops when I realized the best approach to it. And the beautiful thing that I've realized is that a lot of my work doesn't require actually going to court. The telcos have started to realize that it's in the too hard basket for them, they don't want to air their dirty laundry in court. And they decided to withdraw quite quickly.

The success I've had, I guess would be -- I'll start with probably Wilsons Creek, which was in New South Wales, South East side of Australia. And in New South Wales, it was an issue that we had with a telco who was building a tower, we put together a process where we talked about the criminal side of things, and also the precautionary principle issues. I'm the Counsel with the correct tools so that I could reject the development without having to have appeal.

And we were successful with that and stop the tower. And that's when the floodgates started opening. And we realized that a medical certificate was extremely important. And then I went to another issue where I had eight doctors in a street, who were having small cell 5G placed on a power pole next door to a child's bedroom on the street. There were eight doctors on that street, and they decided that they needed to engage me to assist. And at that time, I was also working with another 30 different organizations and communities throughout Australia with this particular network and this telco provider. So in essence, will taking on the entire network with this telco provider. Now this telco provider already had 900 small cell facilities already established, which basically means that already placed on poles

throughout Australia, and they had another 1600 to put through. So they'll propose that all up. We were looking, in that particular one network was 2500 small cell facilities.

Josh: So 2500 small cell facilities, 900 are already installed, and then another 1600 are planned. And this is nationwide across Australia or just in one state?

Raymond: That's state. They've already spent around 130 million dollars on the network. And basically the best thing is I put everything together, joined forces with the doctors, got an expert medical opinion to come forward. And then we had the telco actually attend a public consultation meeting. And we absolutely floored them at the meeting. We also encourage council to attend, which they did, and also members of local governments. And it got to the point where we were very successful with that, and they pulled the pin on it.

Josh: Wow. Now, just on the timeline here, help us to establish when was that process started? And when did you have the result?

Raymond: Okay. Well, it was basically in August, and we had the result in January.

Josh: Of 2018, and then the result in January 2019.

Raymond: That's correct. Yes.

Josh: Okay. Excellent. And so, I mean, that's significant. Have you heard of anyone else in the world really doing a process like this that is actually not only stopped, but reversed small cell and 5G towers?

Raymond: Not I know of doubt. As far as I can see, I'm probably the only person that's been doing this. I do have some counselor assist me and other lawyers. So I do have a small network and a small team that are with me on this. But yes, it's been interesting.

Josh: Now, you're licensed as a barista at law in Tasmania and Australia, correct?

Raymond: Yes. Tasmania is part of Australia. So in Australia, we have seven states and territories. So I can practice in pretty much anywhere I want to in Australia. Yes.

Josh: Okay. Now, you're going to be teaching us a process. That, is it directly applicable? Can it be used in other Western countries? Tell us about its international applicability first before we kind of dive into how it works.

Raymond: Yes. The way I see it is that it's actually very simple and very common sense. On this when your viewers listen to it, they'll actually understand that it should be applicable pretty much worldwide, I would think.

Josh: And just to the viewer out there; in part two, we're actually walking through as mentioned, but we're making the document template and guides, everything as a free included downloadable, so stay tuned for part two. So let's dive into how this works. Ray, just give us, not the step by step the level of detail, but the theory. How have you developed and what do you use in your legal action that has resulted so far in this very significant level of success?

Raymond: I guess the best way to explain it is it's all about putting not only the telcos but also councils, also members of parliament, any decision maker on notice that this thing, literally maybe non ionizing electromagnetic radiation, actually has a potential risk of harm. And to establish the evidence for that so that anything that's written -- when an objection is put into a telco that there is explicit evidence that backs up that claim.

So in essence, getting a medical doctor or medical practitioner to have a look at the science, realize that yes, there's -- they're saying that there no established health effects. They will we have turned that around and said, well, non established health effects, okay. Well, that means that there's no scientific certainty as to whether or not it's safe or actually causes harm. There are thousands of studies out there that indicate that it is actual harmful.

So therefore, the precautionary principle kicks in, which basically means when there is scientific uncertainty, then you must err on the caution. And so what I've done is, in effect, got medical practitioners to assess the science, and it's up to them to come up whether or not they believe that it's harmful or not, or it's got a risk of harm. Now, once my client has received this medical advice, then the fear of this particular electromagnetic radiation being emitted onto them from their neighbor, which is a telco, is enough to start criminal action in a court. And I can explain that later. But that's basically the principles. So in essence, we use the precautionary principle, we circumvent federal law where they try and use telecommunications acts and federal standards, such as in Australia, we call it the ACMA. In the US, I think they call it the FCC, F triple C or whatever it's called.

And basically what it is, is we would have worked around that. And I realized that the trick is to bypass all that and go straight to the Criminal Code to assist and then we apply for restraint orders or threatened to apply restraint orders, and that's enough. When they realize that not only the telco, but their employees that anybody that's in the decision-

making process, including counselors in councils. Anyone that's agreeing and allowing an assault to actually occur against my client is enough to instigate restraint against them in a court of law.

Josh: Wow, that's excellent. So you're using the medical system and the authority that the legal system, you know, holds -- the medical system holds, in other words. Like, the authority that the legal system recognizes when the doctor writes a note with regards to the health and/or well being, and/or mental or physical state and risk of harm for their patient, then that carries legal power and weight.

Raymond: Yeah, exactly. Because who is responsible for health? Is it a scientist? Or is a doctor? It's as simple as that.

Josh: Sorry to interrupt. But I mean, even the agencies don't even have proper scientists. They're mostly just engineers, but please continue.

Raymond: That's correct. Well, there are psychologists who don't have medical training, there are all sorts of things. And the issue is that really, in our society, a doctor's opinion -- that's why they're doctors, that's why they're medical practitioners, it's up to them to set disseminate what's out there and to diagnose their own particular patient. And to assess the risk of -- and assess what's best for their patient. And that's the trick. That's it.

Josh: Wow. So what are you finding in terms of the number of doctors that are termed willing once they are appraised or educated on the science? Like are doctors responsive to writing letters like this for their clients?

Raymond: Yes, very much. And once people realize that -- the whole issue is this; if we go to court, it's got nothing to do with how the doctors assess this, okay? It comes down to how the patient sees whether or not the fear of electromagnetic radiation is true or not, or if they established a reasonable fear inside themselves that this is going to harm. I don't have to explain how a doctor came to that conclusion in court at all. That's the beautiful thing about it. All I have to do is, say; a doctor has given opinion, my client has established a reasonable fear backed up by that expert opinion that this is going to harm and that's all I need. I don't have to go into the science. And the worst thing is, I learned that a long time ago was that if I had experts; engineering, physicists, and everybody in court, there was always a counter argument raised by the other side. And what I've done here is completely removed that.

Josh: Yeah, because it's not like the other side, so to speak. And that easily have a doctor write a note about that individual. You know, it's basically like you're trumping, so to speak, their defense completely by --

Raymond: Completely throwing them out of the window. And once doctors understand this and realize that they do have the freedom to diagnose and treat etc. And all it is, is I'm saying, is this particular person -- all I'm asking the doctor, is this is safe? My client is down and consulting their doctor and say; excuse me, doctor, they're going to start putting this tower right next to my house or they going to put small meter in or whatever, 5G small cell facility, whatever it might be." "Excuse me, Doctor, can you please tell me? Can you look at science, please, and tell me if it's safe?"

Josh: Yeah. And on the legal side, tell us about -- you send notices.

Raymond: Yes.

Josh: And tell us about how you use and invoke criminal law and how the legal side of the process works.

Raymond: Well, how it works is that; anything in law, you always have to put the other side on notice, so that they are under -- and it's all about consent. And what you're doing, in a sense, is you're withdrawing your consent to be irradiated by electromagnetic radiation. Now, the Criminal Code for example, in -- and I'll just use a good example of a definition of assault, so that you understand what that means. And then you'll understand it sort of makes sense. But in Queensland; I'll just use this particular state because each state is different. And you'll find that in Australia, we have a slightly different context as to what assault is, and you'll find the same thing in the UK, US etc. But assault is really the principle that we're working on here.

And I'll just read this to you. And this is the Queensland Criminal Code Section 245. And it says definition of assault. "[a] person who strikes, touches, or moves, or otherwise applies force of any kind to, the person of another, either directly or indirectly, without the other person's consent, or with the other person's consent if the consent is obtained by fraud, or who by any bodily act or gesture attempts or threatens to apply force of any kind to the person of another without the other person's consent, under such circumstances that the person making the attempt or threat has actually or apparently a present ability to effect the person's purpose, is said to assault that other person, and the act is called an assault."

Now, when I refer to the applies force issue, "applies force includes the case of applying heat, light, electrical force, gas, odor, or any other substance or thing whatever if applied in such a degree as to cause injury or personal discomfort"

Josh: Interesting how both electrical force and injury, and personal discomfort which probably includes fear. Both of those --

Raymond: Is correct, yeah. So you can have injury in the form of anxiety and some form. Or you could have it in the form of personal discomfort. And that's all I'm doing. I'm just addressing the personal discomfort issue, if that makes sense?

Josh: Now, just to back up; this is the criminal -- the definition of legal assault use within the criminal legal sphere.

Raymond: And the reason I use that particular section in the Queensland Code is because Queensland is probably the most codified in all states in Australia. And you'll find that that codification means that it's got all the common law in everything -- basically all the common law since time immemorial, has been developed to form this particular definition of assault, and you'll find that will probably apply pretty much worldwide.

Josh: Now, common law is still active in United States, right? Because there are some people who says it's no longer.

Raymond: Yes, and common law is just basically case law. So when a Supreme Court case is handed down, when they interpret certain legislation or a particular act, their interpretation becomes case law, common law, as we say.

Josh: Okay. I quickly want to ask you, before we dive into the next layer of understanding; you're using notices, you're using common law. Many of our viewers will know that in 2017, I helped to bring forward an organization called InPower Movement, doing a liability process, using common law using notices and using commerce. And have since entrusted that organization, like my cofounding partner, Cal Washington and the board. Really quickly, what's your perspective on the notice of liability process that InPower is doing?

Raymond: Mine is a little bit different in that I'm not going into -- I can't really answer. I had to look it up, I just can't remember it. Like there's a lot to it. I think in essence, it's very similar in that we've got a notice of liability issues. So by sending a warning and objection notices is really what we're doing. And attached to that notice, is a legal advice, which explains the law and the legal liability either in both in the civil and the criminal sphere. And in that, we also attach the medical evidence to it as well. So really, it's just those three simple documents, which is enough to tell guys to listen. So in essence, it's a warning and objection notice, which is basically just a cover letter, really. And in that notice, we talked about saying we don't consent to being radiated by electromagnetic radiation. We don't consent to it being coming from your property onto my property. That's it, basically. And then we put it together and send it off.

Josh: Excellent. So the first thing you do is the notice, and that invokes your terms, right? And so do people do this as an individual or people coming together in groups to do this process. How does that work?

Raymond: You can do it both ways. And I've had groups of say people that have set up not for profit organizations and associations. And we've put, for example, Wilsons Creek, we went on that level, with the Randwick City Council issue, which was the 5G TPG set up where we had over 2500 sites gone. We use the group issue there. There's other towns have been doing where it's just individuals where that's been successful. It really you can do it either way.

Josh: So you mentioned the second one; the Randwick City Council, is that right? You did a process at the local level with the City Council? And then it had a federal like country wide effect, is that what you're saying?

Raymond: Yes. So how it works is that, in essence, you're putting them on notice. You're saying I don't consent to this. This is technically constitutes assault, if there's intention on the other side to actually harm us. Now, the trick is, is that when you put them on notice, you're saying, hey, I've got a medical opinion; this thing, electromagnetic radiation, in my opinion, and it's a reasonable fear that I have, because the doctor says so, that this is going to harm. Now, there's no assault yet. It's when they then act on that and say, "Look, we're disregarding the medical opinion. Therefore, we're going to proceed. And we're going to install the facility and we're going to radiate you." That's a threat. And that's a threat to assault.

So it doesn't actually kick in, technically, until they make a positive action to start the emitting process. And they don't have to build it yet, they just have to tell you; we are going to proceed. We're not listening to your advice, or etc. Then that gives us the catalyst to taking the call.

Josh: Brilliant. So what about the scenario where the other side goes silent and they don't respond at all?

Raymond: Well, then in my notice, one notice that I've drafted up I say this, and I'll just read it very quickly. "If you intend to disregard my fears concerns and the medical advice and make it known to me by the literal conduct that you will precede, regardless, then I'll treat such intentional conduct as an intentional threat to physically assault my family and myself with electromagnetic radiation." So in essence, if they're quiet, and they don't feed back, you just say, well -- and I will say this. "Please note that if you fail to respond to this 14 days from the day of this letter that will be deemed by your omission to respond that you intend to radiate my lane. I will therefore have no choice but to seek remedy in a court of law." So you have to put that in your letter. Yeah.

Josh: you have to, essentially, politely issue a warning or a threat, right?

Raymond: Yes. It's been very calm, saying, look, we just let you know about, you know, I've got an obligation to inform you that what you're possibly doing, does have some liability issues to you. I don't think you realize what you're actually doing to me, but I'm going to let you know anyway. And there's no excuse after you've got my warning notice. And my objection notice, medical medium, if you continue then you're really just open yourself up for all sorts of liability.

So what this notice actually does is, it sets up everything; it sets up criminal liability, it also sets up compensation for civil issues. So let's say in the future, you find that you've got a personal injury; for some form, it's quite found that in 10 years time that, yes, it does cause cancer. You already had this setup in place by this simple letter, to protect you and to set up your liability issues right there, because they were informed that it does cause harm; what's called a potential risk, and they've completely ignored it at their own -- and they've been reckless and negligent in the issue.

And then we talk about shielding, where you can get compensation for shielding for your home. That's all in part of the legal advice that I would give. And there are all sorts of things. So it's a very technical document; the legal advice, but what it does is it covers all scenarios. So when a meter gets a legal opinion, which covers everything literally saying, "Well, you're going to be liable if you don't listen" And we're ready to go.

Josh: Wow. So there's a couple of follow up questions I want to ask because this is so significant. I mean, it really makes intuitive sense here and it's crossing over from you going from the private side, you're sending a notice on the private side. And you're able to leverage the medical system to then take it into a court, which they don't want to do.

Raymond: And the trick with this too, is it's not going into the Supreme Court. When I first started this, I was going to the Supreme Court causing my client absolute fortune, and getting nowhere was like spinning our wheels. And that was sort of just delaying tactics, etc. Now, I realized that the trick was -- I was still restrained that going to this lower courts, into the county courts, the local courts, the magistrate's courts, the very simple courts. And doing simple things like apply for Peace and Good behavior order, or restraint order, it's just simple ones.

Like if your neighbor is being naughty you know, being disruptive to you and is becoming a real problem, you can go and seek restraint in the magistrate's court. And that's exactly what I'm doing; is going through the simple side of it. And you'll find the telcos don't know how to deal with it because they expect everything to go on the Supreme Court. And here I am coming through the local courts.

And I'm starting to realize that this is the principle: keep it simple, stupid. And it's working.

Josh: Well, so in the liability side now, it's really interesting because those who've been following the electromagnetic radiation issue and the big cover up there with respect to agencies for years, know that they're -- for example, big insurance, underwriters don't cover electromagnetic radiation or wireless product -- is a harm from the actual products. Like, Lloyds of London doesn't, Swiss Re, this top 300 companies in the world recently issued an announcement that basically say; specifically, 5G is the highest long term risk rating. And meanwhile, it's not covered by -- Okay, so tell us more about the liability side.

Raymond: Well, you are totally right. Insurance will not insure electromagnetic radiation issues at all. And I guess, the best way to explain is looking at this file. I had a really good look at the tobacco industry and the specialized industry, and as to how it all work. And the spin doctoring that they were doing, how they weren't listening to science. The Erin Brockovich scenario where there's actual cases that they know that it does harm, and they just trying to hide in spin doctoring. And in essence, that's what literally I'm uncovering and keeping it simple, but uncovering it and providing that liability. You'll find that, a good example would be the misleading terms that are currently being used. And I find that extremely frustrating. I think it's very, very erroneous that they're doing this.

You'll probably notice that in restrain legislation -- and I'm pretty sure you'll find that pretty much throughout the world, that it's called non ionizing electromagnetic radiation. Now, the spin doctors then turn around saying no, no we're going to start calling it electromagnetic energy. That sounds better. Okay. "Oh, let's go call it that." Now, they start to call it radio waves.

Josh: Yeah. Because people are familiar with the idea of having radio stations transmit.

Raymond: Yes. And so what that's doing is it's creating -- it's almost negligent and reckless in what they're doing by dumping it down and moving it from legislation. So we have specific definitions in the legislation that says it's electromagnetic radiation, period. And here they are turning it around. These are the people that are supposed to be protecting us. The federal agencies that are protecting us from this, yet they're the ones that are dumping it there. They're the ones saying that it's perfectly safe. No, it's not. Then doctors are telling us it's not. And there are plenty of peer reviewed studies out there. And when you start saying we're dumping it down this way, it's extremely misleading. And that's opening them up to liability, and they don't realize what they're doing.

Josh: When you and I were talking previous to this conversation, Ray, you were telling me about what you're doing more recently? I think you said with public notices and newspapers and such. Why are you doing that? How does that work? And just tell us about that.

Raymond: Again, that's the consent principle. It's all about whenever you see someone that wants to build a town planning, for example, they always have to be told; you have to put in public notices and put an advert in the public notices, so everybody knows. If there's a new law that's been made or change, it's usually putting that in the public notices. And all we have to do, in essence, is put a medical opinion, a legal advice in the public notices so everybody knows. This is all about informing them that this stuff poses a real risk of harm to us, and putting that liability issue out to them. And that the precautionary principle must kick in. At the moment, they're all speaking that there's scientific uncertainty.

Well, if there's scientific uncertainty, then the precautionary principle must kick in, which basically means we must hear on the side of caution.

Josh: This is really interesting, because everybody kind of common sense, you know, intuitively knows that we need to get back to the precautionary principle. If we want our species to continue, we can no longer allow corporate, big government interests to push the envelope as far as they can get away with further and further every day, it seems like. We can no longer allow that. By the precautionary principle and recognition of it, we the people through processes like this, are the ones to bring that back into effect, like that system is not going to self regulate, is it?

Raymond: No, it's not. And one thing that I've discovered in Australia, and you will start to see the same in the US, is that the industry self regulates this. There's nobody out there testing these towers on an independent basis to make sure that they're behaving themselves. And one thing that we're doing is we're chasing, and we'll have it very soon. It's called Nada 3006. And what that does is -- it's exactly the same. We found out that there's only three in the entire country in Australia that they using.

And you think about it, there are thousands and thousands of towers in this country. But there are only three of these devices that are used to going out there to measure. And two of them are owned by the regulatory authority. And so what we're going to do, is going to -- and I'll tell you what, this will scare the pants off the industry, because they'll realize that we're going to go out there with independent, the correct devices to measure these things. And I'll tell you what, they've been self regulating, they've been doing it for too long. And it's about time we went out there and test the muscle. And I can't wait, quite frankly.

Josh: That's excellent, Ray. And so just to kind of dive in to that term, that self regulate term. The way that I had asked the question was they're not going to self regulates meaning self correct, unless acted upon by other forces. And the other version, the other definition of self regulate, of course, is that they are controlling the governing agencies, so they're self regulating in that regard, but not in the regard of self correcting in terms of doing what's right.

Raymond: Well, what we're currently uncovering here, this is something I think everyone's going to -- I mean, I've been doing a lot more than just this. I've been doing a lot of things in regards to; let's talk about hospitals, and let's talk about schools. Who authorized to put Wi Fi into children's wards in hospitals, pilot programs?

And also put them into schools, who said it was safe. Now, we're currently going on a campaign right now where we're sending out Freedom of Information requests -- to the part of education, for example. And it's come back saying, well, who advised you? They're telling us that it was the health department. And then we go to the health department under refer, and they say we never advise the state government, Department of Health in regards to that.

So what we've got, is we've been lied to. And there's been an issue where we've got to uncover the truth. And the only way is that people like yourself and everybody out there that want to get out there, and realize that there is some issues out there with -- the industry is not being regulated, it's not being policed. And it's about time that we as people did the job for them. It's all about people power does work sometimes.

Josh: Yeah. Especially when they can leverage properly like you're teaching people how to do, which strongly appears like you're uncovering something hugely significant.

Let me ask you; there's several I think, to come to mind of individuals that you have told me about that are/ or have been in very high level positions within the system in Australia that are now coming over authentically seeing the scope of risk and getting on the side of people and supporting specifically your work. Tell us about those couple of -- and there's a growing number of them, tell us about that?

Raymond: It's incredible. I've got -- where do I start. I've got a lot of people who are getting very concerned from high level doctors in the medical profession, from celebrity down in the game, and also some very high profile politicians and lawyers. I guess one person I could sort of get off the top of my head would be the former Speaker of the House of Representatives for the entire Australia federal parliament. He's honorable Peter Slipper. And he is actually on board and he's actually taking advises as we speak in regards to electromagnetic radiation

issues, and I work with him as well now. It's been great. So we've been building up that team.

He's a barrister now, and he's always been a lawyer before he got into politics. So he had the Speaker of the House controlling both sides of Parliament, the Prime Minister and the opposition. And he's obviously no longer doing that. But now he has moved from that pool. He still has a lot of connections in politics, and obviously he has a lot of *credo*, and he's great.

And the other person I've got is a gentleman by the name of Greg Melick. Greg Melick is SC; Senior Counsel, as some people might know it as a QC or a Queen's Counsel. He's the current Integrity Commissioner or Chief Commissioner for the Integrity Commission here in Tasmania. He's also the Deputy President; the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. And he's also the National President of the RSL, which is the Returned and Services League. He used to be the secretary member for the National Crime Authority. And he's also the president for the International Criminal Reform Committee, which is having a huge conference very soon.

Josh: At this point in the interview, the recording actually cut out, so we're going to go back to a previous and unreleased conversation I had with Ray for his closing thoughts in this part one.

Raymond: And I'm going to tell you one little thing that really kicked it in for me. And Erin Brockovich, I've seen how she acted and what she did, and that's sort of the gap that I have in me at the moment. When she found the smoking gun, what I found it in Australia; there was the chief medical officer for Telstra, was a gentleman called Dr. Bruce Hocking.

And Dr. Bruce Hocking did a study around telecommunications tower in Sydney. And he found a high incidence of cancer classes for childhood leukemia in that area. In two studies, not one but two, he got a peer reviewed, published in the Australian Medical Journal, and guess what? He was sacked. Okay.

And then we'll realize that -- the industry everybody knows. And the latency periods that you see for Schwannomas, etc. You know, gliomas and brain cancers, the whole bit. You know, there's a latency period of 40 years. There is issue with sperm. You know, there have been the DNA changes. And, you know, everybody's libido is going. There are all sorts of issues.

And one thing that I -- what seems to make sense to everybody in regards to electromagnetic radiation, is everybody is noticing they're not getting enough sleep because their melatonin levels are decreasing. And because the electromagnetic radiation is almost as if the sun is in your room 24 hours a day.

When I explain the melatonin issue to them, it makes everybody; "Oh, you're right. I have noticed a big decline in my sleep patterns, and it's getting worse. I'm really, really worried." And I didn't think I'd ever get back this -- Six years ago, when I look back to who I am today. It's a big concern.

Emergence of New Energy Technologies

Guest: Susan Manewich

Josh: Joining us on the summit today is, Susan Manewich, who's the director of the New Energy Movement; actually, President of the New Energy Movement. Susan, thank you so much for being with us today.

Susan: Thank you, Josh. Thank you for having me. It's certainly a great honor.

Josh: I'll just share quickly with our audience, a little bit about your background; your bio. And then we'll dive right in because this is a fascinating subject, the bridging of new technology, empowerment, consciousness, and in light of the situation that we're in with humanity, and so you're a leader in that. So thank you again, I'm looking forward to this. So, Susan A. Manewich is President of the New Energy Movement and focuses on conscious leadership for the positive evolution of all life.

She has spent 20 years in the areas of leadership consulting, emotional intelligence, resonant technology, and better understanding human dynamics and social systems to successfully transition through these global changes. She has recently co-authored the book, *Hidden Energy*, with Jeane Manning, released in the fall of 2019. Susan currently works to bring ethics, integrity, and cohesion to the field of new energy technology. So, I mean, you could say that you are a world bridger.

Susan: That may be one way of looking at it.

Josh: And probably in a couple of different areas. But just diving in, could you tell us about the New Energy Movement and any other organizations that you're involved in, and the focus you have there?

Susan: Sure, yeah. So, the New Energy Movement was started by

Dr. Brian O'Leary, probably about 13, almost 15 years ago. He was an astronaut, and also someone that firmly believed in helping us to get off of traditional fossil fuels, and the power, as we know it, in our world today. So, here you have a very intelligent leader who was also a visionary. He's no longer with us. So this is the organization that I'm currently president of. It was run for many years, for, I believe over a decade, by Joel Garbon. And Joel asked me to take over in January of 2017, and I've since done that.

That's one of the organizations but I will say this, it was an organization that probably needed to be looked at a little bit differently, in terms of how we can create the biggest impact, based on some of the tools, resources, and also what's happening and going on in the new energy arena. And to be blazingly honest, it took me a while to really figure out what is going on in this field. When you take over a public, front facing organization, you have to really understand and know what's happening and what's going on.

And it took me a while to do that, to really get a good handle on the purpose of the organization; who has what for technology? What does our focus want to be? I'm proud to say, in about two and a half years' time, we've been able to figure that out more. And as a result, we also have created another organization that is like a... you could call it like a brother, sister organization, called the New E Foundation. That is based in the UK and it's a community interest company.

So, similar to like an LLC here in the United States, but the idea or the goal with the CIC is that any profit that's generated goes back into social programs. Meaning programs that are here and organizations that are here, to do good for social responsibility. So we figured that we did need to have both a US base, but also a European base; since what we were finding, through our colleagues and whatnot, that we were working with technologies that were in Europe as well.

Josh: Okay, I mean, this is an important area obviously, for humanity, for our planet, is the development of technology aligned with protecting self-determination, basic individual rights on the planet, so that we don't go in the direction of an AI, trans-humanistic hive mind. So I just want to recognize the importance and the work that you're doing. I mean, it's not easy to be at the forefront, and at kind of the leading edge of this way of having to hold what you hold, and the intention that you hold. And all the work on the ground that your organization is doing. In the midst of a context of this, you could say, like dark agenda seeking to consolidate the control. It's definitely not easy. So I just want to recognize you in that first.

And secondly, to dive right in; okay, why is it that in the 1980s, a guy named Stanley Meyer invented a car engine that runs on water, and here we are 30 plus years later, and it doesn't look like there's anything even remotely close to that that's coming to market? I just feel this sense of this frustration with this, because I want to see these big solutions

come out at this time. What's your perspective on that? Why has it been so difficult? And what's going on behind the scenes that you can share with us?

Susan: Yeah because it has been difficult, that's for sure. There's a lot of variables. It's not one variable or another variable; it's multiple. And when I say we, there's a team of people that I work with. So I may be here doing an interview, but there are people working actively behind the scenes that are working as well. So when I say we, what we've been able to figure out is, you can have a great idea, and there are a number of different inventors that have a whole host of different backgrounds. You can have inventors with backgrounds that some of them are garage inventors, meaning they can be meditating and get an idea for a blueprint that literally they can visualize.

Josh: They're geniuses, yeah.

Susan: Yeah, they're geniuses or they're connected to perhaps a divine source. That's not for us to judge, right? Or they've come from, let's say, even, maybe NASA or they've come from Lockheed Martin, or they come from different places. And they say, "You know what? I don't want my designs and my creative work being utilized for something that's going to be harmful to humanity and the earth." Like, some light goes off that they realize that their engineering mind or their creative mind is being utilized for weaponization. So there's a whole host of different things, but why I said that about the different inventors, see, all these things matter. Their personality, their mission on the planet, what they're here to do.

Speaking about that specific inventor, you don't know specifically what, but we've been able to figure out that having a good support system, and having good resources, and being able to do it harmoniously, and in balance, it's almost like this is like creating a good solid vortex. As it relates to the inventor, the financial piece; again, the support system, the legal aspect of it, and potentially, if there's media that's required too. And then trying to also understand the market. And by the way, there are wonderful, amazing creations and wonderful, amazing inventions.

Is also being able to say, "Can this enter the market? And how does this enter the market?" And being able to have that savvy to know how to create those relationships, and making sure it's legally sound. So great ideas and great inventions don't always translate into what ends up on your doorstep or my doorstep. So being able to bridge that gap is one of education, helping people to see what's possible. It's working to break down old paradigms to create new ones. It's being able to say, "Well, listen, we know that maybe a market will lose some share, but look what can be gained."

My feeling and my sense is, with some of the earlier inventors that had some not so good things go right, let's just put it that way; it doesn't seem like the time was ready for it. Call it the consciousness, the

awareness of the people. It doesn't seem like it was ready. It's not to say that these people didn't have amazing ideas, inventions, and didn't have maybe some of the support, but I think what this is showing us, we need more support. We need more people involved, we need more people educated; we need more skilled individuals that are participating in these processes.

I mean, it's like this, I light up every time someone decides to leave their day to day, we'll call it matrix job, and they want to do something different. And they want to work either in this arena or some of these other ones that you've been interviewing people for, right? It's like a star lights up in the sky because that level of skill is needed; that level of professionalism is needed, where this field has been considered on the fringe before. And it's like, "Well, this is fringe science." Well, sometimes fringe science doesn't necessarily have the support that's needed from a professional standpoint, to translate into getting it into the market.

Or accurately being able to communicate what the technology is what it does, without some force coming in, and trying to devalue it or what have you. And oftentimes, some of these inventors literally just run out of money. They run out of having those resources, and even the technology for their support. So that's just some of the variables, and we're not even getting into the consciousness aspect, with other folks, because there is an aspect of the greed factor; the money factor. And I'm not specifically referring to the inventors, even people that come in to support these processes, there's the dollar signs that go off in the eyes of, "Oh, my God. We can make a lot of money because look at this energy efficiency," or look at this as new.

And one of our inventors would call it the Golem effect. You know, see the eyes and it's like, "Ah! I can have this." And my sense, I can't prove this, but my sense is that there's some built in mechanism with the ether in some way that says, "It can't do it that way." And that's why being able to look at the financial support mechanism or system that this is in, is really critical. Because with a device like that, I mean, you want it to be able to get to the people. You want it to be able to get to those who are most in need.

You want these things that it's not just for the rich and affluent that can afford the \$40,000... Sorry, it's not even \$40,000 anymore. You know, these super, let's say, expensive cars. You want to be able to get these technologies in the hands of people that need them the most. And that's the other part of it, and sometimes that business model doesn't sit so well, from an investor standpoint. But this is where human creativity and human ingenuity and saying, "What can we do that benefits the whole?" and getting creative and collaborative around that process. That's exactly the process that our organization is going through right now.

Josh: What are some of the specific technologies? And I understand you can't share everything that's going on behind the scenes, that's fine, we get it. But tell us, like provide some awareness and encouragement to

our audience of what is coming that you are excited about; that has the best potential that people can actually get behind. And they can help to resource or team up and just help make it happen. What avenues and technologies are you most excited about?

Susan: That's a great question. And here's what I want to share, I might give a little bit more of a comprehensive answer, as opposed to just going straight into the technology. Here's what I think is going on; I think that we're in an energy revolution right now. We are in an energy revolution, we are in a consciousness revolution. I think that we're in an energy revolution, where we are being asked, as a species living on this quickly transitioning planet, to create technologies that are more in alignment with nature.

Okay, so with the change in consciousness comes the change in how you go about utilizing your resources. War, extracting oil, even, obviously as you know, the buzz of the energy from the grid that you're hooked up to in your house, is potentially a disturbance for people. This seems to be especially for awakening people also. So, the good news is this. This is happening in slums of Indonesia, meaning that kids that have no PhD training in physics, advanced physics, somehow they're able to understand some of these concepts.

Now, whether or not that's seeds in that are coming in from cosmic rays, and who knows what's happening or whatnot? But you've got this awakening that's occurring, and it's coming in all different shapes and forms. And you have to say to yourself, "Okay, there is a transition happening, and people are becoming inspired. They're becoming inspired to create. Why? Ah, because there's some type of transition, and we need it." So I think if just even saying this, the fact that we're in an energy revolution, and putting that as like your framework, is exciting.

Okay, because I don't think this is going to go away, and we hear this with the inventors. The inventors just want to get out this one device that can help to heat your home; that can help to power your home, and then they want to go and create the other stuff. And the other stuff is much cooler and more interesting. And it's a common story, they have this need to create this one or two, or even three, what we call simple devices that can really help people out, and didn't get to the other stuff.

So it's almost like we've got a backlog right now with invention, and what is coming through these different inventors, what they're creating, and where it's going. So our organization works to try to unblock that bottleneck that seems to be occurring to let this thing move. So then they can get on to the next the next piece. So to me, I love that because I am blessed that I get to see these different inventors. I'm blessed that I get to spend time with them, and hear their stories. I love to hear how they were inspired, what's going on? What are they thinking? What do they think this whole thing is about?

And the pattern of consistency with what I hear, you say to yourself,

"Ooh, so this isn't just one little thing that's gonna just help all of us." There's multiple devices that they're creating because this change is coming. It's part of evolutionary process, and that's what seems to be going on. From specific devices, I mean, they range from so many different things to what we call the special sauce of geometry. How they wrap coils, how they configure the different devices; how they work with the different materials.

And there's devices called solid state, we've got something called back EMF. You also have LENR [Low Energy Nuclear Reactions], which has been called other names as well. So you've got some of these different devices. You also have plasma different devices. The devices that we specifically work with are devices that cannot be weaponized. They're devices that don't have any harmful radiation type of effects.

Because those are important questions that you've got to be able to ask, get answered, and make sure that you're not doing something that you think is good, and in actuality, maybe doing something that's harmful. So there's a lot of scrutiny up front, before the process really moves and goes forward. So, understanding this field is also understanding that there are inventors all over the world that do have working prototypes.

Josh: Can we see one?

Susan: I hope so, soon.

Josh: Can you help get one to our audience?

Susan: I'd love to.

Josh: Because my feeling is, and I've been feeling this for a few years, I really want to be part of that happening. Like actually just begin to make it real for people in their minds, about something that can actually give hope and encouragement.

Susan: I agree. Listen, I get excited, as you just said that because I agree. And obviously, I don't want to say the secrecy, and people will criticize and say, "Well, if something is really real, then you'd put it out publicly." That's not true because, yes, it is true, certain inventors have gotten threatened. Certain inventors have had things stolen multiple times from their houses and from their labs. So what I've seen is, those that really do have something more than maybe somebody else, typically are very quiet.

And then people will say, "Well, if you don't make a buzz about it, then you're a target." I wouldn't necessarily agree with that. I think that the process needs to work itself through, and you look at what you need to do at the time that you need to do it because that's where that that creative divinity comes in. But, Josh, here's the deal, my sense is, soon that will be able to happen. And if that comes from our group or if it comes from somebody else, excellent. Right? But I would also say this, it's critical that things get really proven out before you go to a main stage and say, "We've got this device, and here it is, and it's over unity. And this

is how it works.” The most important thing is that yes, the information gets out, but that these are actually developed with more volume.

Josh: Yes because whether it’s a controlled opposition or not, we have seen technologies have a big hubbub about them, a big worldwide release; a big demonstration, only to be apparently smoke and mirrors. But maybe even that report that they’re smoking mirrors is a lie. I don’t know, it’s so hard to tell what’s going on. But what we have seen is several technologies that have a big, high potential that have subsequently been apparently proven as being not legitimate and that has flattened the hope and the enthusiasm of a lot of people who really want to see this change.

That people like Stanley Meyer and others who decades ago, were fighting for and even giving their lives for. I mean, he was killed after bringing that information out. So I’m in this interesting position of being very passionate about this subject of new energy movement, but also feeling the urgency of the timing. And recognizing that both the awareness, the consciousness, the readiness is a key part. And also, on the other hand, having interviewed like Professor Emeritus Martin Paul, as part of this summit, in a two part interview that is shockingly good. Because he explains the mechanism for how wireless causes harm, he dives into the science, he dives into 5G, and then his conclusion is very shocking.

That within five to seven years, he’s saying, within actually four to seven years, it could be, with the proliferation of 5G and this wireless that the human brain could collapse into such an extent that civilization could basically fall apart. I mean, as Professor Emeritus, not everyone is saying that. Okay, so that’s his opinion, but it’s a well-informed opinion that is based upon published science that has been covered up by the industry. So what I’m feeling is obviously, I think it’s coming through now, is this sense of urgency balanced with, “I guess, I do feel an invitation to trust in my soul and my spirit.” But it’s really... excuse me, it’s really ****ing hard at times.

Susan: Well yeah, of course it is. I mean, trust me; here’s this, being able to have a logical sound set of science reporting an argument is hard to poke holes through. So what we found when we were figuring out, “Okay, so who are we? What do we want to do? And what do we feel our to-do is here?” And for me, I’m wired somehow, and hopefully it’s a good wire, which I think it is, to help to bring these technologies out in the most conscious way possible. I say it over, it could be my like epitaph down the road.

Because there’s fundamental, basic things that need to happen. Because the hype does hurt. The hype hurts funding. Already, being in an arena that’s considered fringe, which I think is becoming less and less fringe, by the way, extraordinary claims require extraordinary proof. And so what we’ve heard on so many different occasions, and Jeane and I are doing the Hidden Energy book, and she is, by the way, an excellent

writer, and a solid researcher. She's had 30 plus years behind the scenes here, in writing and meeting with these different inventors.

What we realized is, just because somebody had it working for a couple of hours, or maybe two days, and the story is they had it working for two months, well, where's the proof on that? Where's the evidence of that? Can that be recreated? And what's happening and what's going on now? So, to your to your point about that you're upset that, "Geez, it seems that you've got 5G that's encroaching on this gorgeous human brain," I mean for those of us who have children, you see this beautiful being and you see its pureness and wonderfulness. And you say, "Well, I just want to help to continue that."

You want to help to continue to usher that pureness because that's our right. That's our right to be able to do that. We feel that that's our right. And we feel that these rights, so to speak, to allow us to be in our humanness as natural human beings, is being severely affected. And I 100% agree with you. At the same time, I can tell you this, these inventors work day and night. I can tell you this, I work day and night. The people I know work day and night. So there's people that are working extremely hard. But at the same time, the proof and what's really important is that these things need to be replicated and the information needs to be shared. So then others can create this.

So it also seems that while others were maybe going on a stage, Josh, and presenting what they had and saying that they had the device, and it fell flat on its face; others were still doing their creations, and working on their prototypes. And we have, I'll call it, there's a bubble of prototypes that are there, all over the world right now. And it's like, "Well, what's going to be that next push to help this over?" Conscious people being involved in the process. Conscious manufacturing; conscious finance. And somebody once said, "Well, there's no such thing as conscious finance." Well, there should be. This is something that there should be and why not? To me, that doesn't make much sense.

Josh: How about executives within big corporations that have these awakening experiences that realize, "Oh, we're all in this together," right? Nobody gets a get out of jail free card in this, as I say sometimes. But they're in those positions where they already have the ability to promote, to manufacture, to bring to market. That's kind of what wild card, right?

Susan: Yeah, yeah. Oh, listen; listen, this, to me is inspiring. So when I go, like, I've been in Europe, and I meet with these people, and I'm there with my colleagues... I'm trying to figure out what I can say, and it's still protecting people's information... we go through... I'll call it, we go through the Yang stuff. We go through the typical kind of Yang stuff. "Okay, here's the technology. What does it do?" Okay, well, my interest is, is this person that's sitting in front of me that has access to all these millions of dollars, and all these different factories, is this a good...? And when I say good, I don't want to be judgmental, but it is this someone

who is going to literally walk their talk, and what does their talk actually sound like?

And I've got to tell you, I'm blown away at the awakenings that these folks are having. And I'm going to give you one specific example of that. This gentleman said, "Well, I'm in my 40s. I already have enough money, I already have enough influence." He said, "I'm at a point in my life that I can use my brain effectively but when I become a little older, it's not going to be as sharp; and my energy is not going to be as strong. So this period of time in my life, with my capacity to finance some of these things, coupled with my energy level, and the network of people that I have; this is what I need to do."

And the impetus for why wasn't about this... you know, because sometimes folks will get wooed by the sexiness of exotic technology. His deal wasn't that. His deal was, "I think that we are becoming disconnected from nature. I think that it's affecting the human race. I think that we have to do what we can to preserve nature around us. And these technologies can potentially assist with that." So he saw it as the planet going through this planetary transition.

He didn't know exactly what, but his sense was that the environment is hurting on this planet. And whatever is happening with these planetary changes, the Earth's capacity to actually deal with it is worse. So this was his awakening. And then I shared some other research with him; it was a heck of a conversation. So the awakening is happening, and it's surprising, when it does. You're grateful. You have gratitude. And sometimes people will talk the talk, but they won't walk it. But they sound different in what they say and how they say it. And then, of course, their actions are different with how they make moves, in terms of financing or different ideas.

What we found is, those folks that are genuinely having awakenings, they're more willing to be open in contracting processes. They're more willing to be collaborative. They're less of that hierarchical kind of, "It's mine, mine, mine." So they don't do that as well. So it is happening. And it's astonishing. And people are leaving, let's say, their defense industry jobs. They are because they know that, what point is there doing anything else?

Josh: Yeah, exactly. Well said.

Susan: It's happening.

Josh: Yeah, it's happening. And yet, how can we be part of it? How can we hasten it? How can we move it forward? Can people contact you or your organization through your website? I just want to clarify, is the invitation there for people who actually want to come out of the woodwork as an inventor, as an executive; as a funder?

Susan: Yes.

Josh: What's the best way for them to do that?

Susan: They could do that by contacting me through my LinkedIn profile. I'm also very shortly... I'm not sure when this interview is going to air, but they'll be able to contact through the New Energy Movement website, and also the New E Foundation. And we do have a person that manages those incoming requests. That didn't happen for a while, because we were doing, I call it the other work that needed to be done, before reaching out or before communicating with people really from the public.

So your requests will be read, you'll get a response, which I can happily say will happen now. So you can contact me through there. And also the Hidden Energy site. The book, if I can talk for that for a moment, because you don't need to be highly technical to read this book. And that's why we did it. First of all, you have two authors that are females, which is a little bit different in this field, as well. We wanted to be able to make it accessible to everybody. Still feed the science and still feed the technology.

So people, when you walk away from this book, you're smarter, you're more informed; you're not as confused. You start to see who some of these people are, what they worked on, and you start to understand how some of these things potentially fit into cosmology. How it fits into the Vedic... I don't want to say astrology, but the...

Josh: The cycles.

Susan: Yeah, you'll start to see more concepts and ideas about the universe and ether in energy. Because we feature lots of PhDs, we feature lots of inventors. And we do it in a way that's interesting. So we've gotten some really good feedback from people reading the book early on. But the Hidden Energy site, you can go on there, get a little bit of information in regards to the book, but also sign up for the mailing list. But if people want to reach me there, they can reach me there too. But the New Energy Movement site is the best one for communication.

Josh: Excellent, thank you. So, five questions; a little bit rapid fire here, as we move toward completion.

Susan: Oh boy, rapid fire.

Josh: I mean, we have up to 20 minutes longer. But basically, some of these questions might be short, might be one sentence; others might be longer, a few minutes. But let's just kind of go into these final five questions and then see what flows from there. So we're going to kind of go into a little bit of the controlling structure, and then we're going to kind of open it up into consciousness, and your vision, where you see things going. So what is your take on the Federation of American Scientists reporting that more than 5,000 US patents have been suppressed in the name of national security?

Susan: I wouldn't say it's been suppressed in the name of national security. I would say it's been suppressed in the name of money and control, as it relates to technology. So that would be a pretty simple

explanation. And I'll tell you why. If you meet these inventors, they are not looking to blow up the planet, they're not looking to blow up anything. They feel their mission is to help with this planetary transition to create a technology that's in alignment with nature. So that's my answer on that. I think it's a financial and control issue, and it's not an issue of national security.

Josh: Yeah, for sure. I think all of our audience would agree. So, a follow up question to that. I had a conversation with a researcher named Dean Henderson recently. And he helped to trace back and has a surprising amount of supporting evidence, some of which indicates that the US Patent and Trade Office is actually owned and or controlled by the Crown in England. What's your take on that?

Susan: I'd say it doesn't seem like a farfetched idea because here's what I wonder; how is it so difficult to try to get and create this change, if there wasn't a deep seated root of control happening? Because it must be that deeply seated in order for these things to continue. So I'd say it's not that far of a stretch from the imagination, but I don't have any specific knowledge on it.

Josh: My next question is, sometimes when we intend to do something in service that challenges existing power structures, or according to reality trend surfing, which I highly recommend to everyone, pendulums; these forces that seek to create energy and adherence from everyone. When we do work that challenges their so called authority, we come up with or we come against, let's say, almost like, it feels like a veil. Like there's something covering the expression that wants to happen in a full measure. It's like, we can kind of pop our head above this veil or pierce it a little bit.

And then there seems like there's pushback. It's difficult to kind of describe this, but maybe some of our viewers might be able to relate. It's kind of like there's this veil of consciousness or like, in the upper jurisdictions or realities of being able to have that up link to creator or our highest aspect within. It feels like there's a substance almost that is... or this force that's preventing that in some ways. I don't want to focus on that too much to make it more real, but I'm just sharing what I noticed.

What is your perspective of this veil? And in terms of like, who we are as multi-dimensional beings, more than just the flesh and blood matter and bones and sinew, and blood? Like, how does all of this relate into this intention we have of really changing things here? What are we up against, Susan?

Susan: Well, I would say what you describe is very real, I know I've experienced it. I know, the more I tried to do in regards to change, let's say; that the stronger these forces are. And they're there and to act like they're not is not understanding, I believe, the way that energy moves, rolls; flows. I would say this, for those of us who feel that, whether we came to this planet with this knowing or we just woke up yesterday;

that we came here to do something that helps the human race survive in a positive, evolutionary way. That connects us to the life force; that doesn't disconnect us from life force. That we came with one heck of a challenge.

We are that connected life force, and that is what moves in us. That's why when we're in nature, we feel peace or we feel love, or we feel that connection, right? You look up at the sky, and you see the stars, or you see a family member that you love, like, there is that connection. Or even as strangers you're walking down the street, and like I was bike riding yesterday, and I just noticed because I was happy to be not at my computer; and I was happy. So I would smile at everybody. And for some reason it was a lot of women I was seeing and they would smile back and I thought, "Ah, that's connection."

So it's standing up for the capacity to have that life connection; that life force, and that positive evolutionary life force. This is, at least in my simplistic terms, what I would refer to it as. And it seems that would ever these opposing forces are, want to disconnect you with those things that make you feel infinite, that make you feel good, that make you feel at ease, that make you feel love. That produces further creativity; that gives you that vibrancy. That makes you laugh; that makes you happy and smile, and joy.

And again, I keep using the word interconnection. So it's worth fighting for. It's worth fighting for because that is the truth that some of us carry. And I want to say this, when my colleague and I were getting advice, we sought advice from a number of different people. And the best advice that we got was from a gentleman who was in the UK, who's in his 90s; that had done a lot of progressive community work, and wrote a lot of books on that as well. And he said, "What you are trying to do has never been done before." He said, "Is it a worthy cause? Absolutely."

He said, "The first thing that you need to know is that you have to be solid in who you are, and why you're here. And what you're here to do. And the next thing you need to understand is, people will work to rip that apart because it somehow is in this field." In my own personal opinion, I don't think its earth energy. I think it's this kind of pervasive...

Josh: Archontic or something artificial.

Susan: Yes, Steiner [Rudolf Steiner] referred to it as Ahrimanic energy, and I think that's 100% on target. He said, "You're going to get that and you will need to continually... especially if you're doing it right, and you're making progress, you're going to have that happen." So it's almost baked in the sauce here or baked in the cake. It's almost baked in this whole thing, right? That if you are trying to create change, and create a continuation of life force, and create technologies that are in alignment with life force... and again, obviously we're not talking AI stuff, this is the opposite of that.

It's creating technology like Schauberger talked about and Tesla talked

about, and Grander. Like, you see the life force in nature and you say, "Well, how can we enhance nature? How can I enhance my wellbeing as opposed to having something taken from me? How can I have something that is creating that abundance?" And just understanding its part of this deal, I think that's why the dark is so... I don't want to say dark, it sounds kind of silly; but it's right in your face on a daily basis.

And it comes from sometimes people that you don't expect it to come from. That is that expression. So as you're pushing forward with this new way. And it's in balance with the Yin and the Yang, it's creating this opposition almost. But just to understand that that opposition is part of moving through this process. And oh, so easier to do theoretically; so hard to do emotionally.

Josh: Is this like a universe or a testing ground here or is this the real world? In other words, my question I think, is... and I was talking with a friend about this just recently, who's really well connected as well. There is a way in which we can see our own identity and the identity of all that almost like asserts that this is just an illusion, what's happening here; that the real is somewhere else. And that, yes, while we're more than flesh and blood, it's kind of like the real thing is yet to happen or it's somewhere else. And then there's another way that we can see our identity and the identity of all, where we understand that we're more than just matter. And we're actually inspired to really invest here. Can you talk about that? What are the keys between those two responses to awakening to something greater than materialism?

Susan: I mean, just simply looking at my own life, and I've done some research around some of these things as well, I think it's all real. I think it's all real. And when people talk about that everything is in the current moment; the present, I believe that to a degree as well. I think that we are multidimensional beings. I think that we have multiple bodies. You have a physical body, you've got a soul body, you have an astral body; that there's these different,,, and they're not different, they're just different vibrational expressions.

And the relationship to matter. You know, are we just flesh and blood? Well, I think this flesh and blood is pretty awesome. I mean, it allows me to hug, it allows me to kiss, it allows me to touch my child's hair and feel how awesome it is. So, can you do that in the etheric world? Well, I can have somewhat of an experience, but your human body is the sensory receptor. I always say the human body is like your human spaceship, almost. It's allowing you to do so many different things. And wow, what an organic, real cool piece of matter you've got going on there.

So I do think that the whole thing is real. And I do believe it's a feedback loop. It's a feedback, feed forward loop. I know that other physicists and whatnot have talked about that. I do believe that because what happens here, I think is a relationship to what happens in these other different bodies. And I think what happens ethereally in that space also has an impact here. So, I do believe this; that it does seem to be that energy

is first, like these subtler energies, and this is a lot of what I've seen my whole life. It's these subtler energies that move and translate in this planet, to matter.

People say it's a dense planet, right? That this is part of the experience here. You asked, do I think Earth is a school? 100%, absolutely; I do think it's a school. And I think sometimes when we look at it that way, we understand and have compassion for ourselves, when we are not so hot. And we have compassion and understanding for the people around us. And wow, what a diverse university we all chose. But do I think it's real? Yeah, I think it's real, because I feel it.

And I get sad when people do destructive things. And when I see animals killed, and children treated poorly, that's real for me. And it may not be for someone else, or they may have a different theoretical understanding. And that's okay. But for me, Josh, I think the whole thing is real. I think it's a feedback, feed forward loop. I do think that it is a school, so to speak. I think it's a tough school. And I think that for those of us who came to change what we saw was a disconnection from life force, we had a heck of a tough program that we enrolled into. But you know what? There's other people along this journey that did it too, and sometimes that makes it a little easier to digest.

There's one thing, from a helping standpoint, I want to share. What I've found is, the more people that I can communicate with, that are doing this type of work, and have a different level of consciousness, in terms of like, they've done a lot of self-work; those are typically your best supporters. And those are the people that we should be calling on occasions, checking in, and saying, "Hey, are you okay?" And they check on you and make sure you're okay. So it gets tough, but when you realize that you're kind of all in this together, it makes it a little bit easier. Then you can laugh at some of the things that are a little wacky. So I hope I answered all of that.

Josh: Yeah, that's good. I mean, it was a very deep question, and you wrapped it up in a nice way. Okay, so one other question kind of just jumped in here. This paradigm shift that you alluded to near the start of our conversation that we're being asked to make, as human beings, one expression of that could be the internalization of authority. Where we've been projecting, and we've been entrusting our authority to external forces and institutions and power grids, and externally centralized systems. So it seems to me we're being asked to internalize that.

How important, as we navigate this internalization of authority, is it to still remain humble, to let's say, the idea of the source of all existence, an Infinite Creator? Or a source or a loving, like, let's say, benevolent source of everything? So that we don't sort of go like, say, the Luciferian pass, and really internalize the authority and say, "By my will, I shall do this thing." Because I think many people can relate, I can relate; that only gets you kind of so far, and it kind of can lead you off path. How important is humility, as we make this shift?

Susan: I think it's of the utmost importance. I think the humility piece is incredibly important; because the path to getting there, wherever there is, is just as important, if not more important than getting there. And it's something that came to me in a lesson quite a few years ago now, where I don't think that it's all about saving humanity or saving the planet. It's no excuse for bad behavior, I'm sorry. That's my opinion, maybe that's the female body that I'm in, and this is why I'm in this field anyways. That's the point that I make.

I believe that how we operate as human beings, if Earth is a school, I don't believe it's so much about what you physically create here. It's also how you do it, and how you are showing up as a human being. Are you lying? Are you cheating? Are you stealing? Are you honest? Are you humble? Are you compassionate? Are you empathetic? Are you kind? These things matter to me, but I'll go a step further. When you look at near death experience research, and if you've known people that you loved and cared about, and then they passed and transitioned, and sometimes people have dreams, and sometimes people that you know maybe have left and went to the other side and come back, the information is pretty much mostly the same.

They don't remember, like they're not shown that they have been achieving this huge accomplishment. It's how they show up to their loved ones. It's how they show up in their lives and how they evolve. My dad was a near death experience, and, unfortunately, he passed away two years ago, but he was magical. When he came back from his experience... and he had a tough road, he had like a two year recovery from a car accident, but he was different. And I remember him talking to me about the squirrels. He's like, "Did you ever see how beautiful the squirrels were?" and I was like, "What?" And it wasn't a head injury.

Like, he enjoyed fishing, he enjoyed being in nature. And I was blessed to be able to take care of him and be by his side when he passed two years ago. And this transition that he had was really beautiful, and he was conscious of it as well. So, you say to yourself, "Gosh, how we leave this plane of existence must be pretty important." So, anyway, he didn't come back and be like a CEO of a big company or whatnot, he actually became an incredible father, and dare I say, a more amazing grandfather, and great grandfather.

And this whole family, my whole family, refers to him so often because the sage that he turned into from that experience, it's all felt in us on a day to day basis. And he's not here in the physical, but he's there. So I know that was a bit of a personal nature, but at the same time, I live and do this work, and I don't believe... like, if I lose my humility, if I lose my humanity, I shouldn't be doing this. Like, what's the point on that?

I should take a step back. Recalibrate, get back into the divine mode, and say, "What's being asked of me here?" So this is where the schooling process takes on a whole other level. That you say, "Am I just acting this way in the world because I'm mad and upset at everything? Or is this

really what my highest expression is to create here?"

Josh: Oh, that's great. Okay, so in closing, maybe let's just take a minute, and I want to invite you to, in realization of its key, what we focus on, does expand and to be focused on what we want, more than what we don't want. Could you maybe paint a picture about what you see as the positive future, in terms of technology and consciousness?

Susan: This is a super simple answer, but I think it's going to help to light in us, it's going to help to lighten us. It's going to help lighten this density that we feel. I think it's going to help to stop pushing on the earth so much, and stop taking from the earth so much, because she doesn't seem to like it. And that's one of the things that I see as being the positive. Is that we go from having this like feeling like you're being bombarded and feeling like someone's taking something from you, to being in a more... and I like the word sovereignty... to being in a more sovereign state.

That you become empowered to be part of what you want to create. As opposed to feeling like someone's owning and controlling you. I mean, think about it for a second. Well, we've thought about it for many seconds, but energy sovereignty is a huge deal. When you can't heat your home or you can't read, or you can't communicate, right? Because not everybody's telepathic yet. So it should be a basic right. And instead, it's controlled as deeply as we can possibly imagine. I mean, it really is. So, being able to give power to the people. I mean, you are empowering people in a whole new way. That it should be a right, as opposed to, controlled by a few. And making people submissive, for as long as it has been.

Josh: Is it reasonable in the near future that people could have an energy producing technology, safe and effective, and meet their needs for energy in their home, within their home?

Susan: Yeah, absolutely. A hundred percent. Yeah, of course.

Josh: And affordable.

Susan: Yeah, as it should be. There are devices that are not that expensive to replicate, let's put it that way. And those are the ones because there's some big ones. I mean, you can look online and see some of the ones that people have talked about. And they're great in that regard because yes, they're producing over unity, they're producing energy.

But is it something that everybody can benefit from? Is it something that empowers? So this is where you drive the conversation and say, "Alright, well, this is great. But can we do better?" And yeah, there's people that are doing better. So it should be that. It should be more of that. Yes. And this is this we try to work towards, and we try to work with those inventors that have that type of philosophy as well.

Josh: Excellent. So if you're watching this, and you're inspired by this

talk, again, we encourage you to share the link to this talk. That's how we grow. That's how we reach towards the turning point in the threshold, and awareness, by getting the information out there. Thank you so much. Thank you so much, Susan Manewich, for your time and expertise, and wisdom. And just for joining us on the summit today. On behalf of our viewers, I really appreciate it and I really appreciate the work that you're doing.

Susan: Thank you, Josh. I am humbled and mutually appreciative of you. Thank you so much for all your efforts.

Discerning / Dissolving “Social Engineering” Traps

Guest: Joe Martino

Josh: We're with Joe Martino today. Joe is the founder of CETV, which is one of the leading outlets that's documenting and supporting humanities awakening at this time. Joe's TEDx talk on how to change life has inspired many and he has created three films; "Collective evolution I, II and III," demonstrating anew decentralized and truly sustainable way of being.

Joe, welcome to the 5G Summit.

Joe: Thank you for having me where you are. I appreciate you doing this summit right now. I think it's important thing that a lot of people asking questions about. It's good to be talking about it.

Josh: You guys have a huge Facebook following, you have been documenting both of big picture and the science, the dot connecting between the two, really helping our generation and in particular I think the millennials, really you know wake up to a lot of what's happen in both of the inner consciousness journey. And also in different things in the world such as wireless unharmed. I'll just put it to you, you can answer it any way you like. But let's dive in here. How do you see 5G?

Joe: Yeah. I mean, 5G is you know, the way we talk a lot of things here like collective evolution is looking up what's happening in our outside world, what's happening in our external world and seeing what about us as human is creating that and allowing that to be i.e. here we have a technology that has not been tested properly. There's already a number of signs that illustrate very, very clearly that electromagnetic

frequencies, radio frequencies and so forth have an impact on humans in a negative way. We already see that even with a lot of the technologies that exists today. So here we are, we're now going to another level with intensity of these technologies yet there's no safety testing. And it's a multi-billion dollar industry that we're about to just lay out across humanity. And kind of do so at a hasty process and our hasty pace, such that no one can really kind of ask questions or figure out what's going on. We do this under the guise of the economy. So what does all of that reflect about us?

So when you ask the question, "How do I see 5G?" I see 5G as this technology that's being rushed to market that exemplifies in a state of consciousness, a state of being that humanity seems to be operating from, which is we care more about industry, economy and business than we do about how those decisions may affect the very nature of who we are.

And whether it's our health, whether it's our disconnection from one another, and so forth. You know, we just don't seem to be asking those questions. We're like, well, all in the name of business, all in the name of sort of technological progress, right. So that's kind of how I see from a big picture perspective, 5G right now.

Josh: And so I just want to be clear. I mean, you're not like a technophobe by any means, right? So I remember though, saying that -- you know, a couple years ago, when you and I were chatting you were telling me at your office, you kind of had a policy about people disconnecting from their cell phones. Like turning them off and putting them somewhere where they're not interfacing with the technology when they're trying to be productive.

Maybe let's dive into that, like how technology can be amazing in its support of human creation, in our world. But it can also be a system to slowly enslave, which is one of the concerns that I have about 5G and how it's linked to artificial intelligence, Internet of Things, you know, going into transhumanism by the look of it. So how can we find that balance? How do you see that tension that the rapid evolution of technology in our world poses to humanity?

Joe: Yeah. I mean, the best way that I like to approach this question when people ask me or when it comes up in like a comment online, whether it's Instagram, YouTube, whatever it may be. If it wasn't for social media, people wouldn't have these same mental challenges with themselves in the way they view themselves, the mental illness that's associated with that. If it wasn't for cell phones, we wouldn't have this unhealthy addiction to technology and so forth. It's because of the cell phone. It's because of the technology.

And it to me, it's like, well, hold on a second. We're acting as though humanity doesn't have within the very nature of who we are, this ability to make decisions and to be independent of even manipulation, if you will. So what I mean by that is yes, advertising or marketing or Facebook, for example, has used tactics. And we've seen various people who work at these companies come out and say they've used tactics that are designed to prey on people, whether it be mentality or psychology or whoever they operate so as to get them addicted to something.

But with greater awareness of self and with greater awareness of what you're doing and your physical reality, those things don't have to affect you. So we kind of exist in this state where we want to blame something else when it's really about us at the end of the day. And so when I look back at -- Okay. Well, how did we at collective evolution decide how we go about technology or decide how we do things?

Well, say technology, computers, laptops, Wi Fi, so forth, are a tool by which we are allowed to or able to communicate our message across to many, many, many people. Technology, just like money is not inherently evil. It's the way we use it or it's our lack of self-responsibility that makes it seem that way. And I say that "seem that way" in quotations or in bold because that's simply a perception, right? And so the way we like to use technology or why we initially tried a no phone policy, was not policy in the sense, you couldn't use your phone.

It's just we were trying to create distance between having the phone there constantly not only as a potential distraction. So now you can be aware of like how often you start going, "Oh, let me check my phone. Oh, hold on, let me check my phone. Okay, let me check my phone." You know, be aware of that.

But also at the same time, just from a basic biological health perspective, you know that the increase of electromagnetic radiation, it's like a cumulative thing, if you already have Wi Fi going, plus eight or nine cell phones in one small area because of the amount of people that are there. It just increases that amount. So for us it was just about -- you know, again, looking at the totality of something.

Yes, this thing is here as a tool. Sure, and this is a deeper discussion, but sure, that tool could have been designed such that it didn't interfere as much with the biological human body or even biology outside in nature. It could have been designed in a different frequency range, but this is what we're dealing with, so let's do our best to kind of become aware of that and just go from there. But it's not technology's fault, technology is there to assist. It's just how are we using it and how are we designing it?

Josh: Yeah. What is that quote, Joe? Is something like when an unstoppable, an irresistible force meets and something unstoppable.

Like there's bound to be fireworks. Do you know how to call those?

Joe: And unstoppable force meets an immovable object or something like that, what happens?

Josh: Yeah. So I feel like that's what's happening here at this time with 5G. So we have trillions of dollars that are set to be made by industry. You know, we have even the FCC -- as everyone probably knows, just to recap, 2016 FCC chair; Wheeler, who is telecom industry career man basically says, "There's 10s of billions of dollars to be made, and we're not going to wait for the standards. We're not going to do the testing. We're just going to open it up."

And now the conversation is like around the Trump administration, we have to beat China, we have to win the 5G race. And we're making this about competition. Just to get back to that quote, though, with all of this money on the line for the sake of profit and control versus the power is within each of us. We can collect individually and collectively come together, we have the power to change our world. Greater it is the power that is within you than the power that's within the world. The tension between those two seems to be amping up. Huge right now. So it's kind of like getting off the fence time perhaps from my perspective, how do you see that? Do you also see the tension amping up and as a result, what are you seeing in the generation as we're becoming face to face with some of these situations like 5G?

Joe: Absolutely. You know, it's interesting because there's a number of ways or layers in which you could look at this. From a very everyday perspective, it could be seen as the general populace almost versus the tech companies or the government or the government push for something like this. That's one way of looking at it. Another way of looking at it would be to almost say, it's humanity as a whole. It's all of us that it's not so much of versus, but an opportunity to say, "Hold on a second. What the heck are we doing here?"

And so what you're having at that level, so not that everyday level, but at that level, you're almost saying there's this emerging feeling within people that it's like we have to start thinking a little bit more deeply. Because I have this feeling of like, where 5G is going and what's happening here. When I look at the totality of our environment, of our health choices, of our food, of all these different things. There's something that's saying we need to stop and think about this for a second.

It's sort of like that feeling, not as opposed to, but so much amongst a world that is still operating without that feeling. So it's almost like you have this old world that is operating, which is business first. Just go ahead and do it and who cares? And this emerging feeling that is

contrast, if you will. And so it becomes like, "How do I kind of operate through this feeling that's coming up and I'm looking at all this stuff happening, and I'm going. I don't know how to rectify this feeling within this world that's moving forward." So as a people, where do we have the power? Well, the power is continuing to ask the questions, you know, continuing to change the conversation, continuing to explore not just the technology companies or the government or whoever you want to sort of look at, is evil and is greedy, and is money hungry. Let's go a little bit deeper and hold on, they're humans too.

How is this process unfolding? Where are we living in this state of being whereby we can't even think about the health of our existence enough to offset choices that threaten our existence? Do know what I'm saying? To which degree do you want to say there's a threat when it comes to 5G, is still not entirely clear. But the reality of this situation is it's there. And even now there's people that are, "a little bit more mainstream" in the way they think and the way they view things who are now saying, "You know, what? I still I've done the research now with 5G, and I'm kind of like I am concerned. I do believe we should do safety testing." So when it comes back to the power of humanity, to me, one of the big ways that I talked about this is -- you know, how do you get powerful people if you want to call it that, which in this case, we're calling telecom providers which might involve some of the decision makers at that level.

We're talking about politicians who are just sort of saying what they believe should happen as a result of protecting their economy, growing their economy, beating out another country and so forth. How do we get those powerful individuals? We might throw some congressmen and women into that conversation too? How do we get them to care? How do we get them to change in really, aside from the consciousness end of it, where we're thinking and we're developing a little bit deeper, and we're not seeing these people as an enemy, but simply as something else.

And we want to help them make a shift, we have affect them by changing the conversation. So asking them these deeper questions. It's not so much about our right or wrong, but about why are we not questioning the fact that this could harm our reality? Who's going to take responsibility? Or what happens if we find out five years down the road that, "Yeah, you know what? Not only does it do with the preliminary studies we are already showing in terms of damage, but it does weigh more. Who's going to take responsibility for that? What are we going to do about it? You're saying like, what about us? Is making us want to push so hard for this all in the name of the economy.

And the more we have those conversations at a higher level, and really get these "powerful people" to start talking outside of just the economy, jobs. You know, talking outside of that, the more I think we're

going to force a cultural change and a cultural change, in some ways, a consciousness shift. That's a whole conversation on its own. But to me, it's like getting out of these emotions of just like, "all these people we need to fight them and attack them." And more into this thing of like, "Let's join them in their conversation. Let's help change and reshape the conversation." But we got to be coming from a state within ourselves where, not only do we know it's possible to help impact this stuff, but we got to pull the need. There's a need for the experience of these people.

They're there saying, "Hey, we're going to go out and make choices that affect all of society, that are destructive to society. Now it's up to you guys to gain self-responsibility. We're playing the role of pushing you to gain self-responsibility because we're not going to do it. You need to become a parent within yourself." It's the child i.e. society, who has put all the reliance on the parent, i.e. government, policymakers and so forth, who are then going out and making all these decisions. And speaking as though the general public is just a stupid child.

So now the child has to grow up and say, why am I putting all my faith and power and everything into the system? Do I even want to play the games that they're playing? What's going on there? And that's a whole process. That's a much deeper conversation too. But it's part of this situation to truly end these challenges that we have. It does involve a deeper conversation. Unfortunately, is not a sort of a quick fix answer if you want to call it that, you know?

Josh: Okay, good. Well, let's get into the pain aspect of that conversation just for a moment. From your perspective, what happens if we don't engage? What happens if we stay sort of -- Marianne Williamson talks about like infantilized in the adolescent stage where just allow ourselves to be talked to like kids. I guess I'm speaking kind of as humanity as a whole with 5G and what it's connected to, like what happens if we don't take any responsibility?

Joe: We keep repeating the process, and potentially the water gets hotter. If you look at where we've been going for the last -- you know, very obviously, I'll say the last two decades. Obviously, things over the course of time, hundred years, if you want to even just look at it that way, have consistently been getting a little bit more clamp down, clamp down, clamp down, clamp down. But when you look at the last even 20 years since 911, if you want to call it that, which technically is a little less than 20. You see a massive rise in clamp down within society or within overage of governmental power, of governmental reach and so forth. Almost as if to say -- because if we're going to talk about this on a deeper level. We're talking about this on -- Okay, humanity needs to grow up, that's plain and simple.

Look at the degradation of our environment, for example. You could

say that our environment when it comes to planet earth, and you could also say that the means by which we are also intoxicating ourselves. Okay, so this is food, water, technologies and so forth that are getting a little bit over the edge. When you look at those two factors, it's starting to threaten, if you will, the existence of us. Now, this isn't to create this big fear scenario where it's like, "Oh my god, we're going into this. We're about to kill ourselves and we're going to self-destruct."

We're not going to go there, because we're having these conversations, this is coming up in a big way. And the question is, do you want to keep saying, "Okay, our government will kind of take care of it. You know, I talked about this with even with CO2 and the environment." We're talking more about CO2, which is a big scientific fight and debate versus just talking about the degradation and pollution.

And the fact that it's the system that we operate within that is creating all this degradation and pollution. And we're trying to say that a CO2 or carbon tax is going to come in and say, "Hold on a second. We're not talking about the right thing here. This makes no sense." So it's in the states of how hard does the water need to get before you start going through the process of waking up and saying, "I'm not just going to wake up and revolt because that's just a child throwing a temper tantrum. I'm going to wake up as a child, become mature, learn about what's going on in my reality, become an adult, and sort of move from there."

And I think that is the process. So to answer again, the original question through all of that is really just to say, what happens if we don't grow up, if we don't like I say, the water keeps getting hotter. The time out there keep getting more intense, getting more chaotic, because those chaotic times is a mirror and there's a light and the light is shining on the subject, say the person and the mirror is there.

You can already see yourself, but you can't see it clear enough. Let's turn the light up more. "Oh, I can see clearer and clearer and clearer." So how much do you need to see that the one that needs to change as a person in the mirror, which is all of humanity as a whole? And that's the process, "how hard or how difficult does it need to get necessarily." It's up to us.

Josh: Do you see we're reaching towards that critical mass, there's enough collective intention of enough people that really want to wake up and transform. Are you are you optimistic?

Joe: I have been for a lot of years and I still am now. I mean, probably since 10 years ago when I first started to really dive into the exploration of consciousness as it relates to our real reality. And I say that because a lot of times when people think about consciousness or spirituality or the metaphysics, if you will. They relate that to a sort of an airy fairy that has no place in real reality. Whereas we've never approached it that way

since day one, it's always been understanding our reality through its totality, as opposed to just looking at the material.

What is quantum physics saying about the energetic nature, i.e. the energy behind everything about our reality? And how can we look at that and relate that to our world? And so for me, the more I studied that, the more I looked at that the more I saw, not only what the science is showing, but what the intuition is saying, what the senses that we have within ourselves they're saying, the more I feel there's definitely something changing.

There's no reason to be fearful. Yes, there is some chaos. Yes, there is some challenge going on out there. But those are learning lessons. And in humanity's current state, which does not have to be this way, but in humanity's current state. -- It's like when you're a kid going through school, you'll wait till the last minute to do all the things for that one exam or one assignment that you got to turn in. It's all about waiting to the last minute, waiting for the last minute.

But when you grow up, you realize, "No, I got to plan out my time." I don't need to wait till the last minute. I'm going to work on the project slowly over time, and whatever will get it done and it won't be as much of a panic and I won't be forced to have to act. But when you're still operating in this sort of infantile state of being, you need chaos. You need a really intense experience in order to get yourself to move and to get yourself to finish something.

So don't need chaos as humanity to evolve, to change, to move forward. We're just playing that out right now. So it's the idea of you know, water is getting hot, that things are turning up, because it's pushing that evolution. But there's no need to fear and worry, because that's why this conversation is happening. At least that's how I feel. I know sometimes people will -- And this is the challenge I would even put. It's like close your eyes, go to a quiet space for a moment, take a bunch of deep breaths, really disconnect for a second. Intend that you disconnect from the news, the computer, your cell phone for a second, just breathe within yourself. Very simple tools that we all have, breathe within yourself.

And then just ask yourself the question when you feel yourself being a little quieter, you know, are we really headed towards destruction? Or are we going through a process of change? And if you take the time you know, 15-20 minutes and you really disconnect, you really feel within yourself. You really get that sort of innate feeling that you have.

I'm going to throw it out there, you'll probably find that that there is no real reason to panic. Yes, there is a reason to act. There is a push to act, to shift yourself, to change the conversation, to move forward with

things. But I've never really had the feeling that we're going towards destruction. You know what I'm saying?

Josh: So, Joe, you have a podcast. I think Episode Five of that podcast was brilliant. And when I listened to that, you nailed it. You're talking about 5G, the Trump administration and narratives, and how we can really elevate? Let's dive into that, tell us about your perspective on narratives and how important it is to not get bound up in a certain limited understanding or limited hang out whether it's -- but I guess they all have to do with separation, don't they? So how can we identify the narratives, what narratives do you identify that are really like running too much of this right now? And how can we come to a clear understanding of truth and empowerment?

Joe: For sure. Yeah. I mean, one of the easiest, most relatable ways to discuss this is; let's say, for example right now, there's a presidential election coming up in the United States as we near 2020. So the campaigning begins, the news cycle begins and everybody you know, that all starts. And we break things down oftentimes into -- and I'll be really current. You have your sort of establishment Democrats, if you will. You're more independent Democrats, you're independent Republicans, you're establishment Republicans, and you're kind of independence in general.

And these different people that represent the different boxes, will call them boxes. You're now going to have stories or media, speaking through different narratives, as it relates to each one of these boxes. So if CNN is covering something, you're going to get the establishment left. If Fox is covering something, you're probably going to get the establishment right. And so that's an example of it from an everyday perspective of how you get narratives.

Now, there it is also go into the alternative, right? So now alternative media sometimes has narratives where well, it's alternative. So it may be independent left or it may be independent right. Sometimes it's still establishment left and right. But it's a lot more rare within alternative media. Not only that, but you can then go alternative, will say even further and start getting into various deeper.

I will say understandings that are somewhat factual, where you're looking at the world, there's a shadow government. There's something behind the scenes that is sort of controlling what political figures are doing anyway. And so you start to get that narrative, which you're touching on truth, but if you're not careful, it becomes a narrative. Similar to the Q Intel, if you will.

Well, here you have, and I'm not saying for sure that this is legit or not legit. But this is what's happening. You have drops of information that

are coming that people are engaging with, and trying to make a picture out of. So they're becoming citizen journalists to an extent. Now, if you're not careful, looking at things through that becomes a narrative.

So you have all these narratives, what is the mechanism that causes us to want to identify with the narratives? But then also, like really just get rigidly emotionally stuck in those narratives. What's that mechanism? Well, it's perhaps the ego. We start identifying, we see ourselves and who we are in whatever one of these narratives. You may be a person that started out, let's just say in the establishment left or right, that one day saw something about 911 per se. This is a real story for a lot of people. And they said, "Oh, man, I'm going to question my narrative now."

So you started the question and you may have said, "Oh, okay, it's not about the left and the right. There's the shadow government that controls them both." "Okay, cool." So now your narrative becomes over here, alternative community, whatever, all that sort of stuff. And so you're looking at things through that. And then slowly as you got out of one box, you start to put yourself in another box. And then if you're not careful, that becomes another box you get stuck in.

And so you'll hear people all the time saying, "They'll throw the baby out with the bathwater." So they'll be like, "Oh, well, you know, NASA can't possibly ever have a whistleblower because everybody at NASA is corrupted." Or, you know, "this news anchor who left is now a whistleblower about mainstream media." That can't be the case because they come from mainstream media. So you throw the baby out with the bathwater, everything becomes a part of your alternative narrative.

And what you'll start to notice is that no matter what narrative you get in, like let's say the alternative one, a lot of people who get stuck in that are now saying, "Oh, well, the mainstream media could never tell the truth because the deep state, if you will, always has control." But hold on a second. If you're trying to wake up people, if you're trying to offer people a different perspective, it means that there's an opportunity for change. So here you have this opportunity, but paradoxically, you're saying that it can never change because the mainstream media is always going to be whom they are. So what's the point of doing what you're doing? So you get stuck in that narrative.

And so, now all of a sudden you have Trump, who has come in as this alleged outsider. It appears to be the case to some extent. What does that mean being an outsider? Well, he doesn't seem to fit the bill of an establishment Republican, where it's just pushing through business as usual. The media loves and is going to promote them. Yeah, there's going to be a few stations that kind of dislike what they're doing. You know, the classic left right narratives.

But this is different. Republicans don't like Trump, classical Republicans, if you will. Democrats aren't liking Trump because of the all-out war the mainstream media has on what he's doing. So you start to say, "Okay, well, there's a different thing that's happening here." Well, then in comes this whole Q conversation that says, "Trump is part of this whole thing of he's going to save the world?" This is the narrative; he's going to save the world, he's going to save the world, he's going to save the world.

Well, what does save the world mean? Let's say let's go under the assumption that Q is what people say that it is, which is a group of military individuals that had long left the military, that are organizing to help "Alliance overthrow a deep state government and bring power back to humanity." Well, do these military individuals necessarily come from a state of being or a state of consciousness, where they're going to create this beautiful world for everybody? Or might they be coming from a space where "Yeah, sure, let's kind of pull out the deep state."

But yeah, let's still go with the economy. Let's still go with, you know, blowing up technology and doing all these amazing things. We still need to have war, we still need to have armies because we do still need to protect ourselves from all the bad guys out there. Maybe we won't be making up as many bad guys as what happens in our current world. But, you know, we still need to protect."

So the point is, what does that even mean to save the world? What does the world look like when you pull out that deep state? So the narrative there has become everything Trump does has to be amazing. It must be good. So now all of a sudden, Trump is pushing 5G and people stuck in that narrative are going, "Well, I got to find a way to make this seem like a positive." But is it necessary? Hold on a second, let's step back again. Let's say Trump is pushing 5G just because he's trying to pull out the deep state doesn't mean that Trump is not all for an economy, and technology, and tons of jobs and doing all these things that it may hurt humanity technologically, maybe he's not privy to that information.

So now you have people saying, "Well, they're creating a safe form of 5G." We have no evidence that that exists yet we're stuck in that narrative. And again, what we're going back to from child, the infantile state to taking responsibility of self as humanity, is where you step up and you see. Okay, I saw that there's a part of myself that wants to identify to become something to say, I'm Republican, I'm awake. What does awake mean?

And this is where it starts to get a little bit deeper in terms of questioning. If you're stuck in a narrative, you're not awake. You may have a bit of a wider lens of what happens, but you're still stuck. It's when we don't identify and we allow all information to be fluid and all information to fill out a picture that we're not trying to make into

something, but that we're allowing it to become self-evident. Then you become not attached to what you're trying to do. You're not trying to protect an identity you have, you're instead just seeing what plays out.

Now, this is tricky thing for people to do because for a long time, we've been wanting to just be like, "Okay, now I'm over here. Okay, now I'm over here and now I'm over here." So don't get me wrong. I see this as a process that's going to take a little bit of time, takes a little bit of self-mastery, really playing into why am I having the thoughts, okay, what's going on here? Why am I trying to identify? Why does what I put on Facebook? Why does it have to identify me? Now that something has changed, can I admit that I might have been wrong. You know, all these challenges now that really represent personal issues or personal challenges that we have.

So protecting a narrative is really oftentimes protecting oneself and one's own ego.

Josh: Interesting. So protecting the narrative, what it means to me perhaps is -- maybe why I feel inclined to do that is because I want to feel safe, and I want to be part of something bigger. So it seems like we externalize that. We have sort of an ego based structure like threat rather than what's the alternative, Joe? What's the alternative? How can we actually have true safety and truly be part of something bigger? You're talking about this shift from adolescence to you know, responsibility.

Joe: Yeah. And it's the reality that -- and don't get me wrong. What I'm about to say is a bit of a tough one at first to sort of fully internalize, if you will. The reality is, we're always safe and it -- sorry, the other part to that was safety, and what was the other part that you wanted?

Josh: Being part of something bigger.

Joe: Right. So we're always part of something and we are always safe. And when I say that, what I'm saying is, if you were to look at the reality of the situation from a quantum perspective. The inherent nature of our reality in us is that we are all connected no matter what distance to everything. We're part of one ocean that no matter whether you take a drop from here and then move it miles and miles away and drop it in the ocean somewhere else, is still part of the same home. That is the inherent nature of everything. The challenges is our everyday lives. We feel disconnected from that. There's a number of reasons why we can look at that. But we feel disconnected from that because of our lack of awareness, our lack of consciousness of who we truly are. We've gotten caught in this mode of being so distracted, so focused on the material, so focused on work and this and that, and bills and ball. All these different things that we forgotten who we truly are.

And now we've identified just as a mind walking around within a meat suit, having an experience and just doing that sort of thing. So when you step back from that, i.e meditation, where you start going back -- Oftentimes you hear people who are meditating, they were like, "Wow, you know what? I came in off the street into this meditation class and after 30-40 minutes, I started to feel like I was one with everything." This is a common thing that happens. Well, what happened there? The mind began to slowly pull itself out of the robotic state that it's in. Your awareness of who you truly are starts to become a little bit more prevalent in your awakened consciousness, meaning just you walking around. And you started to realize, wow, I feel connected to everything because that's your natural state. And people who continue to practice this type of stuff, bring that natural state into their waking lives on a regular basis, which is why people walk around and they don't seem like a walking mind or a walking ego. It feels like there's a little bit more there.

Now it's not to then go and judge and say, well, the people who are walking around a little bit more robotically are somehow bad. Well, no, they're on their own journey, their own process, they're going to have the same experience of opening things up and more people there to help them go through that process and journey.

Because guess what? That's how humanity grows up. And so there's the interconnected bit. Now the safety bit, again, comes from that same feeling when you're in that state you start to recognize there's nothing to protect. Sure there's what you could say bodily or a primal sort of function that we have within ourselves. Whereby if we're presented with a Tyrannosaurus Rex in front of us or a guy with a gun, whatever, and he's pointing it at our head --

Josh: Or a small cell tower out in front of a house.

Joe: Right. We may have some fear within the body that comes up for a moment, but it's a bodily fear to move yourself out of that particular danger, for that particular moment. But in terms of actual safety, you'll realize you can say to yourself, "Oh, well, I'm looking for safety. I'm looking for safety." How many people are walking down the street, they're healthy. I think it was a prominent soccer goalie. World Class goalie, just the other day had a heart attack. You think, okay, here's a guy who eats well, making probably at this point hundreds of millions of dollars because it's soccer, exercising all the time, still has a heart attack. Well, was he preventing himself? Was he staying safe from a health perspective? You start to realize when you look at the situation, when you play out the stories that we have about safety, you start to realize, what are we trying to be safe from?

It's like something could happen at any moment, and that isn't

something to fear. It's a recognition of like, "hey, that's not where our focus is supposed to be." Our focus is if you stay back to who you truly are. You realize you're safe in each moment. Everything has its sort of needs to be. But when you recognize, "Hey, you know what? These 5G cell towers are going in." And you say, "Well, why are we doing this?" And then you become active, not from a standpoint of fear of safety. But from the stand -- because if you're doing from fear of safety, you're going to panic, you're going to fight, you're going to attack. And when you come from that state, which is to be honest, it's unconscious state of recognition of something going on. You're going to be met back with the same thing, people are going to fight you. You walk into a room and there's tension, you become a little bit tense. You walk into a room and there's peace. You recognize that and you're almost like, you slowly fall into that peace.

Everyone has had that experience before, which means everyone has for the most part a mechanism within themselves, which the HeartMath Institute has helped us understand is our heart and the electromagnetic field that comes from that heart, which is understandable by the brain. Everyone has this mechanism where you can sense energetically what's going on and you can connect with that, and you can feel these different things. So why does fear, why does coming in with fear attacking a situation and with more fear, you create that cycle and then there's more attack back? Well, because we can feel that. People can feel, people can sense that. You're sending out an information.

So to be in a conscious state, recognizing, "Hey, I'm fine. I'm holy and complete within myself. I got to get rid of these fear stories." Then you take that and you go and you impact your environment, you impact your local community, you impact your provincial or state government, you impact your federal government. But you're not coming in there, "This is horrible in what you're doing and all this boom, boom." Then they're going to get offended. "You guys are irresponsible Congress people." They get offended, they go on the defensive, because that's how we're programmed to do things. But then all of a sudden, you're coming, "Hey, you know, I recognize your man or woman, your parent here, whatever you may be recognized that you may not have access to the information, here's some information. What's going on, here's how I feel about it." They're going to be like, "Whoa." And they're going to listen. And that's how people are impacting local communities. And I know you know a lot about that.

Josh: So it's us accepting and stepping into responsibility and accountability for ourselves. We can still bring that to elected reps and utility.

Joe: Absolutely.

Josh: Exactly. I believe still it's our responsibility to bring that, but like you said, not from a place of jumping on that like from immediate judgment, like full on projection of their the problem and we are the innocent. And so, perhaps we're all -- there is a microcosm happening within us, correct me if I'm wrong. Like we can shift the outer reality because we are connected with the all. And so when we make those interchanges as the microcosm, then when we come from that place and have those conversations and send those emails to our elected reps and phone calls, for example. Then that has a different effect, because we are sharing the responsibility and the accountability with them.

Joe: Absolutely, yeah. You know, there's a couple ways to look at this. People will talk about, "Oh, you got to shift your consciousness. And then the consciousness will affect the world." And people will look at that and they'll say, "Okay, well, that sounds like you're being passive, that you're not going to act, that you're going to sit there and meditate and you're going to do your thing and whatever and let it sink." Well, hold on. We didn't come to this planet to not engage with one another. We didn't come to this planet to not co create a reality that has a material element to it. You know, stuff we build, put together, do this, that whatever. We didn't come to the planet to not experience that, we came to experience that.

What is the underlying state of being that we want to bring into the creation? And what will that state of being ultimately create? When you see the creation and you come back from the other end and say, "Okay, here's what it created. How can I now go and create something different?" Well, I have to change the state of being. So what this really looks like in a very simple, where you're merging the physical world and the metaphysical world into what's actually happening is, before you go impact, before you go have your conversation with your Congresswoman, Congressman, local government, whoever it may be, Telecom. You're changing your state of being and you're creating a new energetic environment that is not about a push and pull a duel us versus them. But that's about coming from a different point of view.

So what happens is, you shifted your consciousness, which you then took into a situation which created a new environment that actually was ripe for change to occur. And I'm not talking about change where, "Okay, yeah, you know, we decided to not do 5G in this area." I'm talking about all of a sudden, you brought something to those people, into that situation that starts to create a framework in society because it compounds that starts to not just say 5G needs to be questioned. But that starts to say, the underlying questioning was why are we operating in a way where we do something that destroys us?

And the more we expand that, the more you start creating a whole society around that, because guess what? You shifted the initial

foundation. And so now it's like, well, there's the 5G fight. Then after the 5G fight, there's whatever fight. Then after that fight, there's the -- Now, it starts to collapse the future fights because there's a different state of being, there's a different state of awareness that's happening here. So that's how the consciousness shifts the reality. There's a shift which creates the action and it continues.

Josh: Yeah, that's so good, Joe. Just as we wrap up here, I'm getting this huge energetic hit on needing to share this. The film that came out last year about -- the documentary about Fred Rogers, the childhood educator. You know, children's show host for decades. That scene where he's -- Did you see that?

Joe: I have not yet, but I'm wanting to.

Josh: Okay. I encourage everyone to. After you watch it, you'll thank me. Right now you're like, "What is he talking about?" But go watch this clip, look it up. The scene where he's needing funding because his show is under attack. It's being threatened, it could be shut down. And he is the Pioneer for compassion based children's television. Like, he's the guy. He's the pioneer. So when he's talking with this high level government official, who has the power to defund and shut him down. How he speaks and the place from which he comes; that heart centered compassion place, you can just feel it for a few minutes. You're just right in there. There's this sort of heart and mind meld you can sense that the person in the position of power, who at the start of the conversation was very stoic and like business. At the end of that conversation, Joe, it's amazing. Mr. Fred Rogers gets his funding and it begins to open up. From that moment on, there's new way of empowering, inspiring children on TV and he goes on to reach millions and millions of kids in this in this country.

But I was just so strongly reminded of that, because when I saw that clip, I just had this visceral reaction like a heart based. You could say, visceral reaction of, "Oh, yeah, that's the way that we need to communicate." So we're not lying down. We're not begging. We're not pulling back and doing meditations all day and withdrawing, but we're coming from a place where we're expressing the commonality and including in a bigger context of bigger information that is disarming at the very core of it. Disarming to those which -- you know, if we didn't use that might be positioned more strongly as our adversary.

Joe: For sure what you start to recognize is in that moment, he's actually empowered. Not the illusion of empowerment which to humanity's current consciousness we picture as the man or woman standing on top of the cliff with the sword in hand and a shield like, you know, I'm ready to fight. That's the illusion. That's the story. The real empowerment is, like Neo from the Matrix. When he's standing in that hallway and the

three agents shoot a whole bunch of bullets at him and he's just there, calm, puts out his hand and stops it. Picks it up, looks at it, "What is this that you're trying to do?" drops it. That's empowerment, and that's where we're going.

Sorry, this slightly emotional. It's just the idea like we want to fight. Do you know what I'm saying? We want to think that it's about fighting and it's not. It's this idea of like, you're just recognizing who you truly are. And it's in that state that we actually have the power to do something to make a difference. And in the Mr. Rogers example, what is our world designed to do? Disconnect people, everyone knows this. Look at social media, look at the phones, look at the food, look at the water. Look at the way we're disconnected from our environment. Everyone can recognize that it's about disconnection. So why would you take a disconnected state to an elected official, to another human being and say, "From a disconnected state, which is I got to fight you." Why would you do that? Well, you're just reflecting the world as it is versus if you take a connected state, where you deprogram from that everyday reality and you go. Doesn't matter how stoic and cold that Congress man or woman is at that moment.

By the end of yours little five minutes speech, you've reconnected humanity in that one spot. And no one can deny that, and that's changes people.

Josh: That has a ripple effect, like how we describe how we're each connected at our core in this quantum realm. It goes out that moment in time, that one communication.

Joe: Yeah, absolutely. That's what it's about.

Josh: Thank you, brother. I was feeling emotional there too. I'm a bit of an empathy. Thank you for bringing that up. Just as we wrap up here, I'm going to put you on the spot. So you talked about the meditation, pulling back with drawing, connecting to the realm within us, and then coming from that place. What are three concrete steps that you would recommend that people could use to actualize that?

Joe: I mean, I'm going to kind of go with three things that uses part of protocols that I share with other people and so forth. And it's essentially, meditation is good. Meditation can show up in many forms. So I want to say this from the standpoint, you don't necessarily have to do it in a traditional sort of way. There's a lot of different things that are meditative for different people. But whatever it is that allows you when speaking about meditation, to sort of quiet things down, to get out of the everyday sort of robotic nature of work, repetition of, you know, whatever the habits, phone, distraction, people, all these sorts of things. Sometimes it's as simple as making sure you have like 30 minutes of

time a day where it's just you, where there's nothing else going on.

And that allows you to sort of every now and then get back into who you are. It's like when you go to a camping trip for a couple days and if it's not the kind of camping trip where you got beer and everyone's partying and whatever, but kind of it's more just out in nature. You notice you have like this. "Wow. I feel like refreshed." You know sort of feeling. That is a very powerful thing to sort of start breaking some of the hat patterns and habits, getting out of some of the automatic fear states, the worry states, the fight states, and kind of just like having a bigger perspective. Along with that, I like the idea of creating a little bit more presence now, because presence starts to create a space. It starts to create time, where you're feeling more self-aware, which is going to be the third part. But it creates this spot where you're a little bit more like, "Alright, I'm here. I'm paying attention to right now." And to do that in a very simple way. I just tell people, if you're not good with remembering, is creating an alarm on your phone for every like four hours.

You know, just a quick little thing that comes up. And it's as simple as stop, close your eyes for just a second. You can leave your eyes open, whatever it needs to be. But your focus and intention goes back to let it go, take a few deep breaths. Let your shoulders just relax, let your jaw muscles, let it all relax, let it all just come back to present. What are you hearing around you? What do you feel around you? What do you sense and smell and all these sorts of things? Again, presence, which goes back to that meditative state to some extent again. And then the final thing is self-awareness. Now, self-awareness is going to come as a result of these things. Self-Awareness is why did I think what I thought in that particular instance, in that particular situation? Before I even judge somebody, I catch myself, like, "Whoa, I was just about to judge that part." And you get better.

It's a muscle that builds. You get better with recognizing, "Oh, I was about to say that." When that energy of wanting to do something sort of starts to rise within yourself. You notice it and you catch yourself before it happens. And eventually, you start understanding what that energy with whatever situation it is, what that feeling is, so much so that it just starts to dissipate, because it doesn't need to be there any longer because you begin self-aware of it.

And so that self-awareness is also extends out into how I affect people around me, how I affect my environment, how I now change my actions. So all of a sudden now you've been gaining this greater sense of who you are, you're naturally going to be seeing through certain narratives within the media that are like, "Well, hold on. I'm kind of seeing a little bit more to that than I saw before. Not only that, but now I'm seeing why it's triggering me in certain ways. Why is that triggering me?" You're asking these questions.

Self-Awareness is about under being aware of the mechanisms that oftentimes autonomously operate through you, that don't need to autonomously operate through you. Things like emotions and anger, and so forth that just sort of spew out of you and that we justify because that person wronged me. But it subjectively that person may not have wronged you not only that you didn't need to react that way. All of a sudden I start seeing that I've given my power away to just these autonomous emotions and so forth.

So self-awareness, it changes a lot of different things. And I think there's a good little set of practice to sort of get there. And of course, this isn't by no means going to solve everything. This is like just getting on that path, getting on that journey, starting to pay attention. And you'll notice, you'll be sort of guided if you want to call it that. You'll start seeing, you'll find the right book, you'll have these certain conversations and the journey will keep expanding and that self-responsibility, that self-action and so forth will start to arise within yourself. And you'll be making physical changes within the world from a new state of being. That's really what it's all about.

Josh: Right on. Thank you, Joe. Where can people tap into your work and be part of your community?

Joe: For sure, so we're on Instagram, Facebook, YouTube, and so forth. Even though there's a lot of censorship that goes on in every single one of those platforms, we are there. You can just search "collective evolution" on any of them and you'll be able to find them. Collective-evolution.com is where we put a lot of our videos, so we got articles coming out every day, videos and a podcast every Tuesday and Thursday. We also do original shows, we do a new show as well as we do interviews on a platform called CETV. It's essentially like a Netflix but for like alternative media, news and all those types of conversations.

You know, that's our way of sort of moving away from the censorship engines and into a place where we're kind of more self-responsible, and control of a platform that we can kind of just do whatever we need to do completely censorship free. That's what that's all about.

Josh: Excellent. Joe Martino, my friend. Thank you for being part of The 5G Summit.

Joe: Yeah, thank you so much for having me. It was a pleasure.

5G Versus Your Inner Authority

Guest: Olga Sheean

Josh: With us today on the summit is Olga Sheean. Olga, welcome.

Olga: Thank you, Josh.

Josh: I'm so glad to be speaking with you because I've been following your work and your EMF-related writings and videos. You've written books. And I've been wanting to get your information out. You've been such a soulful perspective to this conversation that touches a lot of people. And you're all about empowering and informing. So, thank you again for being here. I'm looking forward to this talk.

Olga: My pleasure.

Josh: I'll just share quickly with our viewers a little bit about your bio. Olga Sheean has produced numerous books and videos on the impact of wireless radiation in our lives. She is the author of *EMF Off*, a great name, a call to consciousness in our misguided microwave world, and five other paradigm-shifting books. Olga is also an empowerment catalyst, dedicated to excavating the deeper truth buried in every human being. She works with individuals to help them reclaim their autonomy, leverage their magnetism, and transform crises and challenges into breakthroughs and strengths.

So, just diving right in, we're already aware of the 5G problem. We know that the science is solid on it. We know that the risk is serious. How did things get to this point? Just help us contextualize the 5G crisis in context, so the bigger picture as we dive in.

Olga: A long time ago, many, many generations in our history, we became disconnected, emotionally and spiritually disconnected. It's what I call "the split," which was a disconnection from our spiritual autonomy and our emotional autonomy as well. And it happened actually when Christianity was forced upon our ancestors. And at that time, they were forced to convert; either that or die. Many of them did. But those who did convert were forced to defer to a higher authority, an external authority.

And over time, as this got passed down through generations, we did that more and more. We lost connection with our innate wisdom, our own spiritual compass, if you like, our moral compass, our emotional integrity. And we've given away that piece of ourselves to the outside; so, our own hotline to God, if you like, or own connection to the universe and intelligence, whatever it was called back then. We were forced to give that up.

And so, since then, we've been trying to actually reconnect. It's an essential piece that we lost, that has taken us progressively further away from ourselves, from nature, from what is right and healthy for us, the awareness of what is essential for our bodies, and how nature is such an essential part of that. So, we progressively lost the interconnectedness as well.

And because we were deferring to an external authority, we also gave away a sense of self-responsibility for our lives. But this happened over time. And over time it affected the key areas of life. And I fear it is progressing something like this over the timelines. They're probably overlapping quite a bit.

So, it began essentially with our food becoming denatured. And it began to be mass-produced, and chemicals and preservatives and things were added. And after that, medicine became more drug-based, pharmaceutical drug based. And it was more of a symptomatic approach.

And again, more and more we were giving away authority to the outside. We were losing the connection with our deeper selves, what our bodies needed, how our bodies functioned, and how nature supported us in that, the healing properties of nature, the spiritual connection that we got through nature. We were progressively losing this, more and more deferring to outside authority.

Then we had industry increasingly exploiting our natural resources. And because we were more and more disconnected from nature, we didn't really feel that anymore. So, we were losing that sense of being an integral part of our natural environment. And we didn't really see what was happening as these things progressed.

All of the time, and what was driving this, actually, was the dysfunction that occurred at that very point. We were programmed not just to defer to an external authority, but also to see ourselves as being less than, as being undeserving, as being unworthy. And that is the biggest thing that has affected us and hindered us and shaped our lives. So, that lack of self-worth, we were programmed to self-reject effectively.

Josh: Thank you. This is probably the only time we're going to get a chance to talk about this specific topic, from this frame, on the summit. So, thank you for mentioning that, that root of empowerment versus disempowerment. And how you linked it to if one's authority is external and not internal, then one can't truly be empowered.

But I just want to kind of dive into that, if we could. I was raised Christian. And I still feel a deep resonance with those teachings, with the teachings of Jeshua, as I would call him, as his name was 2000 years ago. But they seem to be more about the kingdom. The power is within and it's without. It's all around you and it's within, right? So, we've lost, we've kind of got maybe half of that truth in the religion that followed, right? Everything is outside of you. You're not okay inherently, and you need to be fixed or you need to be saved by a God who is not both outside and inside, but completely outside.

Olga: Yes. It's not just that, though. It was a self-appointed hierarchy. That's the thing. It's an intermediary between us and whatever that godness is. I call it godness, because I think we all have it innately. And so, we deferred to that self-imposed hierarchy, self-appointed hierarchy, which wasn't even about God at all. So, that being interpreted, organized religion has interpreted what God is, telling us what God thinks of us and how we should live to be acceptable, basically. And that's a huge piece right there.

Josh: And so, we as people have kind of co-created and repeated that pattern, right? We've like co-created in having a government that is a hierarchical system, where the power is outside of the people, whereas other social structures, where we have to somehow obey these structures or these big pendulum type forces. And that's been a pattern that's repeated from that root belief that the authority is outside of the human being. Is that along the lines of how you see it?

Olga: Yes, definitely. And as I said, because of the low self-worth that's been programmed into us, that changed everything. And it put us into a state of reactivity as well, and desperately seeking approval, acceptance, and connection. You can't get nourished emotionally or spiritually if we're not connected. This is partly why the digital age is so appealing to people, because they're seeking those connections. That's one of the reasons why it's also so difficult to give it up. We're desperate to fill in

those pieces that have been missing for a very long time.

Because of our programming and the way that we were programmed to not let ourselves accept ourselves and see ourselves as incapable or powerless to create our own lives, because we were taught that all along through the religious indoctrination. We deferred even more to the external forces, so external authority. We wanted them to fix things. But we ended up being in a state of reactivity. Because we are not proactively orchestrating our own lives, we are reacting to all the stuff that's coming out. The problems are escalating.

And that's what happens if we don't address our programming. Because the programming inside of us, the beliefs and the emotions, have a huge impact on our external environment, not just on the way we feel about ourselves, but in what we attract. So, we now know through neuroscience and quantum physics, for example, that our thoughts have an electrical charge to them, and our emotions are magnetic. So, we have very much a powerful electromagnetic field on that's always transmitting and always attracting to us particular things in life.

Now, our higher minds, our super-conscious, or whatever you want to call it, is seeking for us to become whole again. There is some driving force, I believe, that wants us to be whole again. And in that quest, we're increasingly faced with challenges. They're not there to make life difficult. They're meant to give us an opportunity to grow.

So, every challenge that we face has an inherent message about what's going on in us, what's missing. But we need to reclaim those missing parts of ourselves, make ourselves whole, and start to live proactively, because we are creators. And most of the time, even with all of this stuff we're dealing with now, we are reacting.

We live a huge amount of our lives, huge energy, huge money invested in reacting to all the fallout from the food, the unhealthy lifestyle, industry taking over, a loss of fulfillment or whatever, divorce, depression, all of these things increasing, pushing us ultimately, if we can understand what's happening, to reclaim ourselves, to come back to life, to make ourselves whole and to become more conscious of what's really going on and what's really driving this.

Josh: Wow! So, we touched on, you mentioned that we have a creative force in us, that we are creators of our beings. We have a spark of creator, however you want to call it, in us at the core of our being.

I struggle with this sometimes, because this is obviously a heavy topic, this whole 5G agenda, how it's going forward. There's all this harm associated with it. And there's no science indicating that it's safe, and they're not doing any. But they're pushing it anyway for money and

profit and control and all of that stuff. So, this is obviously a very heavy topic. And my concern, obviously, in pointing this out is I don't want to put people in a state of fear, and especially in a state of fear and just leave them there. I want this to be fact, truth-based, empowering, and encourage them and invite them into action and solutions.

I want to ask the question of you, the placebo effect. What we focus on expands. How do we balance that understanding in quantum physics and that risk of getting into a negative mind state, versus the importance of getting the information out? That's a balance that I personally struggle with. What do you think?

Olga: Well, I think we have to ask ourselves what we really want. Because if we spent all day reacting to the bad news out there, and there's an endless amount of it. And you know, all these studies are coming out repeatedly about the effects of the wireless radiation. They are literally endless. So, we could spend all of our time listening to that, hearing it, and getting depressed by it.

But if we understand what's happening, that the programming drives more and more of those problems on the outside, the less we take charge of ourselves, then perhaps we could stop and say, "Hey, wait a minute. What do I want?" Because how much energy am I actually putting into creating all I want, as opposed to putting all of this energy into what I don't want and what isn't working?

Because when you think of the number of us who are aware about this issue, how much energy are we giving to it? And, of course, it's important to spread the word, to spread awareness, and to raise awareness about what's happening to us. But I think we can too far. And to get that healthy balance, yes, we need to know what's happening. But then we need to get on with creating the life that we want, because we have that power within us to create what we want. And if we keep giving that energy exclusively or largely to what's not working, we're going to get more of it.

Josh: Wow! What do you think about the idea of a regular, in-community, prayerful meditation focused on what we do want in solving this 5G problem?

Olga: I think it's a fantastic idea. But I think we have to make changes in our own lives, because really, it's about taking back self-responsibility, responsibility for our choices, the way we live. I know quite a few people who are electro-sensitive and are severely affected by wireless radiation. And they still own a cell phone, but just for emergencies. But you still need a cell tower for those emergencies. It's not going to come on just when you need it.

So, we're not really congruent with some of what we're saying. We're saying, "We don't want this. We don't want this technology." But we still are paying the industry to provide those services. And that's what counts, our actions. Any verbal objections we might have, we have cancelled out by the choices we make. So, we have to start making choices that support the kind of life we want.

And that means we've got to really look at what we are doing. Instead of looking at governments and industry and the harm that they are causing, what are we doing? Are we still on plastic? What about the [coal tar in the mines that are used] for people's phones? That's creating a huge amount of suffering with the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Yet even without that, we keep on buying phones or using the phones.

Josh: I'm sorry. Just to jump in. So, you don't have a cell phone.

Olga: No, I don't.

Josh: Okay.

Olga: And I love not having a cell phone.

Josh: I was just going to ask you, "How do you like it?"

Olga: It's wonderfully liberating. I haven't had one for many years, and I love it. I don't miss it at all. The simpler life is for me, the healthier and more relaxed I am.

Josh: Yea, good. I wire mine wherever possible. I have a PDF on "Take Back Your Power Button." It's a free download for people to look at, minimizing their exposures. And one of them is a specific adapter set to wire your phone. I think that's a step that really helped me. Perhaps the next step is just getting rid of it entirely.

Olga: Okay, Josh. I have a challenging question for you. I've been curious to know how you respond to this. So, you say you have a cell phone. And I know you're against the wireless industry. So, how do you reconcile those two things, when you are actually feeding the industry that you also are judging for the harm that they do to us?

Josh: Yea, that's a good question. It's kind of like related to if your government is out there fighting illegal wars and doing things that are harming and killing people, how do you justify paying tax in supporting that government? It's a struggle, to be honest. And it's like I guess part of the way that I tend to justify it is kind of the same reason why I'm still on Facebook, at least at the time of this interview. It's to use the technologies that exist to help change the situation, to bring awareness through the systems that are established on this planet.

Olga: But why do you need a phone for that?

Josh: Well, in terms of using a phone, I find it's incredibly effective for quick communication if I'm not in my home office. And also, I want to be able to communicate quickly with my daughter with a text or something like that if I'm out and not at home. So, it's food for thought, though. Because I know there are a lot of people such as myself who are wanting to bring awareness of 5G and of wireless harm and still use the technology.

And I think there also is a point to be made for not stopping and saying no to any form of this type of communication, but using it more safely and bringing awareness to the safety issues so that the companies and the people, the inventors, can realize the necessity of doing things in a much safer way. So, it's a good question, though. And I didn't have a phone from 2010 to 2013.

Olga: It's still supporting the industry, right? On the one hand, you're saying this industry is harming us, and we need to change it. We need them to change things. But perhaps we're not willing to make those personal changes. I know you said, "But most people say, 'Well, I need it for my safety. I need it for contact with my family. I'm better with it.'" And it's what everybody says. So, we do justify holding on to the technology. And that, of course, just keeps it going, because it does feed the industry.

And also, if you're thinking about 5G, the smart phone is the delivery system. And I know a lot of others are saying the same thing. I'm not the first. I know others have said this. The only way to really disengage from and say no to 5G is to dump the smart phone. You can still have a flip phone if you absolutely have, too. But that's debatable, too. But the smart phone is going to connect you to that system. And it's going to support the system.

Josh: Good point. I appreciate it. But what about, though, if you're just using a phone. Let's say a hundred percent of one's usage is plugged in, as wired. There's nothing wireless coming in.

Olga: You still need a cell tower. And you're still paying the industry to do it.

Josh: You don't need a cell tower if it's plugged in, though. But yes, you are paying the industry.

Olga: Yea, you're paying the industry. You're supporting the industry. And there's something else. I think this is something else someone pointed out that when you buy a cell phone, the industry is then legally obliged to make sure there's enough cell towers out there to serve you.

So, you know, these are the choices I'm talking about, the hard choices that we have to make, the personal choices that change, because our consumer choices have huge power. That's what will change things, the choices that we make.

Josh: Yea, thank you for bringing awareness to that, Olga. I was observing myself just answering that, definitely in justifying, right? And I have my own reasons, and we're communicating that. But, yea, thanks for bringing that perspective to this conversation.

Olga: Yea, it's tough to hear, I know, and tough to deal with. But we have to be ruthlessly honest with ourselves if we're going to expect governments and others to be accountable to us. We have to have that same accountability to ourselves and to each other.

Josh: Well, I just wanted to ask from another angle, focusing in on this process of awareness. How do you and how you recommend for people to process the fear and the overwhelm that comes from being aware of the 5G agenda, let's say, and other things that are really intense, happening on the planet right now?

Olga: Well, I think we have to disconnect from that stuff and understand that we are feeding the fear. When we feel fear, we are generating a huge amount of energy and giving it to that, giving it tremendous power. If we stop—in fact, we need to stop—we need to really slow down and put down the phone and switch off the gadgets and sit in stillness. Because we will never know ourselves or connect ourselves, connect with ourselves, if we're moving so fast that we can't be present. We cannot create unless we are present.

And one of the reasons we're so speedy is to avoid looking at this stuff. And it's because deep down we don't feel we can orchestrate our lives. We don't feel good enough. We don't see an attractive alternative to this other magical-feeling stuff with these gadgets that seem to do incredible things. We can do many of those things ourselves once we understand how we really work and how to engage our higher spiritual capacities.

So, we have to stop. We have to disengage. We're never going to see the full picture or our place in this and how we're like running on a treadmill. We won't see that unless we disconnect and reconnect with ourselves and just sit still without the distractions, without the overstimulation, all that stuff that takes us out of ourselves and keeps us disconnected. That's a crucial piece. We must be present in order to create. And if we're not present, we're not creating. We are reacting.

Josh: Well, thank you. Let's dive into that then. That's a new segway. How would you define the role of consciousness or spirit or our spirit, or perhaps the one spirit, in this process?

Olga: Well, consciousness, as I see it, is a profound awareness of our wholeness, all of us, our complete self. So, when we become conscious and work to become more conscious through mediation or whatever means we use to reconnect with ourselves, we begin to understand that wholeness that we have, the other aspects of ourselves that might have got switched off, a sense of oneness with all that there is, the whole universal connectedness that we've been missing. And it's interesting that consciousness is the only thing that nobody can take away from us. It's the one thing that can't be sold, hijacked, leveraged. It's eternal, it's personal, it's deeply intimate.

Yet, it's a seamless connection with everything. So, we own that. And we have opportunity to leverage our own consciousness in creating something amazing once we allow ourselves to actually connect at a deeper level.

Josh: Can you give us two or three pointers? Let's say somebody is watching this, and they're like, "How do I leverage my consciousness? What do I do? What's a specific task or action or thing to do? What's maybe two or three things that you would suggest for people that seem to work for you and your clients?"

Olga: Well, I think to become aware of reactive thoughts and emotions, the things that we repeatedly think, because most of the time we are unconscious. And to become conscious, we have to stop. And we have to ask ourselves, "Okay, what's that thought I just had, that negative thought, that negative projection?"

We also get caught up in a lot of drama. Drama is all reaction, reactivity. And it's all about a story that we have about how the world works and what's been done to us and how awful it is. And we get very distracted by dramas. We have to drop the drama. And be very honest with ourselves and say, "Okay, what am I doing here? What am I thinking? What am I projecting? How am I judging? Where are these thoughts taking me? Are they feeding me? Do I feel good when I'm thinking this way or operating this way? And how do I behave as a result of those thoughts and emotions?"

So, it's taking ourselves back again to that stillness I talked about, where we take a breath. And we have to sit out to see what we're doing, how we're living, and what that's creating for us. So, sitting in stillness, meditating, getting back into nature, putting down the distractions is actually the key to getting more connected, to becoming more conscious, and then thinking about the choices that we make. And here is something to think about. If we were personally and individually responsible for our household and our bodily waste, how would we live?

Josh: Interesting point. I never heard it put like that before.

Olga: Yea. I mean what choices would we make and not make if we have to personally take care of all of our waste? Because it's something we give away. We don't really want to know. We don't know what happens to our bodily waste. We have no idea where it goes. Out of sight, out of mind. Recycling, we put into the bins every week and off it goes. And it probably ends up in a dump in Malaysia, as we now know. So, we do that to appease our conscience. But what are we really doing? We're not taking responsibility for it.

Josh: Well, it's funny that you mentioned that. Because just yesterday I was thinking, "I'm so grateful for plumbing." That's like one of the best inventions ever. So, it's interesting that you mentioned that.

Let's talk about self-responsibility, Olga, because it seems like we all want, in let's say this adolescent phase of humanity, I can relate and maybe you yourself can, too. There are parts of me that are not wanting to take responsibility like a grownup. But I'm willing to do my best overall. So, we all seem to want rights and to be protected and to protect my castle, protect me and my family. It's not just selfish. We want rights. But there's a reluctance to assume the responsibility. Can you talk about self-responsibility and its importance in this process?

Olga: I think we have to look at it at a very simple, everyday level. Look at the choices that we make and the boundaries that we are making, the ways we are relating to other people. If we don't start taking responsibility in those small ways, the ways that we can, then we'd expect things to be fixed on the outside. So, we pay taxes. We think, "Well, that entitles me to get things fixed by the government. I pay taxes. So, you know, you take care of it."

But, how can governments fix things if we are creating problems? The thought programming is not being addressed. And we are driving the dysfunction that is consuming our society. Nobody can fix that for us. So, we have to take responsibility for the way we are operating as an individual, the way we are operating in terms of our emotions and thoughts.

Josh: Okay, how do we take and accept responsibility or to be self-responsible if, let's say, government and industry is running things and we feel powerless?

Olga: Okay. Well, as I said, it's about making some fundamental choices. I mean we can't say to the industry, "We don't like what you're doing," and then keep buying their products. So, whether we like it or not, and particularly with regards to 5G this will be true, because it's such a key part of the delivery system.

It means giving up some of those things that are supporting an industry

that we say we don't want to have running things, but we are paying to run things. But we have to make some healthy choices that are in alignment with what we say we want. Because we say one thing, but we're acting another way.

And it comes back to other simple every-day stuff, too. And are we connecting with our family? Or are we sitting there with our phone or some other device and disconnecting? The more we connect, the more powerful we become. The more conscious we become, the more we can create.

So, there are many levels to it, many layers. But we start with the small stuff, the choices that we are making, the actions that we are taking, the things that we can change. And, of course, also standing up to authority and saying no. And let's say we go to a coffee house with Wi-Fi. We start to say, "Look, I don't want Wi-Fi. I'd like for you to put in some cords, where we can plug in computers." And if enough people said that, it would happen. But we just have to create a different kind of demand, rather than feeding and supporting the demand for the other stuff that we say we don't want.

Josh: Yea. Do you see this as an opportunity to really observe that we've been projecting and creating this external problem, and really what it's doing is it's becoming . . . ? (this is a loaded question). But perhaps what it's doing is it's becoming so intense that somehow it gets reflected back onto us, right? Like we did this. Like we actually, all of us, co-created this problem by giving our power away, by allowing illusion really to run our minds, and our egos getting carried away with building up the self, so to speak. How do you see that?

Like are we all getting a reflection back to look at ourselves and to accept responsibility in terms of like, perhaps, we are small versions of the whole? So, perhaps this is a necessary part of our process, to get us to deal with this, and then we can actually finally start to shift the external. But we have the order wrong, backwards perhaps. A very long run-on sentence question. I don't even know what I'm asking specifically. How do you see this? Like are we microcosms, that we really are being invited to self-reflect at a deep level and then just make our perspective inside out, the way that it was before?

Olga: Well, I think there are a couple of ways of coming at it. And on one level you could say that unless we're forced to change because we're so deeply programmed. And on another level you could say that this stuff that's coming at us, these growing problems, all this stuff, the disease, the depression, all the challenges we're being faced with increasingly, are pushing us to see what's really going on, because that's an externalization of the havoc and the chaos inside. So, until we understand that human dysfunction, which is negative programming,

is driving this, we can never really get on top of it and change it or take charge of it.

So, in a sense, we could say that we're blindly pushing ourselves to the point of either annihilation... So, in a sense I kind of see that we're in this last phase of disconnectedness. And after this we'll either collectively reconnect in a hurry. Or, I'm not sure what will happen next. But, also, the nature of humanity, because programming is so stubborn, and because we are so deeply programmed and don't see it, we often have to get a wake-up call.

And I've had mine. I've had several over my own journey. And many of us have to. And sometimes that takes us to a place of deeper understanding. We are forced to stop. We are forced to change. We are forced to look inside to see what's really driving this. And if we do that, especially if we go willingly, then we are richly rewarded, because then we get to see the power that we have.

Josh: Just going further on that path, what will inspire us, do you feel, to change or invest in our personal evolution, rather than the evolution of technology or what's happening on the outside.

Olga: Well, I think the reason we haven't gone there is because we're so disconnected from what we are capable of. And when we start to talk about spiritual stuff, people get a bit uncomfortable. Again, it's because we got forcefully disconnected from that so long ago. So, it's a difficult thing. People think it's a bit like creativity. It's on the fringe. It's not really... I've got life to live. I've got lots of problems to deal with. I don't have time for this spiritual stuff or creativity. It might be something I do in my spare time. But it's really such an integral part of it.

So, it's a tough one, because we have separated from it so much. And we're not comfortable even talking about it. And scientists certainly don't even want to go there, because they think they'll lose their credibility. Yet it's such an integral part of who we are. And that's where most of our power is, in fact, in our higher faculties, which we have neglected. So, because we haven't evolved, technology has evolved massively. It has raced ahead of us, because we haven't consciously.

So, we may not be able to see the payoff until we start to dip into what it means to be a fully activated, actualized, functional human being; until we explore some of those deeper layers. So many people are. Many people are getting more connected, are getting back into meditation and yoga. We're seeing a resurgence of that; not the majority, certainly. But it is happening. And we know once we go on that journey, the rewards are huge.

I have lived this way in the past. I got off track of when I was hit by the

radiation, and I really saw how it disconnected me. But when I used to live in Vancouver, for example, when I started on, back in the early 1990s, our journey of self-discover, because I was alone and needed to fix some things. And I was unhappy. I grew up in Ireland in the programming there. I knew all the religious stuff, even though I'm not religious. It deeply affected me, and I felt very diminished and very aware of programming and how it affected me. I had a lot of unlearning to do.

I did all of that stuff. And I got into this work out of necessity, learning about the body/mind connection and about the subconscious. It was really about how powerful, how magnetic it is, what's in there. If we make it more conscious, how we can take charge of it and then start to create really amazing things in our lives.

I developed to the point where I literally was telepathic. I had a deep intuitive awareness. And working with people served me really well, because I picked up on things that literally they didn't know how I knew. I didn't know how I knew. But somehow, I got very connected. And we all have that capability. And the telepathy was a bit like having a cell phone but not needing one. So, we do have these amazing capacities, spiritual faculties, that we are simply not using.

And we have tried to be powerful by proxy, if you like. Again, externalized our power, giving it to a cell phone, giving it to a gadget. Really, we want it inside. And we're seeking that connection and that fulfillment still, even more, on the outside, which is what keeps us engaged and keeps us addicted and keeps us overstimulated and distracted and all those things.

Josh: And keeps us on social media.

Olga: Exactly, yea. And also, just to a place – and this is another little interesting thing – where we actually lost the capacity to care about what's going on. And I call it social greedia, which is not social media gone haywire. It's actually we've lost our capacity to care, because we're so emotionally and digitally burned out.

And part of the reason we are still so needy of the social media and all of that stuff is that we need comfort. We want something to make up for what's missing inside. So, that gives us something. It's immediate gratification, since it's all the time. It's always there. It keeps us with a sense of engagement of belonging, but not really, because it's just gadgets.

Josh: Yea, and because it's typically--I don't want to say it's for everyone in all cases--but typically like engagement in social media is rooted around being recognized or being approved of by an external authority,

like other people, right?

Olga: Yea. We're looking for the answer on the outside. And the magic on the inside is so far beyond what we conceive of, and so much more than what our gadgets are capable of. And that's where the wonder lies. If we can get to that place of glimpsing that, we'll begin to see that there is a payoff for switching.

Josh: Okay, I asked you earlier, like how do we get to that place of glimpsing that? So, it is being still, you mentioned. It's meditating, doing yoga, prayer, living intentionally, connecting with others in person, loving our family. Is that the basis of connecting with that magic? Or is it like I'm going to sit and figure this out and push myself through this resistance and having like forcing a daily practice, for example? Or is it both?

Olga: I think it's both of those things. But it's also asking ourselves what we want. What kind of life do we really want?

Josh: Just coming back to the why. Just bringing it to the why, and so we can create align with our why, rather than maybe create from a lower level where we're resisting something or fighting something or putting our energy there.

Olga: Well, there's lots of resistance because of the programming. The nature of it is it's very stubborn and it's deeply ingrained. And we don't know it's not a natural part of us. It feels like it's a natural part of us, because we're programmed at a very early age, in our formative years. So, that takes some work. That means some kind of inner work that we do to become connected to that deeper truth of who we are.

But then we also want to hold a vision of what we really want. And I call it pre-living or pre-loving our ideal future. So, instead of getting all of that energy and focus and time and all of that stuff to the bad stuff that's happening to us, we need to step back and say, "Okay, what's my vision of my future? What environment do I want to see?" Because we don't really think we have that power anyway.

Josh: Okay. I've got to put you on the spot here. And we're going to go into this. What would you suggest is a suitable vision that we could focus on?

What do we want here with regards to this 5G agenda and this harmful technology? Can we just do this process together, along with the viewers? What could we focus on?

Olga: Well, I would like to see a really healthy environment. I see people bantering about, connecting. I see other people out on bikes, walking nature, connecting with nature, sitting by a stream, hiking up a

mountain, without gadgets, talking to each other, families reconnecting. We're all more simple, healthy, very basic stuff. And we can feed that. We know through quantum physics.

Josh: Let's do that right now. What are technologies? How are technologies defined? How do we see that in the imagery around and the intention behind what we want to create with regards to communications technology, for example? Just guide us through.

Olga: Well, I think it's about deciding what kind of life we want, and then the technologies come, because we're endlessly creative and innovative. And technologies evolve because of the demand. If we say we want it, we create a demand, and we start to repeatedly ask for something that enables us to live a certain way, and to have certain technologies that serve us without enslaving us.

So, I don't know what that looks like. I don't know if technologies are yet. But I think we need to help it. They should covet and share that vision, and say, "This is what I want." And then it happens, because things evolve as a result of us creating a demand or wish for them.

Josh: Okay, good, thank you. You established that framework. So, if you're watching this, you have your homework that Olga and I are giving you right now. Take a moment. Pause if you need to and take a moment and just imagine what that technology would look like. And then we're going to put some energy into that.

What would it look like? What would it feel like? Safe, non-invasive technology that allows the communication with the speed in support of life, rather than against, combatting biological . . . It's supporting our well-being. It's facilitating real, genuine connections. Just take a moment and really after this call, I would just encourage you to start putting energy into that. And then we're going to in this movement, this group that's coming together in this community as part of this summit and beyond, we're going to be able to further refine that.

But it starts with our thoughts, our committed intention. What does it look like? What does it feel like? How does it align with our infinite Creator, let's say. I would maybe frame it that way. So, I would just encourage you if you're watching this to participate in that. And Olga, back to you.

Olga: Yea, and personally, I wouldn't focus too much on the technology. I want to focus on humanity.

Josh: Yes, thank you.

Olga: Yea. We're connecting with our hearts. We're going back to my life.

What kind of intimate relationship do I want? What do I want to feel? Who do I want to be? What am I going to show up as? Am I going to be somebody who's fulfilled? Am I going to be rewarded? Am I going to be innovative? Am I going to be creative? What ideas do I have? What could I contribute? What could I do?

So, it's about getting excited about who we are and what we can be and what we can share with other people, rather than thinking of what technology. We automatically think that way now, because we depend so much on it. So, we think if that's taken away, what are you going to give me instead so that I can do all the same things, right? So, it's kind of shifting.

Yes, of course we can ultimately create a healthier technology, a way to do a lot of the same things. But what if there's another way? We don't know, because we haven't gone there yet, and we haven't truly opened up to that possibility. And we know now that when we feed a possibility and we literally envision it, start to pre-live it in our minds...And I say also pre-love it, which means we're thankful for it already.

We focus on the feelings, because we don't know what the technicalities will look like, or the details, right? We focus on the feelings that we want, the relationships that we want, and the sure connections that we want, rather than particular objects or outcomes with technologies. That would be my suggestion. I think we're a lot more powerful that way if we don't meddle with the how, but we focus on what we really want and what fills our hearts.

Josh: Yea, getting into feeling.

Olga: Good feeling. That's huge magnetism. That's the thing, you know. My emotions are incredibly magnetic. If we're full of fear and dread, look what we're putting out there.

But if we are confident and grateful for already having created something. It's not there yet. But we are already so grateful for it, which sends out a very strong message to the universe, that it hasn't already happened.

I love the way Joe Dispenza talks about this, because he has beautifully simplified this whole quantum mechanics concept. And he says gratitude is the highest level of receivership, the ultimate state of receivership. So, when we are in that state, trusting and being grateful this vision we have, this future we envision, we visually start to make it happen. We can make our minds matter.

Josh: Yea, really good. And I love Joe Dispenza.

Olga: He's great.

Josh: I listened to him several months back, and I really feel supported and encouraged by his work. So, we need to focus on what we want. We need to feel grateful. We need to take the responsibility and power and accept it as being within, and make choices accordingly. But you're not saying to completely disengage from being part of the solution. You're saying from that place, spread awareness, spread encouragement, spread empowerment, educate our elected officials, for example.

Let me just ask you. How important is it that we educate people like our elected officials, who might not have these facts, or who maybe have the facts, but they don't see that enough people are reaching them and explaining the level of concern that we have. How important is it to spread the awareness?

Olga: Well, I think there's huge awareness out there. I think if it's a matter of degree, as we were saying earlier. We can get stuck there. We can get consumed by it, the need to get the message out, the need to convert people, get them on to a healthier way of thinking, a healthier way of living. But I think we have to live by example. I think that's much more powerful. Yes, we can raise awareness. But we can do it through some of the choices that we make, and the way we live, in the way children copy their parents, right?

I received a wonderful cartoon of two mothers sitting with their children on a park bench. And one mother was on her cell phone, and the daughter beside her, the little girl was also on the cell phone on the other side. The other mother was reading a book, and her daughter was reading a book. And the one mother said, "How do you get your daughter to read a book?" So, it's very simple in a way.

We're continuing to program ourselves from generation to generation. So, the awareness starts with each individual and changing the way we're living and the way we're relating and the family dynamics, which then has a huge impact on the community. So, I think we have to come from that place of making changes ourselves and letting our actions and our choices and the things we say to people and what we say no to, to effectively change things, not just using words, because words are not working on their own.

Josh: Words are not working on their own. Well said. Yea, you can't just focus on moving matter around with matter. Like Einstein said, "You can't solve a problem at the same level of consciousness."

Olga: Yes. And I think even the idea of trying to solve a problem is still reactive in a way. I think we need to reframe things. We need to, again, look at the kind of lives that we want, rather than trying to change what we don't like, because that's more reactive.

Josh: Yea, very good. Thank you for those reminders, just bringing me back to what do we want, focusing on the power that we each have. With regards to that, I want to talk about a significant percentage of humanity, whether they're aware of it or not, experience what we call electrosensitive symptoms, or electro-hypersensitivity, or microwave sickness. There are various terms for it, as these exposures have been increasing.

Can you talk about the role of our consciousness and our frame, for example? This external thing is doing it to me. This is harming me. This is killing me. If I have those beliefs, versus being aware of the science of what happens by default and then really turning on the empowerment that we're living intentionally, and not agreeing with being harmed by an external source. Can you talk about the role of electro-sensitivity with regards to sort of a victim mentality?

I say that very delicately, because it is a real thing. It is a real thing. I'm trying to get underneath of that to ask, can we intentionally make an internal, intentional shift so that we minimize the effect by which external forces have on us?

Olga: Yes. It's a big question. I personally know the effect of that stuff, because I have lived it and got a tumor from it. So, it really caused me to stop and reassess everything. Yes, it is our minds up to a point. But I think we also need to disconnect, to then reconnect with what we really want. So, sometimes it does require us to disengage from that world. In fact, when we do that, if you can—not everybody is able to logistically. But if we disengage from that world, we begin to get back to what is normal, because we remove ourselves from all the hype, the overstimulation, all the stuff that's coming at us, which itself keeps us agitated. Like this is one thing I already discovered. As long as I'm in that environment, I find it very hard to de-connect and to find stillness, because it tends to agitate things.

Josh: You're talking about when you're in an environment with wireless? That is the first thing you need to do, is disconnect.

Olga: Yes, disconnect.

Josh: Disconnect from that.

Olga: To give your physical body a chance to actually stop vibrating, being agitated. So, we do need that separation. And then that enables us to see, to get back to sort of a sense of a new tech life, or a life without all that agitation and distraction. And then we begin to reconnect with all the stuff that really matters.

So, I do see that as the start of the process, to disengage, and then be

able to reconnect with ourselves in a way that might take us to a higher place, so we can evolve consciously, and make conscious choices. Evolve in ways that really serve us and make us more resilient in all those things.

That also requires a change in mindset, because if we are in a state of dread, we are in a state of alert and defensiveness. And that puts the body and the brain in a very reactive defensive state, which takes huge resources. And we can't be both regenerating and protecting at the same time. So, we have to give our bodies a break and switch gears. Get into a place where we are in charge of our bodies and our minds, and have a chance to connect at a higher level with our spiritual selves, without all that agitation and distraction.

I see four categories; you might say categories of people in the world. But it's also four phases of evolution, if you like. So, we have what we call, what we know of as electro-sensitive people. And they're not just the people who are sensitive to the radiation and affected by it. They are those who also are aware of the problems and sensitive to the impact it has on nature and many other things.

And then the level above that, if we want to call it that, above that, we have the electro-enlightened. So, there we have the people who have gone into more conscious evolution and are looking at how to do that. So, it's getting very mindful about what's going on inside them, and about how they're connected to the universe, and how they can tap into that universal intelligence to create what they want, with a vision, with their choices, with getting rid of negative programs, all of that stuff. They take themselves to a higher level, and they become impervious to a lot of this stuff. That's not to say that's what we're meant to do, but having the capacity to rise above it if we need to.

Then below that we have the electro-numb, which is most people. They're not really being aware, not really feeling this stuff, haven't switched off, and really disconnecting because that was the only way they could cope. There's so much stuff coming at us, so much stress, overwhelm, and multi-tasking, all of this stuff. It's a huge amount for the body to cope with, while also having these internal subconscious programs running us unchecked. So, that's where most people are sort of hanging out at the moment.

Below that, then, we have the electro-dumb. That's not to say that they're dumb, to judge people, but in the sense that they're not really connected to the truth. And they're not speaking the truth either, because they're not connected to the real intelligence. And they can't see how self-destructive what they're doing really is. So that's four levels of potential evolution, if you like.

Josh: Yea, that's really great. Thank you for just painting that picture. I like that. Electro-enlightened, right? So, I think that's the invitation, isn't it, perhaps on one level. We have different levels of reality or different dimensions or whatever.

Perhaps on the level, the invitation, if we become aware of this, and if we be even electro-sensitive and feel symptoms in our body, is to really turn that around, to really withdraw from the environmental stressors, the Wi-Fi, and such, and really look at ourselves, shift our own consciousness, and empower ourselves so that we can proceed to that electro-enlightened, and actually begin to imagine and create the way that we're programming our environment with our soul, or spirit, or thoughts, rather than being programmed upon.

So, that's really cool. I remember several years ago talking with a colleague about this idea, that really helping the electro-sensitive to reframe and to see the opportunity and to celebrate the awareness. Like our bodies are more aware. And to see ourselves as that more refined. And I'll just also add that I never really had experiences of what I would call electro-sensitivity or microwave sickness until 2018, when I moved into a new place. And I was forced for a period of a couple of weeks to use Wi-Fi on my phone, because I do still have a phone. And now it's wired almost all the time, except when I'm out. But I was using Wi-Fi on my phone. And both my hand and kind of the wrist area, I started to develop a feeling of pain and inflammation, just from using my phone and Wi-Fi.

So, that to me brought it to a new level of realness. I mean when you actually feel it in your body, then it's not just the thousands of studies, the scientists, not just hearing stories from other people, hundreds of people since I started making "Take Back Your Power." But I began to feel it. So, thank you for helping sort of turn us around and empower people in this conversation.

I just want to close with asking you a question. Is there any other . . . I know you are a skilled question asker yourself. Any other thought-provoking questions or other insights that you would leave our viewers with today, Olga?

Olga: Well, I think we have to ask ourselves, what's it going to take? What's it going to take to come back to a place of balance and natural living? Because everything we're experiencing now is a result of the disruption of the natural order of things, not just with food and our environment, but with our selves, our true selves, our deeper self, the truth of who we are, and how we really operate when we're fully activated or actualized.

So, we have to ask ourselves, "What's it going to take? What's it going to

take for me personally?" We need to ask ourselves that question. How bad do things have to get before I'm willing to change? Does somebody close to me have to get cancer? Do I have to lose a loved one? Do I myself have to get cancer? What's it going to take for me to see that it's less awful to go down that road of self-responsibility and find a better way, than to continue with the pain or the loss or the ill health that I'm feeling? Sometimes it just has to get bad enough for us to make that switch, because our programming is so deeply entrenched.

Josh: Yea, wow. So good. Well, Olga, thank you for helping us, to reflect back to us the power that's within us and reminding us to focus on what we want in this whole process of living and navigating our lives at this time. It's very meaningful. And thank you for your work, and thank you for your time in joining us on the summit today.

Olga: Thank you, Josh.

The Inner Challenge of 5G

Guest: Steven Whybrow

Josh: Joining us today on the summit is investigative journalists from Austria. Steven Whybrow. Steve, welcome.

Steven: Hello. Thank you for having me. It's a pleasure.

Josh: Yeah, actually this conversation just came together last minute. And you're going to be getting into some of the deeper aspects of both what's happening behind the scenes with 5G and the deeper aspects of solution. So we're looking forward to this deep conversation and let me just share with our audience a little bit about your background, then we'll dive right in.

Steve Whybrow is an investigative journalist based in Vienna, Austria. In 2018, he translated the 5G space appeal from English into German, and has since been on tour giving lectures on the planned digital reality with 5G and artificial intelligence. And how we can create a new reality based upon freedom and in harmony with the natural world. The basis of his work focuses on natural law, which is a body of knowledge containing hidden or uncommon Knowledge, truth principles about the nature of reality. And informs specifically about the underlying causal factors and principles that are required for ourselves to manifest freedom.

So that's fascinating that you're both super engaged in this sort of interior, Gnostic, and I guess process you're learning about the sort of the hidden teachings. And you're also so engaged in this 5G problem, which is at the forefront of what humanity is facing as a challenge right now. Tell us a little bit more about your background, and how you came

to this point in providing leadership and giving lectures and going on tour now on this subject.

Steven: Well, what I can say at this point is, what I've experienced is that 5G is a journey. And for me, it has a lot to do that it's a journey of self discovery. And I would say 5G, I would classify it as another symptom of the main crisis that we're facing at this point as a civilization. And going into my background is that I've been studying the topics of the nature of reality and natural law, and what is basically going on in the world from all different angles. Because I choose to not only focus on one particular issue, but the way my approach was, is to really get a deep understanding of why the world is as it is. And I've been studying interrelated topics that share the same basis.

Basically, since 2012, I've immersed myself deep into that. And it started with me in 2009 when I watched The Zeitgeist Movement and the Zeitgeist movie, which alerted me to the fact that 911 wasn't as we were told it was. And that sparked off a whole lot of dominoes, because when there's been such a blatant lie that was presented in all across the world in the major media. The question just dawned on me, "Okay, what else are we being lied to about?" And then the whole thing just unravels because you have this intention to find out what is going wrong in the world. And just a year before that we had the financial crisis, and there was all these crises that keep hitting. And the next step that I found out, which was a major point in all of that.

In 2014, I sought for the first time the work of Mark Pasteur who goes deeply into the field of natural law. And that was for the first time that I got an insight into these universal principles. I mean, I'd read about them also before, but in this presentation which can still be viewed today on YouTube. Let's see how long that's going to last. That's a big issue right now. And it is a brilliant step into the real causal factors that where the more one studies, one comes to realize that all of these crises that we're facing, are there to teach us a lesson.

And if we're able to learn that lesson and have a clear founded understanding in all of this, then we can really step right into the solutions. And one of the major quotes I go by that I also use in my lectures is from Judeo Christian realty where he way said, "The problem and the solution are not separate from each other. But actually, one needs to get a clear rooted grip on what the problem really is, in order to find a solution to that problem."

So that's the basis of my work as I've been doing for these past years is I delve into the problem side of things and find out about the symptoms of it and then correlate that to solutions. And it goes in one flow. The important part in all of this is to not stay stuck at the problem level and the analysis level, which I can see a lot also in the so called truth

movement, where it's still missing the clear big picture of what the solution is about, and that the solution has to do with one's self.

Now, back to my background. The journey just deepened more, because the more crisis as I saw, the more I knew I had to focus my attention more on my work. Because I've been studying mathematics and history to become a teacher at the University of Vienna since 2012. And in 2017, one year before I was supposed to finish that degree, I found out about 5G and I got a deep insights into what this actually means. And that triggered me into basically having to let go.

And for me the entirety of this spiritual journey or this process is at that point in 2017, I let go of what I wanted from life. And I let go of that perspective that was formed years before that, which I was still following. And by letting go of that, I tried to look at what life wanted from me. And that's where everything changed. And it's been an up and down journey from that point. It's been quite amazing. A lot of this spiritual process and the fundamental part in all of this is to also do shadow integration work, which is about gaining an understanding that the basis to approach all things in life comes from self love. Because when I don't have self love for myself, I have troubles and difficulties to give love and be in a state of love. When I don't have it myself, I can't give anything that I don't have myself.

And through this shadow integration work, which we can also go into a little bit deeper later because it is such a fundamental pillar in all of this and in actually living the solution to all of the problems that we are faced with. And yeah, it's been an unfolding journey. And one year ago I got to know Mrs. Claire Edwards, and through her I got involved in the international appeal to stop 5G on earth and in space which was released last year, and for which I did the German translation.

And what I can see is that that document that was formulated there, instead of all the other appeals that I've also focused my research on, like the EMF scientist appeal in 2015. The difference with that appeal is, first of all, that I'm involved in it also. And second of all, by being involved directly with it, I can see that it's dynamic appeal. It's like it lays the basic foundation to do work on the problem of 5G and finding solutions.

But it's that dynamic approach where it doesn't just stay with an international appeal, where the science is laid out in great detail and shows the harmful effects of these technically generated electromagnetic fields and the exposition of it to human beings. But it's an unfolding process, and that's what I see is the beauty in all of this. It's like a plant when we are -- because I relate a lot of things to the natural world.

Speaking of natural law, is to not push so much onto life and push a

certain agenda. But instead, take a whole different approach and to let go and let things be pulled to you. And I've made the experience out of nowhere. Since the beginning of this year in April, I started holding lectures which are two and a half hours long, two parts; one part dealing with the problems second part dealing with solutions. And that is just naturally unfolded and it's just growing every single time I do a talk there's more people interested in organizing another talk, and it's just naturally organically unfolding. And I don't have to push anything it's just meant to be and yeah, that's the points where we're at right now. For me 5G has been an absolute journey, and that's how I approach the whole so to say a problem, which is a problem.

But it's all about transcending the problem and goes into the field of solutions. And everywhere, attention goes well, perceptions lie that is what grows. And so now, what I can see more as this thing is unfolding. This is leading into the creation because we can only create our way out of this situation. It's not good just to think ourselves out and think things, but we actually to create our way out of this. And that's what I relate to a new paradigm that has been built by people that have understood the problem, recognize that the problem also correlates to one's own behavior and one's own moral behavior. And yeah, goes along that journey of self discovery. And things become very clear through that. And it's wonderful process. As we often say here, me and Claire, we have a lot of jokes all the time and we laugh constantly. That is that we love 5G.

And it's going to be a self fulfilling prophecy when we have that perception that this is going to be dealt with. When I learn the lesson behind 5G, then I don't have to experience it. Now that is a hermetic principle that I just throw out there quickly, which is if I deal with 5G inside of me, I don't have to encounter it outside.

Josh: Okay. So let me just jump in there because you said something about you know, not pushing on life, not pushing your own agenda, your own small will but rather listening and responding in a way that naturally evolves into one being of service, right. And so, like I can relate to that because even with this summit, it was more of a process of me like letting go of the resistance and just responding to what I felt needed to happen from a will greater than my own, as an example. Right. But you talked about -- well there's so many different areas that I want to go into there. One of them is you said; a year and a half ago approximately, you got an insight about 5G. You kind of comprehend it at a deeper level like behind, I guess the story or the physical expression of it. Talk about that, if you could?

Steven: Well, again, that has also been an unfolding of understanding because I basically correlated two aspects in this. And that is the first aspect is what is called hidden knowledge, so called occult knowledge.

And word occult is, as I want to quickly describe to the people listening here, because it's often similar to the word anarchy, it is often misunderstood. Because if you break it down logically, occultism or the occult only means in Latin hidden or hidden from sites. It is not readily accessible. It is knowledge that has been deeply hidden. And that is one aspect that I've been researching for the past five years in 2017. So I started with that in 2012.

And seeing how 5G was going to be rolled out very quickly. The agenda is to try to push this incredible infrastructure agenda in a very short space of time before people realize what is actually happening, what is going on. And the key insights I had when I first heard natural law, and when I went deep into it was that the world only changes when I change. It's the same of Mahatma Gandhi. And when you really pull this into your heart and let that sink in that the world can only really change if I change.

And that was the approach that I took once I understood how 5G related to this whole transhumanist AI artificial agenda and what was planned. I knew I had to come out with the solution to that and study the solution, because I already knew. That's also an interesting part. What happens is we quite often intuitively know already the answer to a lot of issues. But it's only when you go back and look into your notes from years before and study these things on a more deeper level and implement them in your life, then it just naturally unfolds and you always basically knew the answers to it.

But it has to do with one's self, working on one's self. And that is often quite a painful process and in the ancient world, that was described as initiation. Initiation is to go deeper into the understanding of the self and how the self basically is the major influence in the reality the self experiences. And that's why they're focused on initiation and initiation had to do with a lot of suffering also.

Because it has to do with the letting go of everything that is attached to one's self or to one's personality, which is not true. It is the breaking away of untruth and that can be often quite painful. And the last one and a half years, it has naturally unfolded. And it has only been the last few months and especially when I got involved in actually doing the action which is holding lectures. And this also relates to a very hidden principle which is the principle of the Trinity. Like everything changes when we complete constantly and as often as possible, the process of the Trinity which is, it's not enough to just know a solution on known knowledge. That is the base level of the Trinity.

The Trinity relates to the three expressions of consciousness. And the basis of it is the fourth level, then the emotional level which can be seen as like a male principle together with a female principle of emotion

that come together in the right action. So as one thinks, and one feels and one act, then the Trinity is completed. And it is only through the application of knowledge that things actually really change.

And that's the journey that I've been on now for the past nearly three months. Is that ever since I started doing what is natural to me and the way I see things and actually have confidence in what I'm saying. But always still keeping an open minded approach and not stick to the concept I go down. But this presentation is constantly changing because I'm constantly changing.

And that's one of the hidden principles that I want to mention here, because it's often also miss associated with the Trinity as it is understood in religious terms. But this is sort of like the esoteric concept; esoteric meaning, the inner knowledge and the application of the knowledge which is where all the power lies. And knowledge is not power but understanding the Trinity and actually using that knowledge for the right motivations is what has a major impact in the unfolding of one's being. And that is what I see as the most crucial aspect in 5G.

Sort of like seeing how these two things correlate it is to find out who we truly are. And that forms the basis of all the actions I'm going to take when I remember who I truly am and not get stuck in what I was told I am.

Josh: So you see this crisis that's expressed with 5G maybe includes other things and extends other things on the planet. But do you see it as an initiation or an invite to initiation to let go of the old or the complacent. The comfortable way of being and actually -- you mentioned we have to create our way out of it. So getting into creative mode in terms of what we want, which is safe technology, a world that respects basic rights and preserves health and safety. So we want that. So that's the thought, right? And many of us have emotions around that. And now you're saying the invite is for us to more deeply embody our ourselves. Let's say the divine connected self, to create to be part of this meta creation. Would you say even like a self organizing creation that's happening? Have I got your perspective sort of fairly accurate or what would you change? So the invite is to create something better. Is that what you're saying?

Steven: Yeah, exactly. And as you rightly said, there's multiple factors playing into that. So it's not only me in my personal journey that's a big part of that, but there are also other actors that are involved in this. But the point I want to make is that -- well, 5G comes from, I would say, powers in this world that have been ruling this planet for a very long time, and that is not a secret. One only has to look at how the financial system is structured, for example. And since the financial crisis -- there's basically been an algorithm running, which has channeled the wealth

of the world into less and less hands. And it's basically this ruling elite class that knows where all this money has been flowing into ever since the financial crisis. And it's an ongoing thing. And that is one aspect. So there's people implementing this for a higher agenda, which is basically the subversion of human creativity and human ingenuity and genius --

Josh: So is that the ultimate endgame is to subjugate or suppress the human expression of creation ingenuity in life itself. What is the ultimate endgame of 5G?

Steven: It is about the subjugation and the suppression of what I would refer to as the Gnostics you talked about, which is innate intelligence. It's an intelligence that we are endowed with by what I would call the source, or Prime Creator. One can use whatever term one wants. And once we activate this innate intelligence, which is intelligence, we don't have to read a single book for or another article or find more about this. No, it's an intelligence that is inside of us.

And it has to do with heart based intelligence. Which is related to the aspect that the heart itself is not only a physical pumping heart, but it actually has intelligence. And when one looks into the research of the heart math institute in America, they go very deeply into this aspect. And one finds out that the heart generates the strongest electromagnetic fields that we have in the body. There are 2.5, sort of like a more inflammation coming from the heart to the brain, than from the brain to the heart.

So this gives an indication of that there is an intelligence in there, and they've also found neurons within the heart. So it is a source of intelligence. It's an innate intelligence. And when we can activate that and access that, this is where things are really -- It becomes unpredictable. And our behavior becomes unpredictable and we become very creative. And the heart also links in with the activation of the right hemisphere of the brain, which is also more tuned into the creative aspects, into the intuitive aspects of our intelligence. And in that sense, it also has a reason why -- And I was training to become a teacher for five years, and I've been teaching children the last 13 years in mathematics. And one can very clearly observe when one sees how the brain is structured in its functions. Are fundamentally served by which hemisphere of the brain although it's also into laps and of course, they communicate with each other.

But one can see that the whole education system is structured to keep people in that rational, linear way of thinking and analysis. That is the primary motivation of the left hemisphere of the brain. And the right hemisphere of the brain is left completely in the dark and the aspects with the heart has to do -- what one can also look at is the number one leading cause of death now society? Well, its heart failure. That is

an indication in the system that we've been brought up. I was born in 1990, for example. I didn't have a choice in which system I was born in, but clearly what one can observe. And this has been my personal experience, and I hear a lot of people say that the system is making -- it's not helping them expressing themselves authentically.

And to shift that dynamic has a lot to do for me with opening up to the hearts, and I will share this with you now. The way I do this, and there's probably definitely more efficient ways of doing it, for example. But it gives you a clear insight into how I approach this. So when I get up in the morning -- I've not done this for the last few weeks, have been quite busy, but I have to get to it again. But I just relax into my heart space. And the notion I use for that is the heart soul essence. Me it is the connection to the soul level of what we are; the true greats of being of ourselves which is outside of the boundaries of space and time. It is outside of this realm that we are experiencing. But we can connect and access this intelligence, this intelligence of knowing. Not only thinking but actually, I know this to be true.

And it has a complete different resonance, a complete different impact. Also, when one thinks this might -- try and work it up, and knowing and putting it out there. And that's also the experience that I had at my presentations is that the energy that generates when one talks about these things is quite amazing.

Josh: The people resonate with it, right. If you're coming from the heart, if you're coming from that place, and you you're speaking of these things, then it's like a tuning fork where the audience is vibrating. Probably right now the audience is tapping into this essence that you're putting words to. So there's esoteric way -- Like, can we talk about history, you mentioned human -- Sorry to interrupt, but there's so many topics that I kind of want to dive into here. We have only a certain amount of time unfortunately.

But you mentioned you're a student of history. And I wanted to mention my background in the conclusion that I've come to that a couple thousand years ago, there was this, like you said, Gnostic scrolls; the Nag Hammadi scrolls, the Dead Sea Scrolls. And then it looks like at some point around the fourth century, based upon my reading of the book called The Gnostic Gospels, that there was a book burning. And there was an edict from Rome to say all of the esoteric stuff, all of the inner stuff, all of the content and material in the scrolls and scripts that are helping people to explore and to connect with that power that runs through us all.

That was all tossed out, that was all thrown out. And the exoteric, the external version of the way became religious Christianity, right? So became transactional based. Everything like commerce, everything on

the external really disconnecting us from how the creator flows through us. This is only my perspective. This is what my -- and I'm encouraging, it's important that everyone follows their own way. But when those Nag Hammadi scrolls were discovered in 1947, and the Dead Sea Scrolls around the same time, that helped to provide context to this sort of a war on this emergence of this, like you say, innate intelligence. So talk about how did we get to this point that we're at from your perspective? Now, that was mine. But from your perspective, how did we get to this point, Steven, where we're in this crisis on this planet, and really being challenged to our very core, to like you say, get internally connected. Come together and create something better?

Steven: Well, it is a lack of knowledge. And it's a lack of application of that knowledge. When one looks into the history and especially this is a very, very hidden history. And when one delves into that subject of the Gnostics, which we get -- by the way, we get the word knowledge from the word gnosis, which was the essence of what the Gnostics were all about. It was about accessing universal knowledge, universal truth, deeper truth. And it has a very mystical theme, but these were people that were involved in all of the sciences. And people like Pythagoras, for example, went to Gnostic teaching centers to actually learn this knowledge and apply it. And when one looks in history, one can see that a lot of the major scientists of our time I've also been absolutely involved in the understanding of the esoteric.

There are lots of examples one can draw up there, like there's a great book on that subject called The Forbidden Universe. And it goes into the scientists like Newton, and like Einstein how they were involved, and were interested in the esoteric understandings. And they followed completely different streams of interest that they would publicly announced what would become fame and famous for. But coming back to the Gnostic history is a very important part because who were the Gnostics? Gnostics was -- the way I understand and I really liked the way you presented your version of it. It goes along the way I see things also. Gnostics were not a one group of people. And those were the Gnostics and those were the Cathars or whatever. Although the Cathars were also Gnostic, so funnily enough, just came to my mind.

But they were spread all around the world. And one suddenly gets to see a deeper understanding also what the inquisition was all about, which was 1000 years after the Nag Hammadi scrolls happened. So there has been a clear and calculated approach to get rid of this knowledge. And the Gnostics were also the people that ran the Library of Alexandria with all the scrolls that they gathered, which was burnt down.

And I would say I'm quite sure that didn't get burned, is now underneath the Vatican bunker. They're in these huge tunnels that they have down there. So they hold this knowledge and they specifically attack this

knowledge or attack knowledge in any form as we are now experiencing also right now we're in the form of internet censorship, why?

Because the sort of information that we have access to forms our perceptions, and everything comes from our perceptions. We can go into deeper into that later also. But focusing back again on the Gnostics this, knowledge was taken out of circulation. And it is exactly this knowledge about natural law which I would say what I've learned and what I can observe myself now. But I learned from the great teacher; Mark Patios, that this is the most hidden knowledge on the planet. And it is the knowledge that actually creates an elite class that uses this knowledge in form of manipulation against a target population.

So actually access to this knowledge and the application of that knowledge, which actually creates the hierarchical structure that we live in now where we've got people ruling over most of humanity. And I give you this as an example; there are so few people at the top of these elite circles. They can control whole societies by being in government and setting up the structure. They can only control the world population and the way it's running right now, when they control the perceptions of the people in world. And that is the basis where this entire control system operates on.

The basis of it is to restrict, especially the knowledge about natural law and sense of that. And we can get into censorship later. It is the information that we have access to that can change our way of thinking and perceiving the world. And absolutely everything we do, all our behaviors come from our perceptions.

Josh: Can you talk about what is natural law? If you can summarize this hidden knowledge or summarize natural law and begin to relate it to actions we can take to have a positive impact in this situation.

Steven: Okay. So natural law is actually a body of knowledge. It actually encompasses -- one can't really differentiate. Actually one needs to ask what is not included in natural law. And it's basically a body of knowledge that in esoteric terms, it is divided into two categories that are interlinked with each other. So it is you have one part of natural law, which is called the minor arcana and the other is called the major arcana. Now the minor arcana is all of the workings of the psyche. How the human psyche works and functions, how the inner world works, everything that is inside the self, the workings of the inside of the being.

And whereas, the other side; the major arcana deals with the laws of the universe, the laws that govern the universe. And both of them through the hermetic principle of correspondence, they correspond with each other, one is not separate from each other. When one goes deep into that it is actually on a causal level. It is the inner world and the workings

of the human psyche that create the outer world.

And those two have an innate connection with each other. And actually natural law exists and works in the whole universe, and all points and at all levels. Also on the level that we can see, and the level of the unseen and that's why it is called occult knowledge, because it is hidden knowledge, because these are from its very basis. They are spiritual laws that govern our existence and that govern the workings of the universe, which trickles down also into the physical sciences that we have. But the problem that we are facing, or one of the problems that is a basic problem is that the physical science is only locked into that frame that we can see. And that we can measure and discard any spirituality.

Josh: But that is shifting with the advent of quantum physics. Would you agree?

Steven: Absolutely. It is shifting. But you won't hear this on the TV news or the newspapers. So there's still a concerted effort to keep this knowledge out as you absolutely say. Quantum physics has been around now nearly 100 years. And we have so many applications where we use the understanding of quantum physics in the way computers work, but you won't hear it in the mainstream sources. It's the knowledge about quantum physics and epigenetic that is also emergent. And also what I've come across the past month now, which is also really interesting, which is an aspect of biophysics.

And how the healing properties of the Sun which also relates to the distorted spectrum of light that we access through our mobile phones and screens. It is actually only the blue light spectrum that we absorb, and this goes quite deeply into I think 3500 peer reviewed studies on the healing aspects of sunlight. And especially the sunlight that we gain in the mornings.

Josh: Yeah. And isn't it amazing when we were told that the sun is bad, and you can only be out for a few minutes or whatever. But I think there are many people who are experiencing the sun as such a reset or such a healing agent.

And when you get in the cycles of the sun like Dr. Jack Crews and other people talk about, in that circadian rhythm and you're actually like engaging with the sun as it comes up in the sky. I mean, something happens to me when I watch a sunrise, that's for sure. But with regards to the blue light, the harmful blue lights from screens and stuff. I found these to be significantly effective; blue light blockers. And they make them clear now, which is excellent. But I'm just kind of diving into this. So if the invitation here is for us to create something better, right? Challenge we have to create so we're being driven by need, by necessity to really wake up to a deeper level of ourselves and embody and create.

Then is it that there's like a field of intelligence or like a plan of creator, or how would you describe it? Is it something that we kind of get connected within and automatically we tap into that field?

I mean, we've all experienced synchronicities and things like this that seemed to connect beyond the logical mind. Is that the mechanism for really -- though, you're talking about reconnecting with natural law. And then getting connected with this pattern and then expressing and manifesting accordingly. Is that kind of the framework help us to understand kind of the through line here in terms of applicability, and if you have any specific tips for people to engage and embody the work that you're bringing forward?

Steven: Yeah. It's a natural law, is a description for the universal intelligence that is operating at all times. One can gain an insight, for example -- because I use the term source. And when one asks the question; if we are connected to the source, how can source experience itself? You can only do that through reflection, through mirroring. And we're all connected to that source, we already are that. Well, there's a very, very important point; we don't have to seek enlightenment. In this sense, we are always enlightened and we are always connected at all points. At any point in this journey we are already always connected with this intelligence. What is keeping us from accessing this intelligence is the mind patterns that run through our psyche.

And I've discovered this on a deeper level is that, a lot of the thoughts one thinks are; point number one -- And it has been shown that 97% of the thoughts we think every day are the same ones we thought the day before. So it comes in on a thought level, where we are disconnected from this intelligence we are naturally always connected to. And again, this relates to Trinity. It's the emotions that keep us from accessing. I notice on a deeper level because from my prime personality, one can say I'm quite a cognitive person. I use my brain and the internet of things through and analyze things and then I compare it. All these mind things -- and what I've come across now in my own personal experience over the last year is, I've been absolutely hit with a lot of emotions that we're just there.

And what happened is that they come in all sorts of forms. It can be anger, for example, it can be sadness, it can be whatever. And it's these layers of emotions -- like when this infinite intelligence is here on the level of the heart, this heart soul essence as I said, and it's like onion rings that are on top of that. And it's all about working on those onion rings of emotions that are trapped inside the body, and finding a way of releasing them, which is really hard. I had to learn it, I really had to learn it.

But it gets easier and this is what I want to give to other people after

banging my head against the wall for a few months. And then finally, finding an approach which really works is to get rooted again. Get out into nature as much as possible. Put your shoes off, take your shoes off, walk barefoot and you'll connect. It won't come straight away. It's all about discipline in this approach, and getting out there into nature.

And that's a wonderful basis. Now then, when emotions come up, which is a great thing, by the way. In the beginning, one regrets that, "Oh my God, it's happening again, I'm feeling bad out of that." Actually embrace it, change the approach completely to realizing thank god, it's happening right now. I have been triggered, I can realize that. And now that it's there, let me just not think about it and just actually go into the feeling of how it feels. What is it trying to communicate to me? What is it therefore, and just feel right into it and find a way.

And this one kind of an approach how he wants but then eventually, you can realize we are not the emotion. We just wants to be heard, it is communicating with us in that moment when it comes up and we feel sadness or we feel like we don't belong or whatever. And just feel that and eventually let that go. And then one discovers that what's lying underneath the emotion is actually the life force energy. It's the power that we've been given.

And for me a major part in all of this transformation is to understand that this control system only operates here. I cannot meet and talk with the system out there. I can go to a European Central Bank. I can go to a stock exchange, I can talk to the people there and ask them, "Are you the system?" And they'll say "Are you're crazy." They might be part of the system but I cannot ever meet that system out there. It is not out there. It is exclusively up here in this range. And that's why I also immerse myself deep into mindfulness practices. And being able to let go of these thought patterns that are not us, and that has been my process when one connects layer after layer and that's the beauty of it.

Once I let go of any aim to finish this process, the whole thing gets much easier because there is nothing to finish. Because it is all about the journey. This has been the greatest insights I had, since I've involved myself more deeply since one and a half years. It is exclusively all about the journey that we are having at this moment, in time also right now.

And, Josh, I can tell you from my perception, it's deeply anchored within me that I know 5G is never going to happen. When we get the lesson and this is my perception. And that perception has to, after steps, become a self fulfilling prophecy, because I know how the nature of reality works. And I know when I do the inner work and do the steps, which my intention is not to stop 5G, but to get the lesson of 5G. What is it trying to teach me? What is the reason it is we are encountering it, not to fight it?

Josh: That's the paradox.

Steven: That's the paradox. Exactly.

Josh: So it's like dealing with the beast, I guess you could say, by looking for the message in a higher intelligence of, let's say, divine creator that would be behind the allowance or maybe our co creation of this tremendous crisis, burden, challenge on the planet right now. So you're looking for the message and in that -- And so you said the control system is not out there, it's not a person or whatever. It's kind of in here, so you're internalizing this. And this is what -- the prophets even in the old writings, they talked about -- I think this is what they're saying when they realize like, "we are creating all these."

And then it's like, "Wow is me. I've been creating this". And so it's the process in which is almost like mind explosion, but it leads to being very empowered at the same time when you actually realize -- Like, here I am you know, hosting and co-producing this summit. Exposing a problem that I have to, on some deeper level, assume responsibility for having helped to create.

So I guess the challenge of this is like a cognitive dissonance, right? When people learn about this and they're invited into this deeper sort of understanding this responsibility. And then there's a lot that needs to be let go of, you know. If you can no longer be operating in this duality and be blaming, and naming the enemy exclusively as it's their fault and not at all my fault. And we still have to engage, we still have to have boundaries and say no. Can you talk a little bit about this is? Is this like internalizing the responsibility? Is that essentially one of the things you're talking about? And can you also talk about this challenge of cognitive dissonance and realizing that we're not as perfect as perhaps our mind in some aspect like us today.

Steven: Yeah, absolutely it's joy to the personal level, because we need to earn the whole thing. If we want to come into unity consciousness into one infinite awareness, then we need to own it all. Just need to own it. And this doesn't have to happen in one day and get it all done. This is a journey. It's all a journey to that. And just recognizing that, yes, there are dark forces that are putting forward an agenda as crazy as this, because -- you asked me about the endgame for.

The people like Ray Kurzweil and Elon Musk, for example. I mean, the end game is basically the end of humanity as we know it. And that's what's the part of this, that's where they're driving this, and where are they driving this? It's again, here, because they want to make a digital neurolink connection between what they call the cloud, which is the smart grid, basically. And make a connection between the human mind and the cloud, and have artificial intelligence become the human mind

and assimilate humanity into sort of like this hive mind.

So it's represented by artificial intelligence and on a philosophical level, is actually collectivism.

Josh: That's the artificial unity consciousness, and what we are talking about is the real unity consciousness where we are sovereign beings. But we're connected in the field of unit. So okay, if we don't want this 1984 Orwellian world, this artificial unit, this hive mind and centralization of everything. We don't want that. Now, you've already touched on this before, but how can we focus on what we do want. Because in quantum physics principles, what we focus on expands. How can we help to stop what we don't want? And actually have a create, like you said, manifest something better.

Steven: Yes, to support each other in the unfolding of our uniqueness, because that's the message for me, very crucial point.

Josh: Individuality must be preserved.

Steven: Exactly, because collectivism leaves that out. And as soon as that is left out, it's a program and it's a scam with the whole Marxist idea and all that. And a very key point in all of this is to support the unfolding of everyone's uniqueness and individuality, to let people think differently. I don't expect you or someone else to think the same way as me. I'm not interested in that. It might be a funny coincidence if we do.

And what I see with a lot of people that have these interesting similar mindsets that we have, but it's the uniqueness of ourselves and going through the trouble. And that's why I'm organizing workshops also to go deeper into this process and assist people in this process. Because the more assistance that you have, and you kind of like can also put your finger on what you're experiencing. Because a lot of people, they don't know what they're experiencing, they think it's their problem. Oh, yeah, I'm sort of like feeling depressed.

And then I take my antidepressants, and hopefully it will get better. No, it's a wakeup call. We have totally got the whole thing on depression also wrong. I mean, a lot of it has its causes from all sorts of things. But we totally got the perception that wrong, because depression is to maybe take a deep rest and have a look at things again.

I've also experienced that in my life. And what triggered this? In my understanding now is the soul level trying to awaken little Steve in this reality. And because little Steve in this reality has been very thought based, very mind based how he approaches things and he means well. But one can only access their feelings and their heart-based intelligence again, through pain, which manifests as depression or other

psychological issues. But it's actually trying to wake us up and stand our ground and support each other in absolutely 100% be our authentic self. Is our complete uniqueness and that's where the universe opens up because the universe doesn't want replicas. The universe in my understanding wants diversity on all fronts. But real diversity, not the notions that the powers that shouldn't be co-opt and then spin it in their own way.

Josh: Beautifully said. Just in closing here because we need to wrap up. Just take a moment maybe 60 seconds and help paint a picture for what you feel. What is your vision of our potential you know, positive future timeline reality? This divine -- and within the way or Christianity it's like God's kingdom on the earth. So whatever how you describe it, but help us to imagine or paint a picture of what you see as possible as we move consciously through and respond to this crisis, with our whole being.

Steven: All right. So my vision is that the whole system runs in this area here. Now, if we activate the heart, the brain becomes synchronized together with the heart. And basically, we don't just get a piece of the puzzle, we get the whole puzzle. So we are actually going to create an entire new level of existence without systems -- kind of systems, but not systems of control.

It is about the having this as much space as possible for the free unfolding of human uniqueness and genius, and ingenuity, and creativity, which has been suppressed for very long time. And it's about time we let that power unleashes and the new world is already there now. We're just going steps. We're going steps and be happy with what we've got now, and the rest is unfolding beautifully the way it should be. It's exciting times, Josh. I'm really thankful to be here exactly at this point.

Josh: Very nice. So decentralized systems where the power is distributed and also communications technologies and other technologies that are safe and promote life. And I would say economic systems --

Steven: On the basis -- but on the basis of natural law, which is align your behavior to moral principles. There is no discussion with principles. It just is, and no harm to other sentient beings. And that's it, the rest unfolds.

Josh: Very good. Steven, I'm so glad that you're part of this summit and thank you so much for your time today. And just for sharing your presence and your insight and your perspective with us, and your encouragement to go deeper. On behalf of everyone watching, I really appreciate that.

Steven: Thank you so much for having me. It's a great honor, great

pleasure. And to all of us out there, trust and believe in yourself, and go the way you're heading for exciting times. Thank you so much.

Josh: Excellent. And for everyone watching, thank you. And please remember, share this link. If you find value in this or any of our talks on the summit, please share it. That's how we grow. That's how we reached numbers towards critical mass. And that's how we're empowering people and coming together. So thank you for watching and we'll see you again soon.

Changing the World with Inner Resources

Guest: Dr. Debra Greene

Josh: Joining us today on the summit is Dr. Debra Greene from beautiful Maui. She's a leader. She's an energy worker, a healer, and a PhD and she helps people basically transform the world around them. Dr. Debra Greene, thank you so much for being with us today.

Dr. Greene: Thank you, Josh. It's a pleasure.

Josh: You and I are -- just for letting everyone else know in on our conversation, we've been having a conversation on this for about six months. And you're part of the team for the summit. You're part of the new platform that's evolving and growing out of this summit, in which we're coming together in community. And you're really a bridge between the inner process and the outer reality for each of us.

So we'll dive into that in as much as it aligns with our intention to shift this conversation around 5G and ensure safe technologies, prevent harmful technologies. That's why we're here. So we're going to give people resources today from your incredible repertoire and toolbox for the inner process, the inner empowerment, and everything that that's associated with.

So I'm just going to pause now and introduce your background to our audience and then we'll dive right in. I'm sorry, I didn't let you say -- do you want to say anything before we get on?

Dr. Greene: No, thank you. We're good.

Josh: I'm a little long winded. I'll try to be concise. Dr. Debra Greene is an author, presenter, educator and practitioner who specializes in energy therapies and mind-body integration. She combines the best of ancient wisdom with modern science in her private practice, writings and lectures, and online courses. After earning her PhD from Ohio State University in 1995, she has worked with thousands of clients, written dozens of papers and given hundreds of lectures worldwide. And as a community organizer, she founded keepyourpower.org. Great name, focused on preventing the rollouts of 5G and other harmful technology in Hawaii. So your work again is about bridging the inner and the outer, the internal senses and the external senses. Tell us about that.

Dr. Greene: Yes. Well, Josh, just as we have like external senses that orient us to the external world, unlike seeing and hearing, tasting, touching, smelling, those senses help us navigate the external world. And just like we have those external senses, we also have internal senses that help us orient to our inner world and that help us navigate inside of us. And these internal senses are things like attention, you know, what you choose to focus your attention on that's determined inside of you. So, attention is one of our internal senses.

And then another internal sense is intention, which is basically attention, what we choose to focus on infused with will. You know, when you're intending something, you're focusing your whole attention on it and you also desire a particular outcome, so you're willing something to happen. So intention is another example of an internal sense. Visualization is another one. You know, we all have the capacity to make pictures inside our heads to imagine something. So visualization is part of our internal senses.

And another one is self talk, how we talk to ourselves. And we all do talk to ourselves whether we want to admit it or not, we do. And that's one of our inner resources. Another one is self sensing, which refers to our ability to sense what's going on inside our whole body. You know, we can sense different organ systems, we can sense intuitive insights, we can have our capacity to focus ourselves sensing or to have it encompass our whole body.

And another final internal sense that I'll mention is self observation. And that refers to our ability to basically do everything that I just mentioned. You know, when you become aware when you observe what you're focusing your attention on. When you're aware of what you're visualizing. When you become aware, you observe how you're talking to yourself.

That capacity of self observation is part of our inner resources. And we could say that self observation is like awareness, like awareness itself, because it allows us to take in all of those other internal senses that I

mentioned. That makes sense?

Josh: Yeah, that was cool. So there's intention, visualization, self talk, self sensing, and self observation.

Dr. Greene: Yes. First one was Attention.

Josh: Attention, and also intention.

Dr. Greene: And they're different, right?

Josh: Yeah. Right.

Dr. Greene: Yeah.

Josh: Okay, cool. So that's great to have that model. Now, how does that directly connect with our intention to shift the conversation around 5G for example?

Dr. Greene: Yes. Well, one of the things that happens with technology, cell phones in particular, is that they tend to pull us outside of ourselves. And they tend to be like a constant companion that's pulling our attention outside of us. You know, pre cell phone age, it used to be that we had time for ourselves. For example, if we were waiting in line somewhere we would just have that time to sort of turn inward and reflect on ourselves.

Josh: Because is our life, right?

Dr. Greene: Exactly. And whereas now if you're waiting in line, so many people tend to just whip out their cell phone, even looking at their cell phone when they're waiting at a stoplight. Or, you know, if you're waiting for a friend to meet you, instead of just being quiet going inward reflecting processing, now we're pulled outside of ourselves. And another example is falling asleep at night. We used to just kind of drift off to sleep and maybe have time to reflect on our day and discover things about ourselves. But so many people these days, they're on the cell phone until they can't keep their eyes open anymore, and then they fall asleep. And if they happen to wake up in the middle of the night, they grab the cell phone to check and see.

And so we're constantly being pulled outside of ourselves. And that's a really serious thing because what happens is, it results in a loss of identity. Like, if I'm always being pulled outside myself, I become determined by all of those external things; the fads and fashions, the bullying. Everything that's going on outside of me tends to influence me, and I'm not connected and anchored inside myself. I don't know who I am. And that loss of identity is huge because, who am I? That's a

fundamental question that most people spend their whole lives with. You know, who am I? Who am I really?

And there are plenty of examples of people who have achieved fame and fortune, and raised fabulous families and done everything to be so called successful. But they realize that they don't feel good inside. They're not really happy. There's an emptiness there's a vacancy, and that kind of vacancy cannot be filled by things outside of us in the material world. It has to come from inside of us from within. And identity; who am I is an inside job. Other problem with being pulled outside of ourselves and this loss of identity is that constantly being externally focused in the material world. It separates us from our internal senses, those senses that I just talked about. And those internal senses are powerful, powerful internal resources that we all possess. And those internal senses, those internal resources can have a huge impact on the external world.

Josh: Yeah. So it reminds me of a teacher I studied from for a bit and named Dione Vamal. He talked about the whole thing, the whole key is going from being post upon by the world or by your environment, like literally from wireless in this case, but just in general being pushed upon by the external to pulsing upon our environment to us and being the agent of effect of change.

And so it makes sense when you talk about it like that. It's like if we're externally hyper stimulated and always needing to do something or always needing to be busy or like being, you know, just stimulated our senses and the external, then that's producing this barrenness internally. Why do you think that we're so drawn to external stimuli and to things like tech addiction and checking our phone in the middle of the night? What do we fear just by or is it a fear thing? Why don't we actually have a natural, more powerful natural instinct just to be still and be with ourselves?

Dr. Greene: Well, for starters, I think a lot of technology is designed to be highly addictive. And so we have that going against us because by design, it's meant to be addictive and keep us going back for more over and over again. I also think that we're kind of susceptible to things like that because let's face it, when most of us turn inside and spend time with ourselves, sometimes it's challenging. You know, sometimes it's difficult, sometimes it's challenging to be with yourself because it's not always pleasant inside there.

Yeah. I mean, fear is yes, that's one aspect of it but insecurities, and I mean, the list could go on and on. Disappointments and regrets and you know, on and on and on it goes. There's no shortage of those kinds of distortions so to speak, you know inside of us. And so it's not always a pleasant journey in there, but it's very crucially important to take that

step. And yeah, because again, that's how we can really find out who we are by connecting inside. And it's also how we connect with something greater than ourselves.

We could say that time spent with yourself is actually time spent with God or creator or divine intelligence or universal source or whatever word you want to use to describe that. Because that is not the bearded white man in the sky, that actually lives inside of us. And so that's how we can connect inside, connect with that by going in, because in his up dimensionally.

Josh: And that's the true power to do anything to effect change in our life or to have an enjoyable life or anything. That's the true power, right?

Dr. Greene: Yes, absolutely. It is. And I wondered if -- I mean, I keep talking about these internal resources and internal senses and how powerful they are. And I wondered, would it be okay if I --

Josh: Walk us through something, yes.

Dr. Greene: Can I do that?

Josh: Yeah, please.

Dr. Greene: Because it can really help us. You know, when we experience something, it can really help us to understand these concepts that I'm talking about. So, if you want to participate in this exercise, those of you who are who are watching, please do. Don't try this while you're driving because we need your hands. Your hands are part of this exercise. And you know, Josh, if you want to participate, please do.

Josh: Definitely.

Dr. Greene: So in order to do the exercise, I'd like you to take your hands and put them in front of you. I am hoping you can see this on the screen and we'll go like that. Yeah, and I want you to put your hands together side by side. Oh, this is so interesting. It's like a mirror, right? So we're putting our hands together side by side like this. And if you look at the base of your palm, you're going to see that there are some creases there. Creases at the base of your palm, do you see those?

I want you to line up your two hands using those creases as markers. So we use the creases at the base of the palm by markers, we line them up. And then I want you to fold your hands together into prayer position. And look at your two hands. Just observe right now, are your two hands the same size or not? Maybe they are maybe they aren't. I don't know. You know, some people's hands are different sizes. Some people's feet

are different sizes. So you know are your fingers and thumbs the same size your palm, how your two palms compare. So we're just observing that right now and making the mental note about the size of these two hands compared to each other after we've used those lines, those creases at the base of the poem as markers and folded our hands together.

So when you have a sense of that, allow one of your hands to drop away, it doesn't matter which hand. Just keep one hand in front of you, and allow the other hand to just drop away. And with this chosen hand in front of you, I want you to focus your whole attention on this chosen hand. And for the duration of the exercise, if you could please keep your attention fully focused on this hand. And it's helpful if you close your eyes because it's easier to actually focus with your eyes closed because then we don't get distracted. The eyes tend to pull us visually outside of ourselves. So close your eyes and focus your whole attention on the chosen hand.

Josh: Okay.

Dr. Greene: The first thing I'd like you to do is to send a clear message to this hand. And the message that I want you to send to this hand is that this hand has actually grown to be a very big hand. The hand has grown large, the hand has grown to be this enormous, gargantuan hand. Massive, it's huge. So I want you to send that message to the hand, to your hand. And the next step is to actually visualize your hand in your mind's eye. To see that your hand has grown to be so large, your fingers are extending out into space. Your palm is thick and wide. Your hand has grown to be this enormous, massive hand.

Josh: Like the incredible Hulk.

Dr. Greene: Exactly. It's an incredible hulk hand. And in fact, your hand has grown to be so big, so huge that you can actually feel the weight of this hand. It's hard for you to even hold it up because it feels so heavy because of its enormity. I'm going to be silent for just a few moments so that you can continue to send these messages to the hand without having to listen to me or perhaps be distracted by my voice. Just continue to focus on your hand and send these messages, and visualize and feel sense how large the hand has become.

All right. Should we do our -- after comparison? Whenever that feels complete, you can open your eyes and using those creases at the palm of your hand as markers. Put your two hands back together, line them up, put your hands back together and tell me if you notice any difference?

Josh: Yeah, it's a little bit bigger. I would say at least a few millimeters

bigger than the other one.

Dr. Greene: That's excellent. So maybe because I've done this exercise so many times, you can see how my hands have turned out.

Josh: Are you going to start doing the other one?

Dr. Greene: I know, right. So, I have facilitated this exercise for groups of people from all walks of life, groups of all different sizes. And the exercise always works for at least 85% of the people, oftentimes more. But at least 85% of the people are able to physically grow their hand simply by taking a few minutes, to do what? All we did was activate our inner resources. We used our internal senses, we focused our awareness, that's attention that we talked about. Then we intended for the hand to grow larger, so we used intention. And then we sent the message through our self talk. And then we visualize the hand being large. And then we did self sensing. We felt it. We sensed the hand being large. And if just by taking those few moments, you're able to physically grow your hand to alter physical reality in that way, imagine what's possible.

Josh: That's cool. So like internalizing the power of suggestion, right? So how can we take these principles and take the internal resources, and then apply them?

Dr. Greene: Well, for starters, it's very important to make sure that inside yourself you have coherence because things like intention work much better when we have internal coherence. And by coherence, I'm not talking about you know, "can I understand you are not, are you coherent in your speech?" I'm talking about having yourself aligned and internally, so that -- I guess we could say, in energy terms, you're vibrating at a higher frequency or there's harmony, there's uniformity inside of you.

And most of us don't have that, you know, I mean, let's face it. Most of us have blockages, we have limiting beliefs, we have fears, we have programmed behaviors, we have emotional patterns, we have shadow stuff, we have all kinds of stuff. And so sometimes people ask me, "Why doesn't intention always work if it's so powerful?" I mean, intention is really, really powerful and it's extremely well researched, by the way.

There's literally hundreds of research studies that confirm the effects of human intent on, for example, living things like other humans and animals, insects, plants, bacteria, yeasts, cancer cells, DNA, has been shown to be affected by human intent. Also inanimate objects like electronic devices and computers, and my favorite; chocolate. Dean Radin, who was the chief scientist at the Institute of Noetic Sciences, he actually did some research infusing chocolate with specific intention. And it actually worked. He's also headed up some research on infusing

tea with intention, and that also works.

And the other interesting thing about intention is that it doesn't matter distance, from a few feet to thousands of miles doesn't matter. That does not limit the effects of intention. And there's also been some really interesting research done on intention affecting the future. Yeah, it's a fascinating field of study and being legitimized by some very rigorous research that's being done.

So how can we apply this to 5G, or our quest to have a safer world with safer technology? I would say that; step one, is to use your internal senses and pay attention to what you pay attention to because attention itself is a very, very powerful inner resource. And we don't have to go too far into quantum physics, for example, to understand how that works, because in quantum physics, there is this phenomenon called the observer effect. And basically what it means is that, what we observe, what we focus our attention on, actually brings reality to life. I mean, we know from quantum physics that that so called reality is not fixed, its potential. Reality exist as pure potentialities as an observation.

Josh: Observation kind of brings it from a multi position to like a defined reality. So the observer can never be completely separate from the experiment.

Dr. Greene: Correct. And what that means for us in real life is that what you observe, what you choose to pay attention to actualizes reality. It brings reality into existence. It moves it from a state of being a potential to being actualize or realized, how powerful is that? If you stop and think about that, it's really quite mind blowing?

Josh: Well, I want to jump into that because like, what you're saying that what we put our attention to grows. If we put our attention on, like a double negative or something like stop 5G. Does that inherently create more resistance? And secondly, we're being made aware of this big agenda that's apparently very clearly, I would say causing a lot of harm. So by default, number one, our consciousness goes on the problem. And number two, it kind of goes into place of fear, right? You and I have worked together on several personal sessions and you're helping me. I'll just share with the audience, I don't mind. To considerable level like process some of these fears about being outspoken about this, about challenging authority, like actually respecting and honoring myself, not giving myself away.

So, in light of like all of the heaviness of 5G in these topics, these problem coming into our attention, how can we actually use the tools that you're talking about to create what we want rather than just to make the problem bigger? If what you're saying is that what we put our attention on expands.

Dr. Greene: Yes. The intention will create, and it's not so much about words, like stop 5G, although words are important. They're containers of energy and information. So they are important but I guess what I'm -- the intention will carry it and so we have to pay attention to what our intention is regard to this.

Josh: They can stay connected, don't lose yourself in the problem and spiral out or go into fear, is what you're saying, right?

Dr. Greene: Yes. You know, sometimes we can get into a space of replicating what it is that we're trying to eliminate. I mean, if I think about 5G and somebody who's a proponent of it, they might be a proponent of 5g because they're operating out of greed or they're operating out of power, a desire for power, or perhaps they just don't know.

Perhaps they're just ignorant. And so I have to pay attention to not participating in that with my own ignorance, with my own desire for power, with my own greed to whatever. You know, greed to have, I want more and more and more people on board with this issue. I mean, that could be a form of greed, right? And the answer to that question lies within, what is my intention? What is my intention here? What is motivating me? Does that make sense?

Josh: It does. And also, I just want to kind of follow that up like when those triggers do come when I feel like lower vitality or irritated or whatever we're triggered in some way, fears come up or whatever. Do you have any practical tools or guidance for shifting out of that kind of perspective, modality?

Dr. Greene: Yes. So let's talk about fear, for example, because it's easy to go there particularly with this issue. Okay, so we talked about intention, that's important. But there is this thing called spiritual bypassing where it's like, "If I'm just exuding loving light all the time, then that's the answer." And actually, it's not the answer when it comes to feelings like fear or other emotions is to actually allow yourself to feel them because feelings are meant to be felt. That's the whole purpose of their existence.

And a lot of us have a very difficult time feeling our feelings, because it's uncomfortable, because we've been trained not to, because we want to go inside our head and try to think it through, figure something out. And that's the interesting thing about feelings and emotions is that you can't really figure them out because it can't happen on the mental level it has to happen on the emotional level, because feelings exist on the emotional level. Or if we want to use energy terms, we could say, the emotional body.

Josh: Is it our physical body, are you saying feelings exist at a location in our physical body or how does that work?

Dr. Greene: Sometimes they do, but the physical body is a distinct frequency domain, so to speak. And it's distinct from the emotional body. I mean, you can see the physical body under a microscope, you cannot see emotions under the microscope. You know, we know they exist, because we all experienced them for sure. But you can't see an emotion under the microscope. So it's a different frequency domain, it's a different type of energy. And because it is that type of energy, feelings need to be felt. So let's use an example. The physical body has its own built in healing process. Let's say we're having this interview and I grabbed this piece of paper and I get a paper cut, I cut my finger, maybe it's a pretty bad paper cut. So I cut my finger and what's going to happen? Well, it's going to hurt.

And then it's going to bleed, it's going to be messy for a while. But if I leave it alone, eventually a scab will form. And it's not going to look pretty but it will form this scab. And if I leave it alone and allow the natural healing process to happen, eventually the scab is going to fall off and you won't even be able to tell that anything was there. You won't be able to tell that there was even a wound. The emotional body has its own natural healing process, emotions, feelings need to be felt and expressed. That is their natural healing process. And if emotions are felt and expressed, they tend to complete and so there's not residue.

And you can see this in children because oftentimes children are quite expressive. And if they're upset, they're going to show it. If they're sad, they're going to cry, if they're afraid they're going to tremble. And if they're allowed to express in that way, two minutes later, they're off playing with a new toy. It's over, it is complete.

Josh: How important is the way that we express emotion?

Dr. Greene: It's very important because I am certainly not advocating that we all you know, scream and cry and yell.

Josh: Or take a boxing or something or like kickboxing. Well, that could help too, right? I mean, getting it out physically.

Dr. Greene: It can, but it can't. And that's a very important question because, like those kinds of physical activities, they happen on the physical level, but it's not necessarily addressing what's going on on the emotional level. So again, the secret, the key to emotional health and hygiene is to be aware of what you're feeling. Feel your feelings, and then allow the feeling or emotion to express. And by expression, I do not mean acting out your feelings, I do not mean that we all become drama queens, okay? That's not what this is.

Josh: Thank you.

Dr. Greene: You can express your feelings even with a word. You know, I feel sad. I feel afraid, I feel angry. And as long as those three components are there, you're aware of what you're feeling. You're feeling the feeling. And then simply by putting a word to it, it helps to release the feeling. There's actually some very interesting research that's been done on just that. That naming your feelings with feeling words and it has to be a feeling word. You can't say I feel terrible because terrible does not name a feeling, right? You can't say you know, I'm feeling upset because that's not a feeling. It needs to be; are you mad? Are you frustrated? Are you afraid? Are you in grief? Those are feeling words, right?

There's something about finding the right feeling where it's like a lock and key. And the research shows that when you find the word to describe your inner emotional state, the emotion simply releases and they've tested this by testing our brain activity. And it's really, really interesting. So I don't mean to become drama queens.

Josh: I can relate to that like just having a conversation with someone or you're kind of getting into it and then you get to that level of depth in the conversation when you say something that has the ring of truth in it, and you feel this rush of emotion or this rush of energy. That's what you're talking about.

Dr. Greene: It then releases expressions, and then we reset.

Josh: So can that happen in something like we're dealing with 5G, we want to communicate how we're feeling and what we feel needs to happen, let's say to members in our society, like elected officials, or like corporate executives or commissions or whatever. Can we actually like channel that kind of communication, that kind of feeling communication in like a written letter or an email or like a phone -- I guess a phone call is verbal. So yes, but talk about how that might relate into this advocacy world.

Dr. Greene: Well, I'm actually talking here more about --

Josh: The internal process first.

Dr. Greene: Talking about I guess you could say self work. I don't really like the word work when we talk about ourselves because like, self fun. How to play with yourself, self play, self exploration, self engagement, engaging with yourself. I'm not talking so much about translating that directly into that type of communication.

Josh: Okay, forgive my impatience.

Dr. Greene: I understand it, I totally get it and I've got it too. But the thing is, the more that we are well resourced inside, the more coherent we are. The more we have done this type of engagement with ourselves, the more empowered we are, the better we're going to be able to act in the world. And it works that way. You know, we're going to be so much more effective in the world. So it automatically has an effect on the external when we do this internal work. And the other fascinating thing is that when we do this inner type of work, we help to uplift everyone. Because we are all connected, right? We're all connected inside. And so it isn't just me here in my little, you know, bubble or working so hard on myself. But when I transform something inside myself, I help to uplift all of humanity. I help make it easier for everyone to do that, because we're all connected inside.

Josh: Yeah. That's beautiful. I agree.

Dr. Greene: And so I also want to make a little distinction here between -- I mean, I'm talking about self engagement and I want to make a distinction between self care and spending time with your son.

Josh: Yeah, I was thinking about that earlier when you're talking about the key is time with yourself. So like, what does that exactly mean? Is it like I like to go to nature, spend time in nature and I just feel recharged that way or body work or reading a book or watching a movie or something. Is that what you're talking about, or is it different?

Dr. Greene: There actually is an important distinction there. And I mean, self care is important, I don't mean to discount it at all. But there is a difference between self care versus spending time with yourself. When I'm doing self care, I'm oftentimes doing the things that you just named. You know, watching a favorite movie getting into a good book, or going for a walk or doing something out in nature. And it's kind of activity oriented. But when I'm spending time with myself, it's not so much about the activity. It's more about engaging inside. And maybe an example of that subtle but important distinction is -- you know, if you have a friend or maybe a spouse, or a girlfriend, boyfriend, lover, whatever. You can spend time with that loved one doing activities, riding bike, and going to movies and doing all these fun things. Or you can spend time with that person where you're just focused on that person.

There's a big difference between the two. And children especially are very sensitive to this. You know, they know when we have our attention focused on them or if we're focused on them, there's some impact. That's another one. You know, especially cats, maybe dogs too. But it's like they want our attention. And if we're reading a magazine or a newspaper, or on the computer, oftentimes the cat will come and sit right on the keyboard or block the screen. Because they want that attention, because they know that there's a quality of energy there when we are focusing

our attention in a certain way.

And so that quality of attention is what we need to give ourselves where we're focusing our whole attention on ourselves without the extraneous activities. You could call it something like daydreaming if you want. And the research actually shows that daydreaming is very good for us. It's very healthy for us. And most of us again, don't have an opportunity to do that anymore because we're always looking at a device.

Josh: Dot I'm connecting here is you know, help me understand if -- clarify this if I'm focused attention, if I give myself that time of focused attention, then it seems logically, I would be less inclined to try to get my needs met from whatever outside of myself, because that's like you said, it's an inside job. So whether it's like food or sex or technology or addiction or like recognition from people or any kind of physical or emotional need. Well, physical needs maybe. We still need to eat food and stuff like that. But is that accurate? And do you want to say anything else about that?

Dr. Greene: Yes, I completely agree with that. And it's by spending time with ourselves in that kind of focused manner, getting to know ourselves inside. That's what is going to bring us true lasting happiness. That's what's going to bring us fulfillment. That's what's going to bring us peace. Those things don't exist out here. They exist in here. And once you have cultivated that inside yourself, it makes all the difference for how we're engaging with the world. And yes, it makes us you know, I guess you could say more trigger proof. And bulletproof, so to speak, where we don't get rocked off our center when something external needs to be dealt with. We're able to respond to life in any myriad of ways, because we're coming from a place of that inner grounding. It's more than grounding, but I hope you understand what I'm saying.

Josh: So that kind of like self love. It's not that we love ourselves like we serve ourselves, is that we're doing it on a different level, like we're actually authentically loving ourselves rather than you could say like, we're just self gratifying. It's not self gratifying, right? It is loving yourself on a higher level, so then you can show up in the world better. So something else I noticed when you're talking is like -- I was thinking like this; when I do this, it actually increases my motivation, my wide to show up. And to actually take on the challenges and to feel better about doing what is aligned with what I feel to be right without attachment to control the outcome.

Dr. Greene: Exactly. And it puts us into a different headspace, for lack of a different term. We're coming from a different place. And our mind has different aspects to it. And if we are using what's sometimes called the lower mind or the concrete mind, we're very much in thinking mode, trying to figure things out. And trying to strategize and use the rational

mind for all these things. But if we're able to engage our higher mind, it puts us in a different place where we're able to see a bigger picture. We're able to observe things from a larger perspective. And sometimes I refer to this as director's mode, you might appreciate this as a filmmaker. It's like we could observe life as a movie. And we always have a choice. We can either star in the movie, or we can be directing the movie. We always have that choice. And if you're starring in the movie, then you're in it, you're in the trauma drama, you're in, you know, you're just in it, right? But if you're directing the movie, you're sitting in the director's chair, and you're watching all everything, you're watching all the action, but you have access not only to that, but so much more. As the director you know what's going to happen with all of the characters, the actors, you know, what's going to happen next, because you can see the bigger picture. And so going into directors mode using that capacity of the higher mind can be really helpful when it comes to dealing with you know, issues like 5G.

And if you want a concrete example of that, we can do a tiny little experiment where just close your eyes for a moment and try to think yes and no at the same time. So we close our eyes and we're going to try to think yes and no at the same time. And it usually doesn't take long to realize that we can't. I mean, we can think yes or no really, really fast. But in order to preserve the integrity of the thought, it has to be one or the other. But if I asked you to be aware of yes and no at the same time, to close your eyes and be aware of yes and no at the same time.

Josh: You know, the kind of delineate.

Dr. Greene: You can do that, right?

Josh: More easily anyways, yeah.

Dr. Greene: Yeah. And that's a tiny little example of the difference between being in your concrete mind versus being in the higher mind, the abstract mind. It allows us to see things that are seemingly contradictory, but we can see them both at the same time. And we're not stuck in that black and white that back and forth kind of thing.

Josh: So it's observing. So in some cases, you're talking about observing rather than trying to force. But in the whole, you're talking about being in a position of directing your life. So this is really like -- I mean, you could say like a crash course and spiritual sovereignty or self determinism.

Dr. Greene: Yes.

Josh: Self determinism that is not about self aggrandizement or like self quantification, but it's about the self -- if we identify self as the self that

is actually connected with the all through whatever your belief system is. For me, I see it's like a holographic fractal, you're connected with the source of all. So that's really what we're talking about here. We're like connecting within, and clearing out the illusion, and then connecting to that true source of power, that source of life and love, so that we can actually authentically direct our life. And then what we say and the actions we take in the world. Something that I noticed on my limited journey, let's say in the time that I've kind of gotten deeper into this internal work; when we act and when we do and when we speak from that place, like you say, almost like less effort. We're putting out less effort we're getting more result, right?

Dr. Greene: Exactly. We can be so much more effective. Yes. And there's also more synchronicities that happen, it's much easier to manifest, things become effortless, they seem to flow. You can set an intention and then suddenly things will appear to meet whatever that is.

Josh: Yeah. Awesome. Well, thank you for this overview and what I would say, intentional living or intentional advocacy bridging these two worlds. So this is something just for our viewers out there, we're going to get more into this subject. So really bridging this world to get and to facilitate our own journeys into true empowerment so that we can really show up in the world. And actually have fun doing it with each other, with our families and community and in person with our group. So that's one of the things that you and I are part of this co creation that's happening together, Debra. And I have to say it's really fun to work with you and you seem to just be there, be present, be in it and you actually enjoy the process of inspiring for me.

Before we go to other questions, we talked about fear, we talked about moving through fear. One of the things that have been since starting to make take back your power, this has always been in my mind, is I don't want to just put people into fear and leave them there. I don't want my net you know, job and focus to be a negative effect. I'm just bringing that awareness of the problem and then, you know, what do you do with that? So it rarely happens now.

But people have kind of accused me, I'm just telling people about the fear side of things and just contributing to the general problem that way. I know you're also involved in advocacy activism in a very powerful way in Hawaii and in your online networks with us. So can you talk to that a little bit in terms of like, Is there a necessary rule of awareness and fear. And obviously -- you know, on the other hand, we don't want to go into this bubble of like just loving light, like you talked about before.

So help us to -- some more insight on this process, how can we sort of be confident, I guess and in the fact that we are not just putting people in fear and leaving them there for a net negative result?

Dr. Greene: Yeah, such a good question and so important. I actually have a little story to share around this. I was at a conference a couple of months ago, and I was having lunch with another one of the presenters. And his issue was climate change, and my issue at the conference was 5G. And at lunch, we were talking about this very topic; we were talking about how can we talk about these very scary topics, and still be mindful about what we're doing, you know, invoking fear in people and how to manage that.

And what does that mean from an ethical point of view, from an integrity point of view. And we're in the middle of having this conversation and another presenter walked by. And for whatever reason, I looked up and hyper focused on the sleeve of this man's jacket. And he had a badge that was like an arm badge on sleeve of his jacket. And I just zoomed in on that with my eyes and the badge said, "we scare because we care."

And so I'm in the middle of this conversation, all of a sudden I see that and I'm like, we scared because we care. We scared because we care. And I said, "Did you just see that?" He was like, "No." I was like, "I have to go talk to him. Is that okay?" And he's like, yes. And so I follow this guy out. He was walking out of the lunch area outside and I catch up with him. And I asked him about this badge that he was wearing on his jacket, and it turns out that he was one of 10 CGI computer graphics guys that worked on the film; Monsters Incorporated.

Josh: Yeah.

Dr. Greene: That was a Pixar film. And the director made these jackets for all 10 of those guys and put that badge on arm because the theme of monsters incorporated is "we scare because we care." And I realized that that's the answer. The answer is when we're talking about these potentially scary topics that we need to pay attention to our intention. And if our intention is that we're sharing these things because we care if we're coming from a heart space, if we're coming from that place of I care about you, I care about humanity, I care about what happens. That is what is going to carry the message and the intention will carry it, in other words.

Josh: Well said. Thank you for that illustration. As we wrap up here, I wanted to ask you about one last thing. Now, one of the things I love about you is how you put your perspective and knowledge into action and you actually are walking this path in the world. And that's something very admirable. So you told me one time about how you know, what happened in Hawaii when you brought some information to someone in a position of authority and they received it and things shifted in a quick way. That was such an encouraging story when you told that to me. I'm just wondering if you could share that with our audience in closing.

Dr. Greene: Sure. So I live on Maui in Hawaii. And we have a community access TV station here called Akaku. And they sponsor these, what they call salons where they bring in presenters on various topics. And it so happened that our Maui County health director, it's actually a state position but he's assigned to Maui County. Dr. Lorrin Pang was scheduled to do a talk on 5G. And so I got the announcement about this by email. And the wording of the title was kind of as a question. Something like, you know, is 5G dangerous or something like that. And I didn't know where Dr. Pang stood on the issue. And so I was very curious about that. Plus, I wanted to contact him because I wanted his permission to pass out flyers at his talk, because obviously, there would be people there who are interested in the issue.

And so I called him and he answered the phone. And this was a few days before he was doing his presentation, and he said, "I'm working on my presentation right now." And I was like, "Oh, that's good." And then we sort of visited and I was asking him where he's at on the issue, and he said, "Well, you know, there are pros and cons to 5Gs." You know, there's good things and there's not so good things. And it sounded like he was you know, kind of middle of the road or undecided. And so in that conversation I shared a couple of websites with him with research, particularly about the health effects since he's -- Dr. Lorrin Pang is MD, he's our health director.

And he was doing the talk as a concerned citizen, by the way, not in his official capacity. But I still wanted him to know about the research on the health effects, and so directed him to some websites. I think I directed him to the 5G space appeal. In Oregon, I think maybe bio initiative, maybe one other. I don't remember. And when I'm there on the phone with him, he actually pulled up the websites and started looking at them. And then our conversation ended, and he did give permission, by the way, for me to hand them flyers. And so then when his talk time came several days later, I was very curious about how he was going to approach the topic. And what had happened is, he actually took the time to read the research and it completely shifted him in his perspective on 5G.

And during his talk, he ended up saying that 5G is an experiment on humanity. And it's an experiment that's being conducted without our consent. And it's as if we're all being told by the government; you have to have this medical procedure done. It's mandatory. It's never been tested. We don't know how it's going to turn out but it's supposed to be good for you. We don't know what the side effects are, but you have to have this done. He said, that's what 5G is like. And he said that it's in violation of the Nuremberg Code, which is a code of ethics that was established after the human experimentation that was done in World War Two, as part of the Holocaust.

So there were points in his talk where he was visibly shaking. He was so affected by this. And I think it was because he was new to the information and he was so affected by it. And then after the talk, somebody came up to me. This was a colleague who I had kind of shared the back-story with, and he said, "Wow, Debra, this is such a good example of grassroots activism." You know, one phone call and this person get the information and then it has such a wide effect.

Josh: That's beautiful. Thank you for sharing that. That's an outstanding example of leading from that inner empowered, intentional space. And just the connection that happens at a deeper level with the people that we're trying to reach when we do that, that inner work. So I'm going to put you on the spot just in closing. I have no --

Dr. Greene: Like you haven't yet.

Josh: I have noticed the power of a morning routine, or doing certain intentional things every day, I find it's best in the morning. What are three things if somebody is watching this and they're saying, "I want to be more intentional in my life and I want to give myself the time and to go within and connect with my inner senses." What are three quick things that anybody can do?

Dr. Greene: I think important steps to take would be when you wake up in the morning, do not reach for your cell phone or your iPad or turn on your computer, spend some time with yourself. You know, we cannot love what we do not know. So if you want self love that you mentioned earlier, you have to get to know yourself. So spend time with yourself, turn inward and get to know yourself. Then if you are a meditator, of course, it's very good to meditate and simply clear your mind. Then set a specific intention for the day, very specific intention. And just one thing, don't do the universal shopping cart. Just focus on one thing for that day. And then in the evening, before you go to bed or perhaps when you're falling asleep, reflect on your day and revisit that intention. And use that as the lens in which to view your day.

For example, if your intention in the morning was joy, I'm just picking something randomly. So joy, I want joy today. You know, joy is my intention, I want to give joy, I want to receive joy. I want to be joyful. And so then in the evening, I would look back over the day through that lens of joy and see my day that way, see how it went in an evening review type of thing.

Josh: Excellent. That's really good. So I made notes for myself. So time inward, meditate and set one intention for the day and then the evening you reflect on the day, you revisit that intention and you use that intention as a lens to see your day. Maybe not to like judge or guilt yourself, but just to kind of observe, right?

Dr. Greene: You understand your day through that doing that review to see okay, “how was joy today?” Where did it show up? Where didn’t it? You know, just to observe these things.

Josh: Yeah. So Debra, where can people dive into your work more and follow you and contact you?

Dr. Greene: They can go to *debraGreene.com*. And it’s the short version of Debra, the long version of Green.

Josh: With an E at the end.

Dr. Greene: Yes, Debra Greene.

Josh: So Debra, thank you so much for your time today. It’s a pleasure to work with you. And I just want to take this moment to say, if you’re watching this right now, you found value in this, you find value in the direction that we’re going with intentional advocacy and going deeper. Or in any of the other talks on the summit, please share the link. Share the link where people can watch it online. That’s how we grow. That’s how we reach towards critical threshold. We don’t have a huge marketing budget. It’s up to us all. So thank you for that. And Debra, thank you so much again for just your wisdom and just your presence and really just caring and walking your talk. That means a lot to me and to so many others. So thank you for joining us today.

Dr. Greene: Thank you, Josh. The pleasure, feelings are mutual. I can’t wait for the next step.

Josh: Thank you.

Root Cause of Chronic Disease Epidemic

Guest: Richard Lear

Josh del Sol: With us today on the summit is Richard Lear. Richard, welcome.

Richard Lear: Great to be here.

Josh del Sol: You're bringing a new model forward of understanding, comprehending chronic disease, correct?

Richard Lear: Absolutely. A biological model.

Josh del Sol: A biological model that dovetails powerfully into Dr. Martin Paul's mechanism for comprehending harm from wireless, and how significant this is.

So you first contacted me last year, I think last summer. And I thought this story was so important. I'm so happy to be helping to break this story as part of this summit.

So, thank you, again, for your work and for making time to talk with us today.

Richard Lear: Well, thanks for having me, Josh. I really appreciate it.

Josh del Sol: So I'm just going to share with our viewers a little bit about you. Richard Lear is the founder of Search for the Cause and chairman of GreenWave, which offers powerline dirty electricity filters and meters for homes, schools, and businesses.

He pursued pre-medicine and engineering at the Georgia Institute of Technology. And graduated magna cum laude from Brown University with a Bachelors in Economics.

He has worked in the technology arena since 1992 and has founded five Silicon Valley-based businesses. Richard has written more than a dozen articles on health and environmental impact and is presently launching *heroics.com*, which explores trends, myths, and heroes in a new era of health.

So let's dive in here into this model, but actually maybe before we do. You have done some incredible collating of studies in various different silos of the area peer-reviewed published science. And you're a bit of an epidemiologist here, right? I mean you've really dug deep and are bringing some commonalities forward that are very, very important here.

So before we get into your new model of the biophysics, Rich, tell us a little bit about what we're seeing in terms of trends in this incredible increase in germless chronic diseases in the past generation.

Richard Lear: Yeah. Absolutely. Thanks for your kind words. I'm really a researcher. And what I did was I did a study that talked about the fastest growing diseases in the U.S.

The Root Cause and the Dramatic Rise of Chronic Disease. And that paper's on Research Gate. It now has about 3,600 reads by scientists. So some people have learned from it, and others have contacted me about it.

But what I found was 36 diseases in a 25-year period more than doubled. Twenty more than tripled. And 16 more than quadrupled. And this was stunning.

And I really went in just to find out how big the problem was. Once I got in I noticed that there were some commonalities. And I wanted to see what's going on in either the diet lifestyle or environment that might be causing all of this.

I started at the biological level. So what are the biological common factors? And I went with the usual suspects, inflammation. Everyone knows inflammation's connected with most chronic disease. So, that was an easy one. All 36 matched up.

I next looked at free radicals. They call it oxidative stress. And free radicals all lined up at 36. So I was getting kind of excited, "Oh, wow, I got two out of three."

The next thing I looked at is something most people aren't aware of. It's

called mitochondrial dysfunction. Every cell has mitochondria; it's the energy center of the cell. It creates ATP. ATP is how your body runs. It's your brain, your heart, your muscles. The deep upon raw energy.

Well, it turns out that the mitochondria is not working well in all 36 diseases, so I'm three for three. And I continued on, and I found four more connections.

But the big one was the peroxynitrite. A single molecule is connected with not only all 36 diseases, but this single molecule is also connected with every single one of the bi-factors — the bio-factors.

So now I have what looks like a model. Now, I didn't create the model. I derived it from science. We just did a lot of work. We looked at thousands of studies to see what matched. And we found a model for chronic disease. We call it P-factor.

And so, what's happened in this era of chronic disease is we not only have this explosion of disease, but we have a new kind of disease.

Like we used to talk about cancer, and heart disease, and Diabetes I, and infectious disease. These are the big four that the CDC has focused on ever since the 1950s. There's still focusing on those.

But when we looked at the 36 fast-growing diseases, we only found three cancers. We only found two heart disease. Those are growing fast. What's growing fast are four new categories. And the key category is the neurological component. This is ADD, Alzheimer's, Autism, and then what we call psychological or mental illness. Depression, Bipolar, we saw Anxiety as a diagnosed condition. But they all have the same biological footprint.

So the neurological component is 91 million Americans today — just one.

Josh del Sol: Have a neurological condition, 91 million Americans?

Richard Lear: Exactly.

Josh del Sol: Wow.

Richard Lear: And if you include sleep, and we could, it goes up into the high 90's. But like, just say 91 there.

Let's look at the next one, autoimmune. Autoimmune, the CDC says 25 million people are suffering, but all of the other stats I read out there said 50 million people are suffering from one of 100 and some autoimmune diseases.

Most people never heard of the term autoimmune in the '80s. It's now commonplace. Suffering from all sorts of autoimmune. So autoinflammatory is really what we saw. These diseases that have an inflammation piece and an autoimmune piece, 50 million.

Now we look at obesity. We all know it's a big problem. But in the U.S. we have 110 million people who suffer from obesity. That's out of an adult population of 250 million. It's almost 40 percent.

Now we think of obesity, it's diet, and it's sugar, and it's bad food. But obesity is actually a metabolic problem. And it's actually created around the mitochondria, and it's a problem that gets caused at a much deeper level than just eating too much sugar. Although sugar is part of the problem.

The last piece is sleep. And people don't see sleep as a disease or a condition. But 101 million people are experiencing insufficient sleep. That means they're really less than seven hours at night. You really need eight.

But if you think of all of the people that have sleep apnea or all diseases out there, it adds up to 101 million. So sleep is a big problem.

So we've got these four big new disease groups that are really exploding.

And then I found the big a-ha. And you mentioned it. There's no germs with these diseases.

Infectious disease is still important, but it's not driving the 170 million people that are now suffering in the U.S. from one of just these 36 diseases. There's no germs. And as a result, really, there's no cures. And so far a lot of doctors and scientists have no answers.

Josh del Sol: Wow. So this is like the first time really in our history, so this is the United States and other countries as well. But predominately the United States, right? Probably percentage-wise the United States is the leading the world in these categories in terms of percentages of people that have these germless chronic diseases. Would you agree?

Richard Lear: Yeah. And it's not clear. Because I didn't do any research on other countries explicitly. But I found a bunch of studies that showed compared to 21 other nations for instance, neurological death in the U.S. is four times what all of our other industrialized countries make. And so when you think about it all 21 industrialized countries out there have neurological death at a growth of 200 percent in the same time period, 1990 to 2015.

But the U.S. is 800 percent.

Josh del Sol: Wow. And that started to really increase rapidly around 1990?

Richard Lear: Yeah. 1990 seems like a good date to choose. You could say the '80s, things start brewing. But the real acceleration happened in the '90s. And I cut it off at 2015. The study was in 2016. It seemed like a good 25-year generational observation. Like what's happened. Here's the snapshot that happened in this period.

Josh del Sol: Okay. So, Rich, if germs aren't causing this health crisis, what is?

Richard Lear: The short answer; it's something in our diet, our lifestyle, or our environment. The longer answer; it's really a combination of stressors in the environment, and the internal biological response. So our body is responding to something in the environment that's triggering a lot of biological chaos.

And then these diseases are a result of that.

Josh del Sol: So you mentioned peroxynitrite, right? That's a molecule that Martin Paul talks about as mentioned. And I would highly encourage everyone to watch Martin's talk on this summit where he explains that.

But peroxynitrite, P-factor, tell us more about these two terms. One's a terms, and one's a chemical, right? Are they related? Is this the cause? Help us to understand the crux of this piece.

Richard Lear: Right. And I'm going to talk a lot about peroxynitrite. But I would say that when I first did the root cause study, I felt the peroxynitrite was the root cause of chronic disease. And the reason I felt that is when I discovered peroxynitrite I found the landmark study on peroxynitrite by NIH, 2007 & 2008.

Pat Patcher is the lead author on that. NIH is the gold standard for research. They did an 180-page paper, 1,500 studies. And in this paper they indicted peroxynitrite. It's a study of nitric oxide and peroxynitrite in health in disease. It sounds pretty bland.

But when I read this study, it's very hard to read. Peroxynitrite has created more than 100 biological disruptions. Peroxynitrite is associated with 60 diseases. This is what the NIH tells us. This is what our government is telling us. That there's a big problem with this one molecule. It's made in the body, the body doesn't really need it, and it's triggered by external sources.

But the peroxynitrite, I thought, "This is the root cause." And I asked, Paul Patcher, I said, "If I wrote a paper saying that peroxynitrite is the

root cause or the smoking gun for chronic disease, would that be hyperbole?" And he said, "Absolutely not."

His paper had basically said it, but he didn't say it. So I went and wrote my paper and I pointed to peroxynitrite, but I also pointed to these other six bio-factors.

Since that time in 2016, I've understood P-factor, which is a combination of seven factors that act like a system. The real problem is the system. It's synergistic. It's self-sustaining. It creates vicious cycles.

So when you look at this system, you might have something like free radicals. If you have oxidative stress or free radicals that cause inflammation. In turn inflammation turns around and causes more free radical production. Then peroxynitrite gets generated. When peroxynitrite gets generated it goes out, and it creates mitochondrial disfunction.

Now when peroxynitrite attacks the mitochondria stopping the energy production, it changes the production; it changes the factory from producing energy to actually producing more peroxynitrite.

So peroxynitrite in, peroxynitrite out.

Josh del Sol: So it's a vicious cycle then, once it starts increasing.

Richard Lear: Exactly. All of these factors start working together, synergistically. Even if you have an external cause that may have begun this cycle, this cycle can continue. And that's what makes it chronic. So, yes, peroxynitrite is in there. Martin Paul's correct.

Martin Paul has identified the idea of vicious cycles. And it's true, but to me when you look at all of the things that are involved. Autonomic dysfunction. You're not supposed to be telling your body when to breathe, or when to sweat, or when to have a sex drive or any of that.

Autonomic system operates on its own. But suddenly something in the environment is triggering peroxynitrite and some other things in the P-factor. And suddenly you have autonomic dysfunction.

So there's a lot going on here. It's a system. And the way I look at it is this. If you look at the elephant and the three blind men. You've got the trunk, you've got the legs, you've got the tail. So peroxynitrite is the trunk. A lot of people are grabbing the trunk and saying, "It's all about peroxynitrite."

Others are saying it's about inflammation, that's the legs. And they believe that's it. They're describing the elephant. This is the leg.

And others are describing free radicals. And scientists will say oxidative stress is a big problem. And they're grabbing the tail.

What we're missing is the elephant is a much more integrated creature. It's a creature with many aspects, not just three. And the idea of P-factor, I've seen seven factors show up in the research, but below there are about a hundred and some biological disruptions happening.

So things that you've never thought about. How do we have our attitude? How do we create an attitude?

Dopamine is part of our attitude. Serotonin is part of our attitude. It's part of our motivation. It's part of our empathy. These are the two most powerful neurotransmitters that make us human.

Well, P-factor and in particular peroxynitrite and free radicals destroy the precursors to dopamine and serotonin. Tryptophan and triazine. If you can't make tryptophan and triazine, you can't have dopamine and serotonin. That's just one set of crazy stuff that happens.

So people with low dopamine, low serotonin, all of the neurological diseases. You can kind of look and see and say, "Oh, this is where they came from." And you can go through the different elements of P-factor and say what causes inflammation and what does it cause?

And so, it's much deeper. It's a longer paper to talk about. But essentially, it's not just three things. It's not just two things, it's just inflammation. It's a composite system that it virtuous and vicious.

Josh del Sol: So it sounds like P-factor is this biological system of chaos, a combination of seven different factors. Peroxynitrite at the center of it. And you mentioned something how it can often be triggered by an external cause or an external environmental factor. Can you talk about that? And do you want to get into, just going through each one of those factors now?

Richard Lear: Yeah. The seven factors we can talk about. They are oxidative stress, mitochondrial dysfunction, inflammation, nitrative stress, which is a lot worse than oxidative stress. And it's really formed by the peroxynitrite. Autonomic dysfunction. What we just talked about. And then epithelium dysfunction, which is skin, and your blood-brain barrier, and the barrier of your stomach? And this is why leaky gut syndrome is happening.

And people with neurological diseases are getting perforated blood-brain barriers, so all of these toxins are rushing into the brain and ambushing the neurons. So you have like neuronal damage.

So these are the key factors of peroxynitrite. It's the heart but it's not always the trigger. So that's a little bit about P-factor and so what you'll see.

Josh del Sol: Okay. So what is the trigger? What are the triggers that start this system of happening in one's body.

Richard Lear: Yeah. There are probably six triggers at a minimum. Two in diet. Two in lifestyle. And two in environment. But the big four, I think first the diet. We talked about sugar. And sugar and high fructose corn syrup are really dangerous. And that's a no brainer. And people know that sugar's bad for a number of other reasons. But for none other than to trigger peroxynitrite directly and get you into P-factor. Sugar is an easy way in.

Josh del Sol: All kinds of sugar?

Richard Lear: All kinds of sugar, yes. Glucose, fructose, but fructose is probably worse.

Josh del Sol: Okay. Wow.

Richard Lear: You need a certain amount of glucose, but not too much. And refined sugar is not great. So fast foods are not a great path to health right now. So that's one.

But the one that's more hidden is what's happening in our food supply, with the corn, the wheat, and the soy, and some of the other crops. So somewhere along the line when we started playing with GMOs, it was decided that GMOs could make these certain crops resistant to a powerful pesticide, herbicide called Roundup. These are called Roundup Ready Crops. So what happens is it helps farmers get a better yield, but they're not even using it to kill the pests. They are actually using it for enhancing a result.

What's happened around 1998 one of these crops started carry glyphosate which is at the root of Roundup into our bodies, into the air, into the water. So now it's floating around everywhere. Glyphosate is a carcinogen. Glyphosate also defeats dopamine and serotonin. And there's very strong evidence that's it's a peroxynitrite trigger. At least it's a free radical trigger.

To get into P-factor through the glyphosate or the Roundup level is very easy. And what's happening is we're eating so much of this food that not's organic. And we're eating it because we think it's healthy. Wheat's great for you. Corn's good for you. And then the animals are eating the wheat and the corn.

And so we have this system where all of us are flooded with glyphosate. And it is the second trigger. It's our diet, although it's really in the environment, so it's kind of both.

The environment is a little trickier because it's all invisible. But the environment is chemical/pesticides and electrical fields. Yes, the electrical field does trigger peroxynitrite in a big way.

So in those two categories, you can break them down. But I think the easiest one is when you look at the chemicals, they could be things like formaldehyde in the rugs, it could fire retardants, it could be all kinds of paint, paint thinners. We're surrounded by chemicals. There's very good connections with peroxynitrite in the chemical category.

The electromagnetic field category, there's two big areas that I would focus on. And that would be dirty electricity and wireless. And I'd be happy to talk more about that at some point.

Josh del Sol: Okay. All right let's just sum up those factors. One is peroxynitrite itself, the triggers. Two is glyphosate. Three is chemicals, various chemicals. The fourth is electromagnetic radiation, which can be both dirty electricity and wireless.

What are the remaining ones and have I got it right so far?

Richard Lear: Yeah. So peroxynitrite is an internal cause. Okay? And peroxynitrite is part of the P-factor. Those are those seven factors that we talked about.

If you want to think about the external causes, first in the diet, you've got sugar which triggers peroxynitrite directly. Then you have the Roundup Ready Crops. That's your dietary piece.

Your environmental piece is chemicals and electrical fields. And within electrical fields, there's two categories. It's dirty electricity, that's because it's so chaotic. And wireless is because wireless is so ubiquitous. But those are the two big ones.

If you look at lifestyle, there's two pieces we all know about, they are not going to be new. But one is sleep. So lack of sleep both causes peroxynitrite and it is also a result of peroxynitrite. So it's a two-way street.

And the other is after sleep we have exercise, and there are all sorts of connections to peroxynitrite or the P-factor cycle with exercise. It can actually calm the cycle down. And it can also increase it. And that's because exercise is closely related to nitric oxide which is one of the key elements of peroxynitrite. And nitric oxide is usually a good thing. Because it does vascular dilation, and it creates a great healthy body.

Blood flow everywhere. So it's good. But when you get too much nitric oxide you're a marathon runner; you're an Iron person, you're doing all of these activities too much, then it starts that reverse effect. And starts creating more peroxynitrite. So exercise is the least known factor, but it's something to consider.

Josh del Sol: Okay. Now we're going to get into diving into the EMF aspect of this, right? Because that's what we want to focus mostly on, even though there's multiple triggers and factors.

But first, before we do that, I would like to just go back to your P-factor model and if you could talk about each one of those aspects. Perhaps the ones that you haven't covered so much. That comprise this system of harm, and chaos, or inflammation in the body.

Richard Lear: So you want to go through the seven factors is that what you want?

Josh del Sol: Yeah. Could we do that for five or ten minutes just to give us a more deep understanding of the P-factor model that you've created?

Richard Lear: Yeah. And we can do that. So if you look at these factors, you have oxidative stress which is free radicals. And I think the most important thing, and one of the most surprising, and stunning facts about P-factor – is that oxidative stress is likely to be one of the key triggers.

This is how it happens. So plants have a defense system against the environment. When environmental stressors are existing in the environment, a plant will react. It has sensors. And those sensors send messages with calcium ions to cells.

Now the cells are just waiting around for information and signals; it's called cell signaling. And the cells all of the sudden get this burst of calcium. That is allowed to come through calcium channels in the cells.

So you have these little channels and the calcium, and it's tuned for calcium. When calcium comes in it enters the cell. When you have this increase in calcium you have an explosion soon after between two and forty-eight hours implants of oxidative stress.

What a second. We're trying to avoid oxidative stress. But the organism, the plant, and guess what? Animals are the same. And guess what? Humans are the same. The cells are releasing this oxidative stress to fight the invader. Because of oxidative stress, the little nasty guys that go out there and chew things up like viruses. And they attack bacteria, and they attack mold.

So the plant or the human thinks that there's an attack. When some of these environmental stressors come, and they're unknown.

So an unknown stressor, electromagnetic fields, for instance. The body doesn't recognize them. It doesn't recognize that particular signal. Sensors in the brain, in the mid-brain, the basal ganglia, they're sending messages to the central nervous system, the autonomic nervous system, peripheral nervous system. And these messages are getting triggered by the electrical fields around us.

Really good research on this.

So what's happening is our skin is also picking up these electrical signals. Those people who worry wireless and worry about electro technologies are concerned about radiation penetrating the skin — penetrating deeply. They're worried about this radiation.

And that's probably a good thing to be worried about. And I'm sure there are multiple ways this radiation can actually cause damage, especially in the brain.

But all it takes is the skin to pick it up. And it all it takes is your electrical fields in your basal ganglia to pick it up. And your basal ganglia is both a receiver, it's like a cell tower inside. It's a receiver, and it sends, and it operates between 500 megahertz, and 2500 gigahertz, which is right where cell phones are.

Josh del Sol: What's the basal ganglia?

Richard Lear: The basal ganglia is this cluster of cells that actually act like a router in the brain. In the mid-brain. They're in the subcortex. And they basically, what they're doing is saying, "I'm sensing things in my environment." And a lot of them are electrical fields and other kinds of fields. "And I'm going to send signals about what I experience. And I can send signals both out of the body and into the body. And I can receive signals from outside of the body."

And so, this was in a paper by Beckman. From Germany, Ford Motor Company produced this study. And he found 111 studies how electromagnetic fields trigger the autonomic nervous system. And the autonomic nervous system all of a sudden we're getting hot and sweaty for no reason. Or our breathing is increasing. Our heartbeat, palpitations are a classical electromagnetic field trigger.

Most people having palpitations today, it's some wireless signal nearby. Honestly. And people will say, "Oh, I'm having a panic attack." No, it's not a panic attack. It's just your autonomic nervous system getting triggered. And actually the smaller the intensity of the frequency sometimes that's

more damaging. So it might be something further away than something right in front of you. But both can cause this.

So what's happening is you have electrical fields, and you have your skin, your brain, it's transmitting these messages and what happens is it's sending a calcium bundle, it's called calcium influx, into the cells. And once it gets into the cells there's oxidative burst; suddenly your cells are creating all of this oxidative energy, free radicals. They're going everywhere. Now you're going into P-factor.

Meanwhile a little bit later, you have this burst of calcium efflux. And Martin Paul identifies the calcium efflux part. That's after the influx though. The influx as already happened. The efflux is a result of this calcium getting pushed into the cells.

And the efflux is all of this calcium coming out. When the calcium comes out that creates more havoc, it's toxic to the environment; it's toxic to your biological environment. And the efflux also through a series of events nitric oxide and some other sort of chemical reactions, that creates more peroxynitrite. So you have peroxynitrite being caused by the efflux and free radicals being caused by the influx.

So both are going into this virtuous, vicious cycle of these seven factors. Which cause each other. As soon as you have oxidative stress present in the body and you're generating it because of this external trigger, that oxidative stress starts triggering any one of these other factors. And usually, maybe one of the first it will trigger, it triggers chronic inflammation through a thing called NF-capaB.

Josh del Sol: Okay. So that's the second of the seven, right? Chronic inflammation?

Richard Lear: Yes.

Josh del Sol: Okay. Tell us about that.

Richard Lear: Yeah. So the inflammatory state, and let's put this in terms of – you want to talk about electromagnetic fields and what's happening. This is a very interesting one.

Olle Johansson from the Karolinska Institutet did a great paper that's in the bi-initiative report. And basically what he did was he looked at patients or individuals who were exposed to electromagnetic fields. And he looked to them as having an allergic reactions. So he saw histamines to be released and cytokines through these mass cell proliferation. And he was looking at the immune system.

We were just talking about the cellular system. But now we're in the

immune system. So the immune system gets kicked up by these electrical fields. How does that happen? Okay.

What happens is somewhere along the line, in my belief, is that somewhere with this oxidative stress, chronic inflammation started getting triggered by NF-capaB. And then with the chronic inflammation is the release of cytokines and histamines. And that's how it happened. So it came from the oxidative stress first. Triggered the chronic inflammation. I'm not saying you couldn't get it another way. But this is like an obvious in the research, there's so much science that says, "Give me oxidative stress and you get inflammation."

So what Olle has traced, is that he traces once the histamines and cytokines get released you get an inflammatory state. Your body is attacking something that's not really there. There is no bacteria. There are no viruses. There is no mold.

What's happened is the electrical field has triggered this oxidative stress and now you're in inflammation. So your body is starting to go through this period of backing off the inflammation, and it does it by the adrenal glands coming in. And they release cortisol.

So when you release the cortisol it's saying, "Battles over guys, you've won the war, end the assault." So yes, the cortisol is not good for you. You don't want it in your body a lot. But it's actually an anti-inflammatory. So it's a good thing for a little while. But for not for a long time.

What happens is it knocks down the current inflammation but the electrical field is still hitting your body; it's still creating oxidative stress. It's still sending this oxidative stress message out everywhere. It's triggering NF-capaB. Then NF-capaB is going over and creating this inflammation again. Cytokines and histamines. So it's a cycle that continues because it's persistent and now it's chronic.

So we want to know where chronic disease came from, these chronic conditions, chronic exposures. Not to just electrical fields. This could happen with chemicals. Okay. This can happen in our diet. This can happen with pesticides.

So we have sensors. Our bodies are very well-evolved to deal with environmental stress. That includes things in our diet. Our stomach lining. Our whole body is reacting to what's not right, "I don't like that I've never seen it before."

So the irony is the beautiful system we have designed to protect us from all of these bad things in the environment, stressors like bacteria and viruses are now getting triggered by things it doesn't understand and the

people that actually have the best immune systems, and the best alert systems to environmental stressors are going to become the sickest.

So the people who would have evolved in 100's of years ago without all of these chemicals and electrical fields. They would have lived. They would have survived all the plagues and everything.

But they're now getting knocked down. So all of these people with an autoimmune disease and neurological disease and things like that, a lot of those people have incredibly astute systems that have been upturned by all of these environmental stressors, chemical, and electrical stress — everything else.

Josh del Sol: That's really interesting, and that aligns with part of another awesome conversation, which you guys have to check out, with Olga Sheean as part of the summit. Where she talked about four different basically levels of people and their bodies, right? And so, those who have, you might say electrosensitivity, microwave sickness, or electromagnetic awareness really have an opportunity to shift that to rise above that once they withdraw from the stressors. And begin to make some other changes in both their body and their mind, let's say.

But Olga talks about that more. It's really interesting that you say like the more evolved piece. That's something that I felt intuitively for some time.

So what's the next of these seven factors that comprise P-factor, Rich?

Richard Lear: So we can talk about mitochondrial dysfunction, we did earlier. Peroxynitrite is really, and to some degree oxidative stress but peroxynitrite really disrupts the electron transport chain.

So mitochondria have a factory. It's making energy. It's called ATP. It's critical for everything we do, thinking, moving, running, laughing, movement, everything. So we need ATP. When we don't have it we're run down, we're tired, we can't think straight, we have brain fog, we can't remember things, sleep is tough. So mitochondria is really important.

A lot of people are now focusing on the mitochondria, and it's important. But it's peroxynitrite gets involved in the electron transport chain and some things happen within the electron transport chain that affected by the radical peroxynitrite.

When this starts going on, it starts kicking off more superoxide, which is O₂. And then there's more nitric oxide available. And those two things are floating around, and they marry each other, and they create more peroxynitrite.

I think the real power is peroxynitrite causing mitochondrial dysfunction.

Which in fact cripples the mitochondria. And now we have a new factory creating more peroxynitrite. So this is one of the most vicious parts of the cycle. And I think peroxynitrite is the big offender, but I'm sure other scientists have looked at this carefully. And they may have other ways to look at this. But those are the big three, oxidative stress, mitochondrial dysfunction, and chronic inflammation. These are the ones that people focus on and people are most aware of.

Other ones are more obscure but really powerful.

So nitrative stress is probably the most vicious. So nitrative stress is what's created by peroxynitrite. Peroxynitrite, what it does is it goes out and says, "Oh, I'm going to hang out and look for something I can marry." "I can look at something I can blend with." And it says, "Oh, here's some tyrosine."

So peroxynitrite and tyrosine get together, and they create nitrotyrosine. The body's not using it. It's not necessary. But it's taking the tyrosine. And the tyrosine is a pure component of dopamine production. Take tyrosine out; you can't get dopamine.

So the peroxynitrite is a direct force on that.

The other part of nitro stress is tryptophan. And we talked about that before with serotonin. So it creates nitro tryptophan.

And on, and on. But when you think about nitrative stress that are thinking about nitrative stress, they're thinking peroxynitrite. The nitrite part is the nitrative piece.

Oxygen is the oxidative piece. But you could talk to most scientists that I talk to about peroxynitrite and about nitrative stress, and most said nitrative stress is infinitely more powerful and more damaging to the body through all of these bad functional things.

So nitrative stress, little known, but probably the worst out of all.

Josh del Sol: So nitrative stress according to science is a worse factor than oxidative stress even?

Richard Lear: This is what I've heard.

Josh del Sol: Okay.

Richard Lear: I can't swear to it but this is what I've heard.

Josh del Sol: Okay, are there any remaining pieces to the P-factor model?

Richard Lear: There is. And we talked about autonomic dysfunction. And autonomic dysfunction is a little bit out on the edge. But autonomic dysfunction and peroxynitrite have a two-way street.

Autonomic dysfunction may actually be the key to why electrical fields trigger P-factor. My hunch is this is a bet. Hasn't been researched. That the electrical fields around under trigger the basal ganglia to send all of these messages. We suddenly have this autonomic dysfunction happening, because that's one of the first starts. This is what Beckman said.

And then, we have these other outcomes. So we get into some oxidative stress, and some of these other factors start emerging. And there is evidence autonomic dysfunction is connective to oxidative stress, a two-way street. But my research in that is limited, so I don't want to go too far out on a limb. But it's definitely one of the seven factors. It's part of every one of these 36 fast-growing diseases, and it's well connected to the 30 modern stress symptoms that we're all experiencing today.

Like carb cravings. Like sleep issues. And like brain fog and joint pain. And fatigue. So it's in there. So it's a bad one.

The last one is also little known. But it's the one that gets connected to me to explain some of these things that really we couldn't explain before. And that's the epithelial or endothelial dysfunctions, used both ways.

We know endothelial and epithelial from the skin. The layers of skin. But it's actually these membranes that protect organs, and protect brain, and protect our stomach lining and things like that.

And one of the key things with peroxynitrite that in the literature is that it creates a blood-brain barrier compromise. It basically comes in and puts little pinpricks in your brain and into your gut. There's big science in the wireless area and the electrical side where you use electrical fields with rats and they saw that there was a blood-brain barrier compromise.

When I first read those studies, I said, "I don't know what that means." What does it mean? What does it mean to us all? But then when I saw the peroxynitrite does it and connected the peroxynitrite with electrical. So you see the circuit, so it's the electrical creating the peroxynitrite. And the peroxynitrite is now creating the damage to the membranes.

Now, what does it mean to us? Think about it. The blood-brain barrier is meant to prevent large molecules from crossing into the brain cavity. Where all of the neurons are and where all of the glia cells, and where all of the good stuff is happening. Okay.

So now you're throwing garbage into the brain. The glia cells are supposed to take the garbage out. But they're overwhelmed. They can't recycle. They can't get rid of the garbage, and you've got all of this toxic stuff going on. So the fact that we have brain cancer, glia cancer is one of the big ones.

It doesn't surprise me because we have now opened up the blood barrier through peroxynitrite, through electrical fields, and through other things like chemicals. And now we've got this toxic brain cavity where the neurons are getting knocked out, and they're getting knocked out in the worst way possible. They are getting knocked out by necrosis.

Rather than apoptosis. Apoptosis is like our cells die all of the time. Apoptosis is a way to say, "Oh, this cell isn't working very well; let's shut it down, and let's recycle it and let's do it in an orderly way that the body can deal with very nicely." And it's a fad thing, the cell dies, and it goes away. And it's hauled off and it's over.

But necrosis is erratic; it's not predictable. It's not alerting our system to do any kind of orderly disposal. So all of this matter is floating around. And necrosis is an outcome. Neuronal necrosis is probably the root cause in Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, all sorts neurological ALS that you just really have tremendous levels of neuronal damage.

So that's what's happening. So this is the seven P-factor complex. The system, it's powerful, it's undermining us, it defines the disease state. It also predicts the disease state. So all of these can be measured. And if we have the diagnostic tools around, if we can make them cheap enough, we can see any given person, "Oh, I've got a couple of systems. I'm kind of like not remembering things. And I'm kind of having joint point. And I'm having trouble sleeping. Sex drive is a little lower than usual." You would go to the doctor in the future, and they would look at some sort of P-factor test.

I'm not saying these are the only factors of the P-factor. We know that these are true because they line up with the 36 diseases. There may be more; it may be subtle. There may be different weights. So I'm throwing that to scientists out there, I'm a researcher, I'm not a Ph.D. scientist. I'm throwing to scientists out there; we need to look at this complex. And we need to look beyond the elephant trunk, and the tail of the elephant, and the legs. And you have just the simple building blocks, and say there's a system of disease. It's predictive. It's reflective of what's happening in disease, and it's perpetrates itself. So it self-reinforcing.

And these vicious cycles, it can be hard to get unleashed, you have to back off.

Josh del Sol: Wow. So I want to dive into a couple of areas quickly here. One is the blood-brain barrier breakage. Now if I understand correctly, maybe you can just summarize and clarify my understanding of this. Wireless radiation and other factors contribute to the blood-brain barrier being broken or permeated and then toxins getting in that cause what you described as necrosis. And this non-natural form of cell death within the brain, right? So brain cells.

Can you talk a little bit more about that? What are the toxins that get in? What specifically, how does that permeability happen? Just a quick overview.

Richard Lear: But just imagine the blood-brain barrier is meant to keep out molecules that aren't supposed to cross the brain. They're not nutrients. You want to be able to take nutrients and get them into the brain. You want to be able to recycle all of the waste out of the brain. So those level molecules can cross the blood-brain barrier.

Many drugs cannot. Some drugs can. But what happens, and what we do know is let's say you're outside and you get a bunch of exhaust in your face. Okay. Let's say you're outside and you're smelling the tar on the roof; somebody's got the tar going and all afternoon that smell, that strong smell. Let's say you're in a car where gasoline fumes are heavy, or you've got the gasoline can in the back. All of these are toxic to the body. Toxic to our health.

But what happens typically, and I'll give you another one that's even more powerful, but typically what happens is when these molecules get into our lungs, some get into our bloodstream. They're floating around, and if we're in a good position we can get rid of a lot of this because our bodies are set up to eject some of this toxic energy and these toxic molecules.

But if it's floating through and it goes through the blood and the brain, and suddenly you've got these holes it can supercross. Some of these molecules can get over there. So you can get petrochemicals in your brain. You can get formaldehyde in your brain. All of these things are not good for your brain. Your brain is very sensitive to these kinds of chemicals.

But these chemical molecules are big enough that they will cross now because there's a hole. And so now we have a new situation.

And there's one theory about autism. The theory about autism is this; people are worried about immunization, okay. Why do some kids who are immunized get autism and other kids don't. Well if you one more factor in there. Let's say this group of kids they've been around a lot of wireless energy and chemicals. Let's say their blood-brain barrier has

been compromised with their mom when they were invitro. Their mom had a cell phone, and she was on the cell phone all of the time.

So their blood-brain barrier is compromised. Let's say that a child's not given injections, immunized or whatever. In the immunization formula there are heavy metals at times. These heavy metals now get into the blood.

So both sets of kids, one has a compromised blood-brain barrier, the other doesn't. The ones who have blood-brain barrier who's compromised, they suddenly are on the autistic spectrum. The other kids are fine. Their blood-brain barrier didn't let those heavy metals in, these did.

So I'm not saying this is true. I'm not saying this is fact. But it is something our scientific community should be looking at because it's not always the fact that one thing causes an outcome. It's a combination. It's a cocktail. And this is a cocktail that we should be looking at. Because maybe it's not the immunization itself, but it's the fact that we have some other root circumstances that are allowing this to happen.

Josh del Sol: And that child is perhaps already in P-factor, right?

Richard Lear: It could be. So there's other things, yes.

Josh del Sol: That's really fascinating. Thanks for stringing those thoughts together for us.

I want to also ask more about this basal ganglia, Rich. You mentioned it a couple of times so far. From what I gather, correct me if I'm wrong, there's like a command and control center in the brain — called the basal ganglia that operates at 500 megahertz to 2.5 gigahertz. Which again is within the microwave, the wireless spectrum, right?

Talk to us more about that. What do you think is happening? How big of a factor this basal ganglia perhaps getting crossed signals or mixed signals for being able to do its job from wireless radiation?

Richard Lear: You're not going to find a lot of science in this. The Bergman paper that was published in 1965 cited studies from 1930 to 1965. So people look at that and say, "Ah, this is old stuff, it doesn't really matter. Who's Bergman. Where did he come from?" So a lot of people discount this. But in his paper all of these studies were empirical studies.

So the studies that he's relying on are studies where they took an individual, they inserted an electrode on the top of the person's head. They taped it to the head. And they put it into a light switch. They then had the person grasp something in their hand. This is the motor, your

nervous system, the motor nerves are working. And turn the light on. Turn the light on.

So people wonder if there's electrical energy in the body. Yes, there is. And this gets transmitted from the motor neurons, the motor nerves right up into the basal ganglia. And the basal ganglia is basically sending a message, and it's creating an electrical field that goes out of your head.

It's going to sound crazy. But Bergman talked about intuition, and he talked about hypnotism. And he talked about why we can see things, dousing. And he said, "The capabilities of a human, it centers the basal ganglia." The basal ganglia has receptors and senders. Of electromagnetic energy. And it's operating on DC, and so like DC would be direct current.

But basically it's creating these fields. And the range, he put it in centimeters. But the range, when I calculated it was actually 500 megahertz, which you were right, to 25 gigahertz.

Josh del Sol: 25 gigahertz, okay?

Richard Lear: Which is satellite stuff.

Josh del Sol: Which is 5G stuff, just getting into those higher 5G frequencies.

Richard Lear: Exactly. 5G would be right there. Because a lot of 5G has a 20.18, 20 and some of it goes up to 60. But this is the 5G energy. So we don't know, electromagnetic fields are tricky. Some are positive for us. We have low-powered lasers that are helping brain plasticity. They're doing really well. It's an infrared delivery system. We have some really positive things.

Electrical energy does change the biological situation, both positive and negative. But when you think about the basal ganglia, the way he describes it in the studies he cites is there real evidence that the basal ganglia is the operating center to convert external electrical energy into internal signals into the cells. And internal energy, and internal signals into the cells into electrical signals that we can send.

So this the way he describes it. And his explanation for autonomic disfunction, they called them short waves in the article. Why are these short waves causing people to have heart palpitations? Why are they causing people to sweat? Why are they causing people to have quick arrhythmias? And things like that.

So he said that's were the point is. That's the mechanism of communication. It's the basil ganglia. And there are things that confirm

this. There's a study out three years ago in China, it talks about the ganglia. It talks about ganglia in the spine. A different kind of ganglia. And that ganglia is the same kind of densely nerve cells in a dense actively. And this Chinese team went out and they said, "Okay. We're going to stimulate this ganglia with electrical field. We're going to take a 10-hertz field," 10 hertz is ten cycles per second. "And we're going to stimulate this to see if we can grow neurons."

"We're going to see if we can repair neuronal damage. Let's see if we can fix this." And they got great results at 10 hertz. At 10 hertz they were seeing by stimulating with the 10 hertz, I think it was one-volt or a five-volt signal, I can't remember, and they were getting some regeneration of our nervous system. They were really excited.

Then they said, "Let's try 20." Twenty, guess what they got? Oxidative stress. The body said, "Oh, I don't like that one. I'm going to do what all animals and organisms do; I am going to release free radicals to protect myself." They got freaked out. They tried 50. Oxidative stress. They tried five, oxidative stress.

They found the magic one at ten. Ten hertz was the right frequency for your body to heal. Your body needs electricity to heal.

Robert Becker, the great individual, the doctor and he's looking at electrical fields. He said, "You can only heal at the point of attack, there's a negative field." If you force a positive field in reptiles that were trying to grow new limbs, they wouldn't grow new limbs if it's positive. You let it be negative; they grow a new limb.

Our healing is impaired by the energy that's positive.

Josh del Sol: What do you mean positive and negative fields?

Richard Lear: Well positively charged, and negatively charged.

Josh del Sol: Oh, okay.

Richard Lear: So our bodies operate really well on negative fields.

Josh del Sol: Okay.

Richard Lear: Kind of backwards, right? All of the electrical energy that we create around us, wireless routers, cell phone, Bluetooth, all of that it's a positive charge.

Josh del Sol: It's positive on the polarity.

Richard Lear: Yeah. So basically, what's happening is you can have,

like your cells are operating at minus 25, healthily, minus 25. Millivolts. That's your cell. Well, externally you might be getting millivolts of positive energy. So somehow that may affect your cells. Nobody's done enough research on that. I've haven't found any research to decide like power electrical fields actually changing the polarity or changing the action of your cells.

But the body really likes negative. What else they found was that the acupuncturists in China were getting great results. And so the U.S. wanted to know why in China it was working so well in operations, how could they use acupuncture to do these heavy surgeries?

So what you basically had is you had people mapping the acupuncture points and finding every other one was negative and positive. One negative, this point's positive. The one next is negative. So we have a grid, an invisible grid of acupuncture points that vary between negative and positive.

So electrical energy is an interesting thing. Can be good. Can be bad. But when we're just throwing it out there randomly, it's probably not good.

Josh del Sol: Rich, this is so fascinating. I'm kind of sad that we have to wrap up this conversation now because we're almost out of time.

But I wanted to mention; also, you mentioned healing frequencies. So not all EMF, we are electromagnetic beings; not all electromagnetic fields are harmful. There are some that are healing. And we're going to be talking with one of the experts, one of the pioneers in healing frequencies, Wolfgang Jaksch on the summit. So I'd encourage everyone to check that out as well.

Just in closing, Rich, how concerned are you about the 5G rollout as it is happening now and the proliferation of wireless? What's on the line? How big of a risk is it?

Richard Lear: Well, we're at the tipping point, we've been there. If you look at the explosion of disease, all of these diseases in the 25 years since wireless really started; you have to believe, I have to believe that wireless is forty percent responsible for the \$2.7 trillion health problem that we have in the U.S. today. With just 36 diseases.

That's a trillion four, a trillion two, whatever it is. So if it's 40 percent responsible now. What happens when we put satellites in space and start flooding the world where you can't get away from these electrical fields? What happens when you put 5G signals in our neighborhood 100 feet from our house, and right next to our car, and right next to our lawn? What happens then?

And so the question is nobody knows the exact answer. But there are ways to track it. And we're going I have two sites that are important. One's called *Search for the Cause*. And *Search for the Cause* is looking at both the internal biological causes as well as what are the external wireless, and like chemicals, and like pesticides that are causing all of this havoc.

Josh del Sol: So that's *searchforthecause.com*, right.

Richard Lear: It's *searchforcause.com*.

Josh del Sol: Okay. And you're going to have all of this science on there about P-factor and everything that's related, is that right?

Richard Lear: Exactly.

Josh del Sol: Okay, good.

Richard Lear: And then another way to look at this is what are the solutions? And so, *heroics.com* deals with solutions. *Heroics.com* is where you can go to look at a new era of health, not just a new era of disease, a new era of health. And there's so many people that are heroes. There's innovators, there's great people. There's And the plasticity world. And there's leptin and the epigenetics. And all of these people are making a big impact. There's Martin Paul that's doing incredible science.

There's these people Olle Johansson. These people are looking on the cutting edge. They're outside of the box. And *Heroics* is a place where you can go to find out what's cutting edge, what's happening with trends and our diets. What's going on with Keto. What's going on with all of the new diets going out, is it good or bad? Bone broth. Things like that.

So *heroics.com* is basically asking you to look at the factors in your life, which are P-factors. Which are like the six factors that trigger P. And it's giving you a challenge to reduce the P and actually track it. And we do with a P score that lives on *searchthecause*.

So both sites are going to be important. And we'd love you to come and check them out.

Josh del Sol: Richard Lear, thank you so much for this talk. And for summarizing all of this information. This is amazing and inspiring. And dot-connecting at a deeper level.

Having a deeper understanding of the mechanism and the model that you bring forward, looking at all of these studies; this is a powerful piece.

So again, just encourage our viewers, like with all talks, please share this

talk. Invite people to this talk. That's how we get this information out there. We're doing this to publicize this information.

Thank you.

And, Rich, thank you again for your time today.

Richard Lear: Great to be with you, Josh, good luck.

How Wireless Causes Harm, Part 2

Guest: Dr. Martin Pall

Josh: All right, we're back with Martin Pall on part 2 of our conversation on the summit. Dr. Pall, welcome again.

Dr. Pall: Glad to be with you.

Josh: So, we're going to get into the five most critical areas in terms of areas of human health effects that you've identified, that you can kind of sum up for the audience. It's deeply important that we identify and comprehend this information and then help it to proliferate. But before we do, I want to ask you, what is an overview, according to the science, of environmental or ecological impacts from EMF radiation?

Dr. Pall: I want to talk specifically about 5G. Let me just say in the broader sense that you raised it, the EMFs work on the VGCC's on basically any animal cell, even in various invertebrates. They also, interestingly, work in plants in much the same ways. There is a specific kind of channel in plants. It's often called TPC channels. It has a similar voltage sensor to the ones that we talked about in the last section.

And so that voltage sensor can activate that channel. And when it does that, it allows calcium to flow into the plant cells. It's not as specific as the VGCC's for calcium. But that's the main effect, is through calcium. So, the upshot of that is the EMFs work in plants and animals in various sorts in very much the same way.

And with regard to 5G, as we said before, there are gigantic 5G effects near the surface of the body. But there are also effects that go very, very deeply in the body. But nevertheless, the surface effects are important.

And so, the consequences of that are that organisms which have much higher surface exposure relative to their volume are going to be much more sensitive to 5G effects. And so, I expect that almost all organisms, plants and animals, are going to be more affected than we will. And we will be highly affected.

So, I expect that the ecological impacts will be absolutely stunning, and of a sort that we can barely imagine at this point. But the reason is I think that plants, even large trees, have their leaves and their reproductive organs highly exposed. So, I think they're going to be highly impacted. And the same thing goes for insects and small birds and mammals, which will be highly impacted.

Interestingly, there was a patent that was taken out to use millimeter waves as an insecticide, because you could kill insects really easily with millimeter waves. So, there is some evidence, in fact, that insects are very, very sensitive to these millimeter waves. And again, 5G, because of the extraordinary level of pulsation, will be vastly more dangerous to the insects and to small birds and animals. So, I'm expecting massive ecological impacts of this.

And one of the things I'm specifically expecting, that has to do with the impact on plants, because EMFs in plants make the plants produce much higher levels of highly volatile and highly flammable terpenes. You can get like hundred-fold increases in these terpenes. And so, they become highly flammable. I mean it's like spraying them with a light spray of gasoline.

And I think a lot of the problems with the California fires, in fact, have been caused by the EMFs. And that takes a longer argument than just mentioning it. But I just wanted to mention it. So, I wouldn't be surprised if we have just gigantic, huge fires all over the place from 5G. And I wouldn't be surprised at all if that's true.

Josh: Can we just take another minute and dive into that? I have heard Jack Crews talk about this as well. How does electromagnetic radiation, wireless, and specifically 5G, how does or would it cause fires, forest fires, or house fires? We know about smart meters causing house fires. Can we dive into that for a brief moment?

Dr. Pall: Yea. Well, the smart meters are a different issue. There you have a technological glitch that caused the fires. But no, this is a different situation.

So, what happens is that the EMFs, also working through excessive intracellular calcium, trigger a regulatory system, which in the normal plants just helps protect the plants from insect predation. And when you artificially trigger this thing, you can get much, much higher levels of

these terpenes and terpenoids. And they have a number of properties.

And I'm only going to talk about one of them, and that is that they are very highly flammable. And that's not the only thing that's important, actually, for fires. There are two other things that happen that are also important with regard to the fires. I don't think we have time to talk about those. So, as I say, it's just like spraying the plants with a light spray of gasoline. They're going to be extraordinarily flammable. And they are.

Josh: I think this is a topic of interest, though. Can you also sum up, what are the two other things?

Dr. Pall: Well, one of the things is that the terpenes actually act to spread this response to other plants. They act as a messenger. The second thing is after that, I think that the terpenes, when you accumulate them, can undergo the chemistry of spontaneous combustion. And in so doing, they can start their own fires. But they start their own fires under specific circumstances.

Josh: Such as having high loads of microwave or millimeter-wave radiation around them.

Dr. Pall: Well, that's an assumption, of course, behind it. But basically what you need is very low wind conditions. You need access to oxygen to have spontaneous combustion. But you also have to accumulate heat from the chemistry of spontaneous combustion. If you have a lot of wind, the wind will both blow away the terpenes and will also blow away the heat. So, you can't have that. I think that if you have low wind conditions, you can generate fires by spontaneous combustion, through the impacts on the plants.

Josh: So, okay, this is some commentary, a bit of speculation in comparison to the other elements of what we're talking about today, which are much more established as fact. But this is your opinion based upon a deep understanding of the existing body of science.

Dr. Pall: Yea. I mean there's other evidence that comes into this. I wasn't planning on talking about this, but yea, there is other evidence that comes into this.

Josh: Thank you for just being willing to go there. So, diving in, your five specific areas that we're going to talk about here in this part two, neuro-psychiatric, reproductive, autism and ADHD, DNA, and early onset Alzheimer's and dementias, not in that order. We'll start with that last one first. What is very early onset Alzheimer's, and what does the science say about EMFs and its relation to early onset Alzheimer's and other dementias?

Dr. Pall: Okay. So, Alzheimer's historically has been a disease of old people. What we're finding is that over the last fifteen to twenty years or so, there has been a substantial decrease on the average age of onset of Alzheimer's disease, which requires an explanation. And this, of course, roughly corresponds to the time when we've had huge increases in the EMF exposures. That doesn't mean that the EMF exposures are causing it, but it suggests that it may be causing it.

The other thing which is true is that there are some epidemiological studies which suggest that EMFs cause Alzheimer's. Those have been involved mainly with extremely low frequency exposures. And as I mentioned in the last section, the extremely low frequencies work on the same target as the microwave frequencies. So, they are relevant to the issue of what microwave frequencies are, but we're not directly assessing that here. So, there is evidence that electricians and other people who have high exposures to extremely low frequencies have higher incidences of Alzheimer's disease.

Now there is literature showing that not only Alzheimer's disease, but all of the neuro-degenerative diseases, they each have an essential role for excessive intracellular calcium. So, as we mentioned in the last section, the EMFs act by VGCC activation. And the first thing that happens when you do that is you get excessive intracellular calcium. So, the fact that all of the neuro-degenerative diseases have an essential role for excessive intracellular calcium, of course, is consistent with the idea that the EMFs should be able to trigger these.

The other things that have been shown is that you can get increases in neuronal cells and culture of the production of the amyloid beta-protein, which is characteristic of Alzheimer's disease. So, you get this effect from the big increases in the amyloid beta-protein. And there are plausible mechanisms by which this can occur. And in particular, we mentioned in the last section that NF- κ B is activated by the MS. And any increase in NF- κ B will increase the level of crucial protease activity that's involved in producing the beta amyloid protein. So, with all of that said, when you look at mechanisms, what you see is that you see there's a lot of evidence that's consistent, and specifically that this is going on, at least that may be going on.

Now, there were two really crucial studies that were published by a research group in China. I think the senior author is Jiang, et. al. And they found that if you gave a whole series of short pulses to rats, to young rats, and then you stopped exposing the rats. So, you just did this for a certain period of time, and then you stopped.

Then you ask, what happens when they're in the equivalent of middle-age rats? And the answer is absolutely stunning. What you see is that all of the rats that were irradiated appeared to have the equivalent of

Alzheimer's disease. They have the usual problems with memory and behavior that you see in Alzheimer's in humans. And they also have high levels of the amyloid beta protein and oxidative stress in the brain, which is, again, what we find in Alzheimer's disease. So, this is truly stunning.

Now, we talked before about the fact that 5G is extraordinarily highly pulsed. That's what it's intended to do, is to extraordinarily highly pulse. So, it's reasonable to expect that you're going to get huge responses to these pulsations. We do have experimental evidence, which again, I referred to in the last section, that millimeter waves, which are the frequencies that will probably be used with 5G (there are some people that are backtracking on that), can produce effects on the EEGs in brains of humans. And therefore, it can impact the brains in other ways, because you're seeing impact on those brains, on human brains.

And that doesn't include all the pulsations which 5G will entail. Everything we know about pulsations means that that's going to make things vastly, vastly worse. So, it's reasonable to expect that 5G exposures will produce a similar effect to what you see from the pulsations in the rats. And if it does, then we will produce either universal or near universal early-onset Alzheimer's disease from 5G exposures.

And again, I'm not saying that I have absolute proof of this. What I am saying is that we are taking risks of the sort that no rational society on earth can possibly take. This is not something that any rational society would even think for a microsecond is something that might be an acceptable risk.

Josh: So, Martin, I just want to jump in here. So, there are many studies that indicate this risk, this risk of neuro-degenerative diseases that are all increasing in humanity, relating to EMF and wireless and millimeter-wave radiation. That one study that you mentioned, was it a Chinese study that looked at that?

Dr. Pall: Yea, there were two Chinese studies, the same group.

Josh: Okay, just to confirm, you're saying that those studies were mice or rats.

Dr. Pall: Rats.

Josh: Rats that were exposed with pulses earlier in their life, but then not exposed, and then later on in their lives, they showed Alzheimer's-like conditions. Is that correct?

Dr. Pall: That is correct.

Josh: Okay.

Dr. Pall: Let me just say, Alzheimer's in humans is thought to have a long latency period, from the time you start until the time you start seeing symptoms. And so, this pattern is very, very similar. Except, of course, rats, and generally in rodents, things go about fifteen times faster than they do in humans.

Josh: Yea. Now what do you say in terms of, let's say, some skeptics might have a question about, "Well, if you observe it in mice or rats, it doesn't necessarily translate to an effect on humans, because they're just too, different, apples and oranges." What do you say? Because I've received that kind of comment before over the time of educating people about EMFs. How do you answer that?

Dr. Pall: I think you answer it in two ways. One is that there is a huge literature on animal models of human disease. And so, these are very, very important studies. There are billions of dollars every year that go into these studies, obviously because the NIH and other funding agencies think they are highly relevant to what goes on in humans. So, in fact, here you've got studies and they show this.

And the other thing is that a lot of these animal-model studies, in fact, are stunningly good models of what goes on in humans. And again, people use these models to try to determine mechanisms of what's going on in the human condition. And then, it's more difficult to look at humans. But once you find out how it works in the animals, it's usually a lot easier to look at humans and try to confirm that something similar is going on. And these are things that are very, very important in terms of our understanding of human disease.

Josh: Yea, thank you. So, topic number two is autism and ADHD. What does the science tell us about the link between EMF and autism and ADHD?

Dr. Pall: Okay. So, first of all, I want to say, again, the EMFs act primarily through VGCC activation, and through then excessive intracellular calcium. And so, there is a lot of evidence from genetic studies that mutations in the VGCCs and also in some other genes that influence the activity of the VGCCs, the mutations that produced excessive activity of VGCCs can cause autism. We know that. There is no question about that.

And the other thing which is clear is that there are what are called genetic polymorphism studies. So, here you're looking at relatively common variants in human populations where the form of the gene, again, produces higher activity for the VGCCs. It produces increased susceptibility to autism. So, that says the VGCCs are important, not just in rare mutations, but in the general population that develops autism.

Josh: Is that what polymorphism means? Is that species-wide genetic polymorphism?

Dr. Pall: Yea, genetic polymorphisms are defined as genes in the human genome, where the frequency of that particular form (it's called an allele) is at least one percent of the total. And that then allows you to study those in populations, or they're frequent enough. In other words, you can study them in populations.

So, if I remember correctly, the one that's been studied the most is something like, I don't know, nine or ten percent or something of the forms of this particular gene. And that one, it turns out, is associated with all kinds of biological neuro-psychiatric effects. Autism is only one of them. And so, you get increased susceptibility to a lot of different things.

And then there are also, it turns out, there are polymorphisms in a couple of T-type VGCCs. We haven't talked about what those are, but they're VGCCs that are particularly susceptible to activation. And they also have roles in autism. So, you've got more activity in those and you get more autism, more susceptibility to autism. So, a lot of things of that sort. And so, what I wanted to do . . . And there are a couple of epidemiological studies that also argue for this.

And there's at least one animal study that argues for it, for autism being caused by the EMFs. Interestingly, actually more animal studies have been done with ADHD, which I think, and I think a lot of other people think is, or at least should be considered part of the autism spectrum, just down at a lower level of effects compared with full-fledged autism.

And in animals, this has been shown, I believe, in mice. If you do prenatal exposures to EMFs and then you stop exposing them, the mice develop ADHD-like effects that go all the way through adulthood. So, these are very long-lasting effects, where there are changes in the brain caused by the radiation in utero that produce long-term changes in behavior very similar to what we see in ADHD. There are also, by the way, some epidemiological evidence that argues that EMFs are involved with causing ADHD as well.

So, there are a lot of different kinds of evidence pointing in this direction. I think what we should talk about is a figure that discusses how this whole thing works. And I'm going to put on something on my screen. So, you're going to be looking at a figure here. If you look at the center top part of it, you've got low-intensity microwaves and various other frequency EMFs, which activate the VGCCs and produce increased intracellular calcium. That's what Ca^{2+} is, the increased intracellular calcium.

So, you're following down there towards the lower left. And the increased intracellular calcium then impacts five different mechanisms that are involved in the formation of the synapses in the developing brain. And so, during the perinatal period, the period just before birth and just after birth, there is a huge amount of synapse formation.

So, the synapses are the ways in which different neurons in the brain communicate with each other. And in order for the brain to work right, it has to have the right kinds of synapses, or at least largely the right kinds of synapses. And so, the synaptic formation is very important.

And it turns out that there are five mechanisms there you can see that control dendritic outgrowths, synapse formations, synapse maturations, synapse elimination, and also something else called MECP2 function. All of those have critical roles in regulating the formation of the synapses. All five of those things are regulated by intracellular calcium. So, this is really stunning that you can get these effects through the VGCC activation.

Now I also think the chemicals have roles in this process. And we talked about this before in the earlier section, I guess. You can get chemicals acting on the NMDA receptors. We see that on the upper right side; again, producing increases in intracellular calcium, making that impact on synapse formation as well.

There are reasons why I think that the primary driver of the autism epidemic is probably the EMFs, rather than the chemicals. The main reason why I think that is that a lot of the chemicals that act to activate the NMDA receptors, the increases in the amounts of those chemicals skyrocketed in the thirty years following World War 2. That was really before the autism epidemic started. So, my feeling is that those chemicals are not the primary driver. They may act synergistically with the EMFs, however. And so, I'm not saying they don't have any important roles. I think they probably do.

Josh: What about metals such as mercury in terms of driving autism, according to your research, and also metals combining with EMFs to act as antenna, if you will?

Dr. Pall: Well, the metals, mercury acts also to give you increases in NMDA receptor activity. And some other toxic metals can also do that. So, they can have roles through these pathways. Let me just say that the action of these different chemicals, they act along different pathways in order to impact the NMDA receptors.

So, unlike the EMFs, which are directly acting on the VGCCs through the voltage sensor, here you have various kinds of pathways by which different kinds of chemicals can act. But they act along different

pathways to give you impacts of this sort, where you get excessive intracellular calcium. And they also can impact the synapse formation.

So, that's the basic pattern. And let me just say, there is a huge amount of evidence that the synapse formation is absolutely key in autism of various sorts, including the fact that autism patients, and autism animal models have changes in the conductivity of the brain. And it's the synapse formation that determines the conductivity of the brain. So, these are all things that are, I think, quite important.

Josh: What can you say about, you mentioned in your work the role of de novo mutations that have been observed? What are de novo mutations, and how do they relate to autism, just in brief before we move on to the third category?

Dr. Pall: Yea, that's a very important point, and it allows us to move on to the third. So, what happens is that, we talked about the DNA effects in the last section. You get cellular DNA damage produced. And the way it is produced is from the free radicals derived from peroxynitrite. They attack the DNA, and you get single-stranded breaks, you get double-stranded breaks, and you get oxidized bases in the cellular DNA.

Those things, then, can produce de novo mutations when they occur in germline cells, that is cells that end up producing sperm or eggs. And then you can pass those mutations on to the next generation. So, something like twelve to fifteen percent of the autism patients have de novo mutations of a sort that influences the occurrence of autism and that impacts either directly or indirectly the synaptic formation in the developing brain.

So, we think that these de novo mutations . . . So, a de novo mutation is something that did not occur in either parent. Neither the male parent or the female parent had a mutation. So, that means that the mutation occurred in a specific germ cell, or at least in a precursor of a specific germ cell. And that then caused it to be passed on to the fetus. And that then greatly increases the occurrence of autism in those people that carry those mutations.

And what's important here is the following. When you look at mutations, you can look at them in different ways. So, one way of looking at them is in terms of what kind of changes are occurring in the DNA at the DNA level, and how can those kinds of changes be produced.

Josh: Okay. So, just to wrap up this second section, autism and ADHD, if the viewer wants to go deeper, I can suggest Dr. Martha Herbert's research with Harvard. She has done some research in this area. Are there any other points or any other recommendations that you would

have in going deeper on autism and EMF?

Dr. Pall: Well, the thing that I wanted to mention to you . . . There are studies on the role of synapses and synaptic formation in autism. There are studies on the role of intracellular calcium in autism. Those are things that are very important here. But the other thing that I want to say here is the following. Three kinds of mutations that we talked about, there are three kinds of DNA changes that are produced through VGCC activation. Those three can produce the major types of mutations at the DNA level that, in fact, are involved in causing autism. Those are chromosomal rearrangements, copying over mutations, and point mutations. And all three of those turn out to be very important sources of the de novo mutations that occur in autism.

Josh: Okay. And this is our third area, DNA effects.

Dr. Pall: Right.

Josh: What else do we need to know about how EMF affects DNA?

Dr. Pall: Well, the main thing you need to know is that there is a large amount of evidence that human sperm can have these DNA changes, DNA attacks on human sperm. And those are the same changes that we know produce mutations. So, the linkage between the DNA changes and the mutation is very well documented.

And one would expect then when you have exposures of the sort that we are exposed to often every day, Wi-Fi, cell phone radiation, cell phone tower radiation, etc., when you have those things every day we are exposed to, you have to be very, very concerned about what's happening to the human gene pool, to what's the sum total of all the genes that we have in humanity. And how much contamination is going on of that gene pool because of high levels of mutation?

And I have to say the most convincing evidence that we have, that we are seeing a big increase in mutation, I think comes from the autism studies that we talked about earlier. There's something going on there to produce these mutations in the autism individuals. And they are becoming much more common than they used to be. So, we have reason to be deeply concerned about that. And that's the third issue. Are we in the process of destroying our gene pool? And if so, then we're extinct for that reason as well.

Josh: Okay, so, about the DNA effects, Martin, how far along are we in that potentially irreversible change, genetic change in humanity? And what do you feel, according to the science, how much worse are we going to find 5G to be, just in terms of DNA mutations?

Dr. Pall: Yea, okay. Well, look, first of all, this is not a potentially irreversible. Mutations are irreversible, and they are cumulative. You just accumulate more and more. You almost never have a reversal of a mutation. It's extraordinarily rare to have reversal of a mutation. So, what we have here is a situation that things are inherently cumulative and irreversible.

Now, as I alluded to before, in some ways I think the autism genetics data is the best data we have that argues that we're already far along in terms of mutations. The autism incidence has gone up something like two-hundred-fold over the last fifty years or so. And when you've got twelve to fifteen percent of those carrying these de novo mutations, you're talking about a lot of events. So, it's still a minority, but it's still a lot of events. And these are the mutations that are occurring in genes that influence the synaptic connections. But there are, of course, lots and lots of other genes that don't.

So, I think that argues that we are already pretty far along in terms of the mutations, based on the exposures we've already had. And, of course, again, the reason that I'm so concerned about 5G is that both the frequency and the incredible stunning amount of pulsation it will involve means that the effects on the VGCCs will be vastly greater. And, therefore, everything will be hugely increased.

And let me just say something more about that, because when you look at double-strand breaks in the cellular DNA, they have certain special properties. And that is that when you have two double-strand breaks in different locations, you end up getting various kinds of chromosomal rearrangements. They're going to go up more or less as at least the square of the dose, maybe even higher.

So, that means when you see a much bigger effect from a huge amount of VGCC activation, you could see gigantic increases. And I expect to see gigantic increases from 5G. So, what the industry is doing with 5G is making it impossible, impossible, for people to avoid this stuff. It's just horrible. It's just outrageous what's going on.

And one of the things that we haven't talked about, which I think is terribly important, Dr. Boyd Haley proposed that the level of male dysfunction that we're seeing is caused by essentially the same mechanism that is involved in causing autism and ADHD. And if that's true, and both autism and ADHD are much more common in males than in females. And we know, for instance, from genetic studies, that the same gene found in a male produces more severe effects than that gene found in the female.

So, for whatever reason, males are more sensitive to that issue of the disruption of the synaptic formation and in the developing fetus. I think

that may be due to the unique hormonal situation of male fetuses, where you've got testosterone produced from the fetus, but you also have a lot of estrogen and progesterone from the mother. There may be things of that sort going on. But for whatever reason, males are more sensitive.

So, if this is what's causing male dysfunction, and the process goes on during the perinatal period, then dysfunctional males that we're looking at are mostly age twenty or greater, or maybe eighteen or greater. So, they were in utero at least eighteen to twenty years ago and also much more than that when the exposures were vastly lower than they are. So, with that said, if Haley's view is right, and we've have had huge, huge increases in exposures, what it means is that we will have a gigantic epidemic of male dysfunction coming down the way from the exposures we've already had.

Josh: How do you define male dysfunction?

Dr. Pall: There are a lot of things in males. Males don't do nearly as well in school as they used to. Males have difficulty now in taking responsibility for things. And I think, in fact, many young males feel that they're not functioning in the way that either the society or they expect. And so, they are frustrated as hell about it, and for good reason. I think that a lot of the political changes that we've seen are probably caused by that. And so those are things that are important.

There are all kinds of things that we haven't talked about that are really major, major issues, one of them being the fact that the electromagnetic fields are actually physiologically addictive. I think that we talked about that on the phone. And that's a huge, huge issue. So, as I say, every time I look at something new, it makes things vastly worse. You know, in 5G, the more you think about it, the more of an absolute total nightmare it is. It's just incredible. Again, no rational society on Earth can possibly take these risks.

Josh: Yea, what a wakeup call. Okay, going on to the fourth area, what reproductive effects? You mentioned that you touched on this previously. But what reproductive effects have you observed in humans and animals from following EMF exposure?

Dr. Pall: Okay, so again, you get changes in the structure of the testis, the structure of the ovaries. And those have been studied in animals. You get increases in sperm counts, increases in sperm motility, and lowered sperm quality based on other kinds of measures. You get lower levels of oocytes of eggs. That's been shown in animals. You get increases in spontaneous abortion. There's a lot of evidence in humans of that. And you get decreases in each of the three types of sex hormones and decreases in libido. So, all those things are going on.

Now, how far along are these in human populations? And here we get to really crucial stuff. So, there was a big meta-analysis that was published by Levine et. al. in 2018, if I remember correctly, which showed that sperm counts have dropped below 50 percent of normal in every single technologically advanced country on Earth. And reproductive rates in all of those countries, with a single exception, have dropped well below replacement levels.

So, they were running in 2016 about seventy-three percent of replacement levels. That means you're going to have a big drop in, and you already have a big drop in births. And you're going to have a big drop in children going through school and then workers and so forth within one generation. Now, maybe you can say we've got too many people. Maybe that's good. Maybe that's alright. And that might be true.

But what happened, there was an animal study that was published by Margaret [inaudible] twenty-one years ago, where they showed that young pairs of mice put in little cages on the ground in an antenna park where the levels—they actually studied two levels. But both of those levels were well within our safety guidelines, so nothing should have happened. But what happened was there was an immediate drop within the first liter.

So, a liter of mice takes thirty days. They're really quick. So, you get a first liter in roughly thirty days and your second liter in sixty days and so forth. What happened at the higher level of exposure is there was a drop in the first liter, a drop in the second liter, no third liter. No third liter.

Josh: Ninety days later.

Dr. Pall: Yea, yea. And that apparently was irreversible or almost completely irreversible. Essentially you take them out of EMFs and you see almost no recovery at all in the reproductive rate. The same thing happened at the lower level exposure, except it took to the fifth liter to crash to zero. You get irreversible or almost irreversible. So, within a very short time period in mice, you can get a complete crash in reproduction.

Now those mice were exposed under uniform conditions. That is each location, you had uniform. So, you expect them to behave more uniformly than they will in human populations. We have more variation. And in addition to that, things as I said before go roughly fifteen times faster in rodents than in humans. So, you wouldn't expect us to crash that quickly.

So, then the question is are we seeing any evidence for crashes in human populations? And I think now we are starting to see evidence of that. And those occurred between 2016 and 2017 in three small,

densely populated, high-technology East Asian countries. And those are Singapore, which had a thirty-one percent drop in reproduction in one year, absolutely stunning. Macao, which really isn't a separate country, but has separate statistics, had a twenty-six percent drop. And South Korea had an eleven percent drop in reproduction within one year.

The South Korean government has been trying to stimulate reproduction, because they knew it was way too low. And it has totally failed, as you can see. The first six months of 2018 for South Korea are out, and they had another roughly nine percent drop in reproduction. So, I think those countries are going over the cliff. And they're now down well into the forties range based on 2017.

Josh: Forties range of what?

Dr. Pall: In the forty-percent range of replacement levels. So, within a couple of years, if this continues, they will be looking at extinction. I think the rest of the technologically advanced countries will follow along within another couple of years. The U. S., interestingly, in 2018 had a two percent drop in reproduction. That's not enough really to say, "Okay, we're crashing." But it may be the first part of it.

And so, I think that, again, we're looking at risks of the sort that no rational society on Earth can possibly take. We may well, and again, if we have, and these are based on the exposures we already have, obviously. If you put in 5G, it will probably have a gigantic effect. Further expansion of 4G is probably going to have a gigantic effect. And putting a radar in cars so they can drive themselves, that gives a lot of extra exposures.

I mean we're running as fast as we can in exactly the wrong direction. And so, here again, we have every reason to think that we will probably have population crashes within a few years. I mean I estimate something like four years at this point.

Josh: That's amazing. I mean it's really hard-hitting. That reminds me of that movie from maybe fifteen years ago called "Children of Men," in which nobody knew why people couldn't have babies anymore.

And nobody knew maybe if we apply it to this real-life scenario is because of the incredible super-prevalent incidents of propaganda and industry spin and preventing this information and fake studies by the industry. And all of this is really positioning our scenario so that humanity is being threatened from being able to continue.

So, by people sharing this information and bringing awareness to it and having solutions like Timothy Schoechle talks about in the summit, like others talk about in the summit, that we can go to wired. It's simple. There are examples of cities that are doing it and reducing our wireless

exposures. We're seeing now the critical need of getting this information out. So, let us avoid that scenario like in that movie, "Children of Men," by getting this information out.

So, just wrapping up here, a few minutes, if we could. Running out of time, but the fifth area is neuro-psychiatric effects. Dr. Pall, what does the science tell us about EMF exposures and neuro-psychiatric effects?

Dr. Pall: Okay. Well, so, I published a paper on this in 2016. And what's interesting is that I keep discovering other people who have found similar patterns. At the time that I wrote that paper, there were two or three earlier studies that showed similar patterns, and now I know of a total of ten. That's interesting.

So, what I found was that you get effects. People argue and they find, "I can't sleep. I'm tired all the time. I'm depressed. I'm anxious. My memory doesn't work." There are also sensory problems that develop in the eyes and in the ears and so forth. And so, anxiety and depression have become incredibly common all over the place. Lack of sleep, lack of concentration, all of these things are epidemic in our societies.

And almost everybody knows that. You can't miss it. And we know they are all caused by EMF exposures and various types of EMF exposures, not just one type or two types or something. And yet, we're ignoring this stuff.

The underlying mechanism is primarily a mechanism which has been studied in animals, and that is the brain function. The brain structure, rather, is impacted by these low intensity EMFs. And those things develop slowly over time, as do the neurological neuro-psychiatric effects. What you see is that the brains in these animals, these were studies done, a lot of them in the 1960s and even 1950s, where you could take animals and expose them for different periods of time and then look at the structure of the brain.

And what you find is that initially the structure changes slowly over time. If you then take the animals out of those exposures, they will recover spontaneously. You put them in a low EMF environment, they will recover. It will take a couple of months or something, but they will recover. If you keep exposing them, the effects get more and more severe with time. And then they become irreversible, at least apparently irreversible. You take them out of the field and they still have these.

You get absolutely bad effects on the structure of these brains. And one of the things I remember reading about was the average neuron in the brain has about a thousand synapses. And they were doing these studies, and what do they find? They find a neuron that has zero synapses; zero synapses! Imagine you go from something like a

thousand to zero. How massive the effects have to be to produce that!

And so, you see these things. They become extraordinarily powerful. And there were also occupational exposure studies which were done on humans, which showed that these effects are cumulative. So, you look after, let's say a year-and-a-half to two years of exposure. You have modest effects. You look after six years and they become really vastly more serious. So, they become much more severe with time.

So, when you have these things that are already widely occurring in our populations, and where you have things like, for instance, people live near cell phone towers, people living within three-hundred meters of a cell phone tower, which is probably forty percent of the population, having substantial impacts on these neurological and neuro-psychiatric effects. We have major, major impacts from many of these exposures that we have. And all of this is covered up by the industry propaganda. It's really extraordinarily disturbing what is going on here.

And so, my guess, my projection, and this is based on what we know from the occupational exposure studies and what we know from the animal studies. And as I say, things typically go about fifteen times faster in the animals. That's a rough estimate.

You can make some . . . and my guess that I made about a year ago was that we probably had something like five to seven years until our brain function would absolutely crash. In that case we would go into utter chaos. And I have to say, given what's happened over the last year, I think that's probably a reasonable estimate. I mean I think we're going down that route. That's based on the exposures we already have.

I'm not talking about 5G. I'm not talking about further expansion of 4G. I'm not talking about putting radar in cars. We have every expectation that our collective brain function will crash. I'd guess now that it's something like four to six years from now. And again, that's completely apart from 5G. 5G might make it four to six months.

Josh: So, you're talking about . . . Okay, just to sum this up. I mean this is obviously heavy for us all. But it's a science-based realization of what could very well be happening to the human species. This isn't fear-mongering. It's not projecting based upon lack of facts. You are a scientist, and you're a professor emeritus. And you're telling us that by pushing this wireless and micromillimeter wave radiation agenda forward, we could have only a handful of years left for civilization as we know it.

Dr. Pall: No, I'm saying that given the exposures we already have. If we put out 5G, we could crash within months. And if your collective brain function crashes, we would just go into utter chaos.

Josh: Okay, so, do you have with this knowledge and perspective that you have, do you have any hope for the future? Are there any silver linings? And if so, what would we need to do in order to preserve life, in order to have a safe and healthy future?

Dr. Pall: There are lots of things we could do. But the first thing we have to stop doing is running as fast as we can the wrong direction. And that's putting out more and more of these exposures. So, we really have to block 5G. We have to block 5G. We can't have that. We have to really block further expansion of 4G. And the answer is trying to basically do both of them together. And we have to stop putting radar in cars to drive themselves. We have to look very skeptically at any further exposure. And we have to start reducing exposures. A lot of these exposures are not that hard to reduce. We have countries where cell phone towers can only put out 1 percent of the radiation that ours do.

Josh: Like India, for example, cut theirs tenfold. They reduced their emission standards by a factor of ten a number of years ago, based upon largely the sterility and reproductive studies, I believe.

Dr. Pall: Yea.

Josh: Okay, now you talked about what we as a society need to do. What about at the individual level? What's a good strategy from your perspective?

And others are speaking about this in the summit. But is it getting together, sharing the information, and is educating our local governments and teaming up with them to make a stand against industry's push?

Dr. Pall: Well, I mean ideally that would be true. I have to say I'm living in Portland, Oregon, which thinks of itself as a right-thinking sort of place. And the city council and mayor just caved on all of this stuff. So, it's a real challenge. And it's not like nobody told them what was going on. I have to say we probably need a few hundred-thousand lawsuits. That's probably what we need.

Josh: Like with Monsanto and that two-billion dollars now in May 2019. The lawsuits there, we need the same thing to happen and swiftly in this wireless situation.

Dr. Pall: We need something that's the rough equivalent of what we did in World War 2. This needs a major, major effort. It needs something where we have the sense of that if we don't do this, we will be doomed. And I don't think that is an overstatement at all.

And let me just say, the five scenarios that I just outlined, you can argue

against them. There are arguments against them. I don't think they are very good arguments, but there are arguments against them. And let's say maybe one or two of them are wrong. You still can become extinct from the others. I mean the point is we're doing . . .

And there are lots of things. For instance, we don't need Wi-Fi for anything. We can do everything wired. And I was amazed when I went back to Washington State University after I gave the talk on this stuff. When was it? About four or five years ago, shortly after I published that. I guess it was about five years ago now. And I was shocked since I left there, they've taken out all the wired connections. We had wired connections in every single office on the campus. They put in Wi-Fi. I mean how stupid can you get?

And now we have college students who are exposed to Wi-Fi all the time. And what do we find? We find the suicide rate skyrocketed. The level of depression has skyrocketed. That's not surprising. There are just all kinds of stuff that is just simply stupid. I don't know.

What's interesting about this when I talk about these things, and I say these things. These things you need to think about. These are outrageous things to say. There are a few people who actually call me on it. They say, "This is outrageous. It can't possibly be true." Because I think so many of us have the feeling that all kinds of things are really going wrong, and we know they are going wrong. And therefore, when you hear something that makes sense out of how they are going wrong, why they're going wrong, it resonates with people's personal experience.

So, I think there are lots of ways we can make these improvements. The hardest thing has to do with cell phones. But I'm sure cell phones could be designed to be much safer than they are. There are patents that companies have taken out on how one can do that. But they're not doing it. And so, even the most difficult thing, which is cell phones, and everything else can be wired.

Josh: Yea. Wow! I'm just feeling the gravity of this. And I'm feeling the responsibility to just really help this get out in as big of a way possible, so that we can start making the changes at home and within community, the online community, with getting with others, with other groups, and educating our elected officials, and really mitigating the harm.

And at the same time, we need to stop these agendas. We need massive lawsuits. We need empowered movements, notice of liability process. I've entrusted that to Cal and the board. And we need them to come out and to release that in a big way. We need in-the-box lawsuits, legal action, like we're seeing with Monsanto. This is really like I'm just feeling the emotion of this. And I'm just appealing if you're watching this, please help this get out. And please get involved in this conversation.

We're doing this from a place of love and from preserving life. And Martin is presenting the facts in a very powerful way that's challenging you right now, as much as it's challenging me. I know that. But I just encourage you to be part of the solution. And just trust in the essence of life that is bringing us together at this time.

There are amazing things happening and transformations happening in the world. We know that there is an awakening happening. And we feel on the other end the compression, the tension, the death-wish almost that the shadow-side of humanity has.

And so, I just invite and encourage you to be part of this. If you're watching this, thank you. And I encourage you to go deeper and share this information and decide that we are going to save our species. We are going to take a stand for life, for our kids, and for everything that we value.

So, with that being said, Martin, I'm just so grateful for your information, for presenting this in a way that is so . . . Obviously it's challenging. It's heavy. But it's a wakeup call. It's a reality check. And it's science-based. So, thank you so much. Do you have any closing thoughts for the viewers on this talk?

Dr. Pall: Well, I just wanted to add something. And that is there are approaches to shielding that can be useful. We haven't talked about those.

Josh: Yea. We have other experts on the summit talk about those. But absolutely, shielding fabrics, paints, wiring your mice or keyboards, wired internet and so forth, absolutely.

Dr. Pall: I mean the only other thing I would say is that everything you care about, that I care about, anybody cares about, is being severely attacked by this. Everything is being severely attacked. And I have to say my worst nightmare is that perhaps our collective brain function has already deteriorated to the point where we can't deal with this; in which case we're doomed. I certainly hope that that's not true. But when you look around the world and you see what's happening, I think you have to ask the question. It's really incredible what's happening.

Josh: It's real. It's getting real on the planet, planet Earth.

Dr. Pall: Yea.

Josh: Martin, thank you so much again for your time today and for helping wake us up to the reality of the situation.

Dr. Pall: Thanks for doing this.

Wireless Radiation in Autoimmunity

Guest: Dr. Tom O'Bryan

Josh: With us today on the summit is Dr. Tom O'Bryan. Tom, welcome and thank you so much for joining us today.

Dr. O'Bryan: Thank you, Josh. It's a pleasure, such an important topic that I'm grateful to be a part of it.

Josh: Thank you. I'm just going to share with our audience a little bit about your bio. So Dr. Tom O'Bryan is an award winning author and internationally recognized speaker on food sensitivities, environmental toxins and the development of autoimmune diseases. And he's considered a Sherlock Holmes for chronic disease. He holds faculty positions with the Institute of Functional Medicine at the National University of Health Sciences, and has trained and certified 10s of thousands of practitioners around the world. Dr. Tom is the producer of the video series entitled *Betrayal, The Autoimmune Disease Solution They're Not Telling You* which has been seen by a worldwide audience of now more than 500,000. Wow, you've been at this for quite some time, haven't you?

Dr. O'Bryan: Oh, my goodness. You know, it was January of 2013 that my friend, JJ Virgin got me to come to one of her events. And you know, I had never gone to any of these events. And at that event, I actually raised my hand and said, "Excuse me, can you tell me what a celiac is?" Because I didn't understanding any of that. And it was that weekend that I decided, I haven't been playing way too small. It's time to just go out there even though I don't know what I'm doing. And I said, "I'm going to interview the world leaders on celiac disease and wheat related

disorders outside of celiac disease, and I'm going to put it online. Will you guys help me?" And everyone in the room said, "Sure, we'll send announcements out for you." So I did the gluten summit, came out in November of 2013. It was a first gluten summit to come out ever.

And so I did this thing. And we just made it up. We didn't know what we're doing, you know. But I went to Oxford, England and interviewed the godfather of celiac disease and leaders all over the world. And it was so successful that my friends called and said, "How did you do that? I want to do that on detox, or I want to do that on thyroid." And I said, "Well, we just made it out. You know, there is no playbook. We just made it up." And they said, "Can I talk to your staff? Is that okay?" I said, "Sure."

So my staff then called me, within a couple weeks said, "Doc, so many people want us to do this for them. Let's form a company. And let's do this." And I said, "Oh, you guys, go ahead. It's not my passion. You know, it's not my dream, but you guys go ahead." And that was the formation of health talks online, which has carried out most of the summits in the last six years that 10s of millions of people have seen.

Josh: So obviously, our partners as well are getting this out. So that's a really fascinating story. I'm so glad that you follow that intuition to get powerful information out to the world. And I can relate to that because with "Take Back Your Power"; my film exposing smart meters, when I first started that in 2011 I was like, "I don't know what I'm doing. I've never made a movie, but this information needs to get out." So it ended up taking two years as a passion project that I'm so blessed to have more than 500 people contribute to get that out. But yeah, you just make a decision and the way opens up. So thank you so much for that.

Dr. O'Bryan: That's the important point here is that I didn't know what I was doing. You didn't know what you were doing. But we just had the passion. And I think that's the key to doing such fulfilling work in life, that it's now work. It's fulfilling. You know, it gives you the juice of life when you're doing what you know you're here to do.

Josh: Yeah, that's right. So in this journey, when did you first learn about electromagnetic?

Dr. O'Bryan: My first week in my medical education going to Chicago. My wife was still in Ann Arbor because she had to continue for four more months to get her degree. So I come to Chicago, I'm alone. And the first week, there was a sign in the hallway that said Dr. Sheldon Deal, Mr. Arizona, was going to be speaking this weekend about electromagnetic. This is January 1978. So I go to this seminar and you know, for students, it was like 20 bucks or something. And I go to the seminar, and Dr. Deal had a color TV on in the room with the volume off, but the picture was on. And he walked over to his briefcase on a table, opened it up and

took out a bar magnet the size of an iPhone.

And he walked up to the color TV and the picture went upside down. And he walked away it went right side up. And he walked towards it, it went upside down. And he walked away to it right side up. And he said, that's what electromagnetic pollution does to your brain and your nervous system; is called neurological switching. And you get switch.

And those people say right when they mean left. They write backwards or they write numbers backwards or they they're going for their right foot and they lift up their left foot. But there's some switching going on. And that was 1978. And what he was teaching about was his concern about batteries on your body. And what was that? Electric watches had come out just a few years before or something. And so he was talking about their battery on your wrists and how it affects your nervous system.

And then 1979, I came across a research paper that said children that live within a quarter mile of high power tension wires have a much higher incidence of lymphoma and cancers in general, but mostly lymphomas. 1981 there was a paper that came out that said adults, higher incidence of cancers if they live within a quarter mile of high power tension wires. So this information has been kind of trickling out since 1980s, have some damage. And this is just peripheral. I wasn't focusing on this. These papers just came across my desk as I was looking at concepts about holistic health care in functional medicine.

Josh: And obviously it's snowballed from there and it seems like you've stayed with it. You told me before when we were booking this interview; you've been studying 5G for the past eight months or so. So we'll get into that in a moment. I've wanted to first just sort of like zoom out and just kind of tap into the breadth of your knowledge and ask you what's causing the increase? If you could sum up in a minute or two, perhaps, what is causing the increase in these exponentially increase of journalists chronic diseases that we're seeing in this generation?

Dr. O'Bryan: Really good question. The journal Pediatrics is the number one journal for healthcare for children in the world; pediatrics. If you get an article published in that journal, you've really scored. That means it's gone through very critical review, and they accepted it and they published it. There was a policy statement in the journal Pediatrics, the number one journal.

And so a policy statement is not an author, it's the board. The board of directors of the American Academy of Pediatrics trying to get a message to us. And they said, the Toxic Substance Control Act of 1974 failed miserably to protect children from the potential health detriments of toxic chemicals. And they went on to say that in almost 40 years that it

has been the primary regulatory guidelines for the chemical industry, it still is, the TSC Act of 1974. Five chemicals or classes of chemicals have been regulated in 40 years. Five.

There's thousands that come on the market every year, but there's no safety studies for any of them. There are no safety studies for flame retardants in your baby's clothing, or in baby's crib mattress cover, or in baby's blanket or your blankets or your adult down comforters that are soaked in flame retardant chemicals. There's no safety study anywhere on them, because the manufacturers are not required to do it. Because the Toxic Substances Control Act is so cumbersome.

The government can't regulate these industries. It's up to the public to pay for the research, pay the government our money to pay for the research, but the government doesn't have a research organization. The EPA is a regulatory agency. It's not a research agency. So we don't have any protection. And people don't know this. And they think, "Oh, that can't be true. This is America." This is true.

The lobbyists in Washington at that time were very successful, to get the "T" taken out of the Toxic Substance Control Act, and have so many side provisions that failed. Now this is the policy statement from the American Academy of Pediatrics. And they said it's 247 pounds of toxic chemicals per person, per day that are being manufactured or imported into the United States. 247 pounds; that's for you and me. That's ten 50-pound bags every single day that are being manufacturer and imported to the US, and that doesn't include pharmaceuticals, or petroleum products. And what? It's the plasticized, is the pthalates that are in the lining of coffee cups and in the lids of coffee cups, and that stuff gets into your body and accumulates. I'll give you one example of the accumulation effect.

346 pregnant women, they do urine analysis. They measure the urine for five pthalates -- there are hundreds of pthalates that are in our bodies. Everybody has got them now. But they measure five; women's Bisphenol A or BPA, the one that many people have heard of. They categorize the results into four quadrants; the lowest quadrant, the next quadrant, the third quadrant, and the highest quadrant. They followed the offspring of these pregnant women.

And when the offspring turned seven years old, they did IQ tests on them. Standard sophisticated IQ test. Every child, not the majority of children, every child whose mother was in the highest quartile of pthalates in urine in the eighth month of pregnancy, compared to the children of mothers whose pthalates in urine in the eighth month of pregnancy with the lowest level. Every child with the highest level, their IQ was 7 points lower than the kids in the lowest quartile of pthalates. It was 6.7 to 7.4 points; 7 points lower.

Now one point lower is noticeable. Seven points lower is the difference between a student studying really hard, getting straight A's and a student studying really hard, getting straight C's. They just don't have the neural network. It didn't develop, because phthalates inhibit neurogenesis, a geek word for making new brain cells. Phthalates inhibit that. So when mom was higher in phthalates, baby's brain didn't develop properly. Now, what are phthalates? Nail polish. Every time you put nail polish on within three to five minutes, there's phthalates in your bloodstream. No study shows that it's toxic, there's no study that shows that amount of phthalates are toxic. Every time you put lipstick on, unless it's organic phthalates free, you get phthalates in your bloodstream.

No study that shows that their toxic levels. And we inhale it, the house dust if you've got plastic blinds on the windows. The house dust has phthalates in it because the phthalates leach out of the plastic or the plastic coffee pot and it's in the house dust and you're breathing it in. No study shows the amount of phthalates in house dust is toxic to humans. That's how they get away with this stuff and get it diffused. But this stuff accumulates in your body. A 28 year old woman who's pregnant for the first time, who's got a high level of phthalates has 28 years of accumulation of these minor amounts that accumulate, accumulate, accumulate.

The result is, a whole generation of children now who are coming out have compromised brain development. That's the primary reason why autism is going through the roof. It's not vaccinations. I tell docs on stage all the time; don't ever say vaccinations cause autism. If they did, every child would be autistic. But it's very legitimate to say vaccinations may cause autism if it takes the child over the edge.

Josh: Sorry to interrupt, I just wanted to jump in. Do you see there's like a threshold which perhaps is different for every human being like a toxic load threshold. And then once you're past that, whether it's chemical or environmental or you know, electromagnetic radiation. Once you're past that, then you start exhibiting symptoms on a deeper level. How do you see that whole toxic threshing hold?

Dr. O'Bryan: That's the takeaway we want from every listener.

Josh: Okay.

Dr. O'Bryan: It's not EMFs. It's not gluten, it's not phthalates, it's not vaccinations. It's the whole world of toxicity that we're being exposed to. Joe Mykola published a paper that said, since 1918, since World War One, in the last 100 years, it's one quintillion fold higher levels of EMF exposure. In 100 years it's one quintillion fold increase. We don't have an immune system to deal with this. Mrs. Patient, your body is just like your ancestors 5000 years ago. Your kidneys work the same. Your gallbladder

works the same, your lungs work the same, everything works the same.

We use our brains more so we've got more creature comforts and easier access to food and all that, but our bodies work the same. Your immune system is the armed forces in your body, is there to protect you. There's an Army, and Air Force, and Marines, a Coast Guard and navy IGA, IGG, IGE, IGM. They're all branches of the Armed Forces trying to protect you.

What did our ancestors have to fight against and be protected from? Bugs, parasites, viruses, molds, fungus and bacteria. That's it. Bugs, parasites, viruses, molds, fungus bacteria. You know, I'm a go-to-guy in the world about wheat related disorders. I travel the world teaching about this and you don't have to have celiac disease to have devastating results. But what does wheat do? For every person, wheat activates a century standing guard in your immune system called Toll-like receptor 4.

And what is it? It's like an antenna that sticks out into the lumen of the intestine. And if there's any bugs that are trying to get in, toll-like receptor 4 invites them in, they get here, it sends the message out; we got bugs. And then your immune system gets activated to fight the bug to make inflammatory compounds to fight the bugs. Toll-like receptor 4 is the century standing guard. Wheat stimulates toll-like receptor 4 in every human. Go ahead.

Josh: I just have a question about that. How comes, for example, I can eat wheat; that is pizza made in Italy, but I can't eat North American wheat. Is there a difference?

Dr. O'Bryan: Yeah, there is. And that's a segue but a lot of people have that question. There are many compounds in wheat that trigger an immune response; 62 have been identified. Most doctors, the labs they use they check one; it's called alpha glide or they'll call it gluten, but it's alpha glide that they're checking. So 33 amino acid peptides really important to check. About half of the celiac have that as the trigger activating toll-like receptor 4. But the other half don't, they've got other peptides of wheat that the immune system is fighting causing the problem.

When you get symptoms from eating wheat, the lucky ones are the ones that get symptoms in their gut. They eat something, they feel it. I can't argue with that. The unlucky ones are the ones they eat something, they don't feel it, but you're causing damage to your brain, or to your eyes, or to your joints or to your skin, but they don't feel it when they eat it. It's the next day that they've got brain fog, or it's the next day that their thyroids not working too well and they have a hard time getting out of bed.

And they don't associate what they ate yesterday is the trigger for the

symptoms are having today. And the ratio is 8:1. For every one person with gut symptoms, there're eight that don't have gut symptoms. They have symptom somewhere else in the body. And the Italians call it when it's anywhere else in the body, a loss of well being. So when you have a response, a negative response from wheat that's anywhere in the body but the gut, it's called a loss of wellbeing.

What we know in the compounds of wheat is that the compound of wheat that stimulates a gut response, bloating, gas, diarrhea, constipation, little bit of pain maybe, that compound of wheat is called FODMAP; fermentable carbohydrates. And it's the proteins of wheat, the gluten, the glutenins, and the gluteomorphins, there's a bunch of different proteins. They are responsible for the loss of well being whether it's your brain, your ears or something. Well, the wheat in Europe much lower and FODMAP.

So you don't get the gut symptoms when you eat the wheat in Europe. So you think you're fine. You think you're fine, but you're not because you still activate the immune response, which you don't feel. Mrs. patient, you pull it a chain will breaks at the weakest link, it's one in the middle of the other end of your heart, your brain, your liver, your gut, your kidneys, wherever the weak link is.

So if your genetic weak link is your brain, when you eat wheat, you get elevated antibodies to myelin basic protein, which is the saran wrap around your nerves. When that goes you get MS. Or you get elevated antibodies to cerebellum; that's the part of the brain that controls muscle movement. And when that starts to go, those are the elders that can't walk up and down stairs very well. Is not that their muscles are weak. It's that they don't have gained control of their muscles and they have to hold the railing, and that's called Cerebellar atrophy and when it gets really bad, is called ataxia.

But there are many 70 year olds that can dance up and down the stairs. Even they can dance on a straight floor without effort, because their muscles are good, but they don't have proprioception to tell distance and to walk the stairs. That's your cerebellum that's being killed off for 30 years, 40 years little by little by little, if that's the genetic weakness. So it's the whole FODMAP thing.

So back to this loss of tolerance; 247 pounds of toxic chemicals per person per day, a Quintillion fold increase in EMF toxicity. And nobody argues with the danger of X-rays. Everybody knows X-rays are a problem. You know, and there are solar flares. I mean, the sun erupts. The solar flares are an 11 year cycles. It peaks. It starts to come down and 11 years later it peaks again. And when you're at the peak of an 11 year cycle, when you fly from the New York to LA, you get the radiation exposure of seven chest X-rays every time you fly.

Now at the low end of the 11 year cycle is one to two chest X-rays. At the top end it's seven. But that's why pilots have the highest incidence of lymphomas of any profession in the world. And flight attendants have the highest incidence of reproductive disorders, miscarriages, infertility of any profession in the world, is because they're being exposed to EMF, all the time, all the time constantly.

So it's not your immune system designed to protect you, is designed to protect you from bugs, parasites, viruses, molds, fungus and bacteria. But now it's having to deal with 247 pounds of toxic chemicals per person per day, is having to deal with the types of foods that are no longer the foods that your grandparents ate that came from the earth.

Now these foods are coming from hydroponics and they control what's going into them, there are lots of chemicals on the foods if you're not eating organic. And even on some organic food, there are chemicals because the politics are getting involved now and all that. The fish have plastic inside their meats. It's called micro plastic that's in the meat, because the fish are swimming and oceans are full of plastic.

So these plastics start to break down eventually and they get inside the fish. So we have all of these different toxins were exposed to that never before in the history of humanity have humans had to deal with this. And that is the primary reason why the Alzheimer's Association tells us one elder in three currently dies with dementia. One in three, whether it's diabetes or Alzheimer's or Parkinson's, whatever it is, but one in three dies with dementia. That's the current statistic. So if we had one more person on this call, one of the three of us will die of dementia. That's how common it is. In a family of five, two of you are going to die of dementia.

Why? Because the brain is the most sensitive tissue, and all of these different things that are coming at us all day. The only way your immune system can respond is a bug, parasite virus, mold, fungus or bacteria. And what happens when the immune system responds thinking that it's one of those six that have coming in? It triggers in an inflammation, it turns the genes on, kill that thing, break that thing apart and get it out of here. And that's what your immune system is doing trying to protect you. So the result is you get all this inflammation, and the inflammation causes the tissue damage that causes the degeneration that causes the lack of function eventually of the organ, that causes the organ disease, that causes the organ disease.

Josh: Okay. Let's dive in. Thank you for that. That's a really profound overview and there's so much wisdom and dot connecting in that that is going to be helpful for going forward here. Let's dive into the wireless and the millimeter wave. You know part of this discussion now, millimeter wave is being associated with 5G. What what have you

discovered? What are you seeing? What are you learning? What are you concerned about? How big is the risk?

Dr. O'Bryan: There has never been a risk. As far as I know, there has been one risk larger. But there's only one risk larger than the risk assessment coming from our scientists that we're hearing today who are not involved in the corporate production of the risk. In other words, independent scientists, or university professors who are not getting grants from the industry, and they're saying this is the largest risk they've ever come across.

Aside from one, what was the other one? Above ground nuclear explosions in the late 40s and 50s in Nevada, and they said, "Oh, this is safe." You know, you can go back to the papers. Chicago Tribune, front page. "Nuclear bombs are safe as long as we're far enough away, don't worry about it." And 1950s it was nuclear bombs they said were safe.

In the 1960s, it was cigarettes they said we're safe. And they have commercials with doctors with the stethoscope hanging over there. You know that's the holy instrument. They put a stethoscope over a picture and all of a sudden, there's authority there. And a doctor smoking a camel, the ones doctors recommend most. You know, so the marketing that's done on all this stuff. And then 1970s those bovine growth hormone, in 1980s it was margarine. It's safe for you. In the 1990s, here come the EMFs starting now to show up. 1990s it was GMO, and the 2000s it's EMFs. And the independent scientists -- and there's so many papers now that talk about the dangers.

I mean, when you listen to NPR, and you hear the study and they've gone to interview the kids. The eighth grade class that took a pack of seeds, I think they were tomato plants, I don't know. And they brought a thing of dirt and some containers and they put the dirt in a big seed pot and they put the seeds in there. And someone else was in charge of the watering and they did that in two containers. And they did the exact same thing in both containers, and they put them on the shelf so the sunlight would hit them, in different rooms.

And one room the shelf was right below the wireless router and the other room there was no wireless router. And they just watched what happened. And in the room with no wireless router, here come the sprouts after a number of days or a week or so, and they're growing. And they go run around to the other room, there's no sprout. There's no growth, there's no germination. And then, you know, the sprouts grow big and tall, they take pictures of them. They go to the other room, there are no sprouts, there's no germination. And you hear just simple things like that. And then we have our scientists that work for the industry and say, "There's no evidence that there's any danger with this." And we know. Come on, really, come on now.

So one of the things, for example, that I recommend that people consider just to reduce the EMF that you have control over right now, is get a case on your PONG. Right? This is a PONG and I don't know if it's the best one or not, I got it on Amazon. But I drive an Acura. And when I walk up towards the car, my key sends a message to the car and the dome lights come on in the inside, and the lights by the door handle come on if it's nighttime, as I'm walking to the car, because the key sends a message, "here we come."

But if I'm holding my keys in the same hand as my phone with the palm cover on it, there's no message that goes to the car. And I say, "What's wrong?" I can't unlock the car. And I have to take the phone out of this hand and I can with my other hand, unlock the car because I've got the keys in this hand now. So I know this work, to some degree they work and there might be better ones. I don't know. And you'll know maybe on this summit, you'll have people talking about that. I'm no expert in that, but I know it works.

And we have to be aware that the amount of toxic exposure we're being exposed to whether its chemical toxins, food toxins, electromagnetic toxins, this is accumulative and that our bodies are not designed to deal with this. That's why the incidence of dementia and autism is going through the roof, because your brain is the yellow canary in the coal mine.

And for those of you that don't know, coal miners use to take a cage with a yellow canary down into the mines. And if the canary falls over dead, you know there's a methane leak before any humans can smell it. And so they get out of there real quick. That's the canary in the coal mine. Your brain is the canary in the body's coal mine, if you will. So when you've got brain dysfunction, whether it's brain fog, or its memory lapses, you've got a problem here and your body's trying to tell you something.

Josh: What does the science say? Or what can you tell us about the link between EMF microwave or millimeter wave radiation and the rise in autoimmune and other conditions that you're seeing either in your practice or in the published science? What can you tell us about that?

Dr. O'Bryan: There's no question, absolutely no question. In my book that came out in 2016. *The Autoimmune Fix* won the National Book Award, because it's a really good book. You know, there's no marketing idea. I didn't have a marketing team for this, but it's a really good book. We show you the studies that identify it's the inflammation that comes up. That is the fuel in the development of Hashimoto's thyroid, or psoriasis, or losing your hair, alopecia. Is the inflammation and where's the inflammation coming from? The inflammation is coming from the damage to yourself cells. Your cells get damaged. Like with wireless,

your cells get damaged in a way, not mainly but primarily -- Primarily, the first thing you look at is the damage to the mitochondria. The furnace in every cell is the mitochondria. That is extremely sensitive to EMF toxicity. And when you cross the threshold of EMF toxicity, you're getting mitochondrial damage that produces a compound called proxy nitrate.

You ever started a charcoal fire and you squirt some lighter fluid on it, and you light a match and you throw it on there and it doesn't catch, you ever had that happen?

Josh: Yes.

Dr. O'Bryan: So what do you do? You light another match and you gently lay down the coal so it doesn't go out. And you squirt the charcoal lighter fluid, not at the match because they'll drown the flame, it goes out. You squirt that at the charcoal next to it so the spray will catch igniting. And then the thing will ignite, right? What happens if initially you would pour gasoline on those charcoals and threw a match in there; that's proxy nitrate in your cells. It's got so much reactive free radicals and reactive oxygen damage. Is one of the most powerful damaging compounds that get produced as a response to your immune system trying to protect you. Then it has to try to get rid of proxy nitrates. And proxy nitrates go up as you increase EMF exposure.

Josh: Okay. So is proxy nitrate a naturally occurring thing that somehow increases in its prevalence and its toxicity and its activity with the increase of electromagnetic radiation?

Dr. O'Bryan: One would assume -- you know, there's a normal reference range for proxy nitrates when you test for it. There's a normal reference. When is it normal? Well, it's normal when your immune system is trying to protect you from something. You know, you got to scratch and you got some bug in your body. And so the immune system is trying to kill off that bug. And if it's damaged some of the cells around the area, you might have a little proxy nitrate a little bit. You know, spine is part of our immune response. Damage occurs, the immune system has to get activated to go in there after it. But the amount that we're getting -- just turn your phone on wherever you live and see how many wireless networks that you can connect to right now. That's how many different wavelengths are hitting your body that we don't have any defense mechanism against them. Bugs, parasites, viruses, mold, fungus and bacteria; that's it.

Josh: That's what we're designed to have defense against.

Dr. O'Bryan: That's correct. We're not designed and we don't have a defense against electromagnetic pollution.

Josh: What are your concerns? What do you think would happen with people's health if 5G is allowed to be deployed everywhere with small cells, every few homes with 20,000 satellites. Let's say what if this thing just goes forward as industry wants to without any change in course, what's your anticipation based upon all your knowledge and experience, and the science?

Dr. O'Bryan: Devastating, completely devastating. Currently, we're at the stage where -- mainly because of the toxic chemicals. Between 1974 and 2011, they did analysis; it's called a meta analysis. They look at a whole bunch of studies on one subject. The subject was sperm count in healthy men, not infertile men, in healthy men. And in those 37 years, there has been a 59% reduction in sperm count.

Now, that's just a number that everybody is numb to. It doesn't mean anything until you find out. Scientists worry about extinction of a species at 72%. We're at 59% in 37 years, what do you think is going to happen the next 20 years. And then just go to Google and type in EMFs and sperm count. And look at the studies where they say there seems to be a correlation here between this. Just look at the studies and then imagine with 5G which is much more powerful. What do you think is going to happen?

If you were a practitioner, and you tell patients 5G is harmless, that's okay if it's outside your house. If you don't know, then that just has to be written off to "he didn't take the time to study this." But if you know and you say it anyway, that's malpractice because you're putting patients in harm's way. There's no question about EMFs in general, and now this most powerful EMF producing networks, which is launching now in a number of cities already in the US. There's no question that for people who have come up against the wall of oral tolerance, or immune tolerance --

And so you say oral tolerance because I talk about wheat. But immune tolerance when you come up against that threshold. Now here comes 5G takes you over the threshold, wherever the weak link in your chain is. So I imagined in five years we're going to see studies in kidney disease and kidney cancer, and bladder disease and bladder cancer, and brain diseases and brain cancer all being associated with 5G. The joints and the skin and the hair and there won't be a tissue in the body that we won't see in association with crossing the threshold in electromagnetic pollution.

Josh: Wow. Can you talk about -- you mentioned leaky gut and leaky brain? Is there science, is there experience or knowledge that you could share about leaky brain or leaky gut and the wireless proliferation?

Dr. O'Bryan: You bet. If I explain the gut first, it helps to understand the

brain. Mrs. patient, your digestive tract as a tube, is 20 to 25 feet long start from the mouth goes down to the other end. Imagine a donut, if you could take a donut and stretch a donut out. One big long donut. If you look down the donut, it's one big long tube. So when you swallow food, it's in the donut. It's not in your body yet. The food has got to go through the walls of the donut to get into the bloodstream. So now it's in your body. And that's the process of digestion is breaking these food compounds smaller and smaller and smaller and smaller. Snip, snip, snip, snip, snip. Well, the inside of the tube is lined with cheesecloth. And the cheesecloth only lets really small molecules get through. So the big molecules can't get through until they've been snipped down small enough to get through. But what happens for example, wheat tears the cheesecloth every time you eat it, but the fastest growing cells your body the inside lining of your gut.

You have an entire new lining every two days. You eat toast for breakfast, you tear the lining and it heals. You eat sandwich for lunch, you tear the lining but it heals. Pasta for dinner that turns on your salad a cookie, tear the lining but it heals until one day you cross the threshold you don't heal anymore. Now you got leaky gut. And what that means is that the cheesecloth gets torn and it doesn't heal, because it tears every time you eat wheat. But usually it heals until you lose oral tolerance, and you don't heal anymore. Now you have intestinal permeability.

Now these molecules that are going down the track being snipped around smaller and smaller. But now, these larger molecules called macro molecules can get through the tears in the cheesecloth into the bloodstream. And they're not supposed to be there. And your immune system says, "Whoa, what's this? This is not good for me, I better fight this. This is not something I can use to make new brain hormones or muscle cells. It's not a raw material that I recognize. It's not calcium or amino acids. I better fight this."

Now you make antibodies to tomatoes, or to pickles or to chicken or to beef. And that's the person that does a 90 food blood test panel to see what you're sensitive to. And it comes back you're sensitive to 25 foods you say, "Oh my God, that's everything I eat." Well, of course it is. Your immune system is trying to protect you. There's nothing wrong with your immune system, is trying to protect you. You got tears on your cheesecloth.

And so when you heal the cheesecloth, and you wait three months, then you go back and check three to six months you go back and check. Now you're sensitive to two foods, maybe three and those are the ones you stay away from long term. But that cheesecloth concept -- I know four areas of the body that have that cheesecloth; the lungs, the gut, the kidneys, and the brain and it's called the epithelial lining.

Now it's the epithelium aligning the cheesecloth of the brain that's the tightest. It's got the smallest holes, and lets the least amount of stuff to get through in the brain. So it's really tight, and it's called the blood-brain barrier. Now, scientists call it a breach of the blood-brain barrier, I call it B4. So you know, you don't have to say these geeky words like breach of the blood-brain barrier.

So you know what, I wonder if I've got B4. And so when you have B4, larger molecules get through the blood-brain barrier into the brain that aren't supposed to get there. They're okay to be in the bloodstream, maybe be good, but it depends if you got leaky gut. They're not supposed to be. But even the molecules that are okay to be in the bloodstream are too big to be in the brain. Only the really small molecules are allowed to get through into the brain. That's the purpose of the blood brain barrier.

But when you get B4; a breach of the blood brain-barrier tearing the cheesecloth of the brain, you get these big molecules getting in there. And when you do -- we have four different immune systems in the body and the most powerful of them -- the immune system in the gut is like the town Marshall. You know, Tom Marshall keeping the peace until he's got a six shooter. You know, any problems he -- you know the old cowboy towns, he pulls out six shooter.

So that's the town Marshall. But then there's the sheriff. The sheriff is like for the county, and the sheriff has a rifle. Then in your bloodstream -- then the sheriff is in the liver, called Kupffers. Then in your bloodstream, you've got an immune system called antibodies. That's Special Forces with high powered rifles. These guys are target specific. You make antibodies to wheat, you got a problem with wheat. And you make antibodies to tomatoes, you got a problem with tomatoes, because they're not there unless they've been instructed that there's a problem with this food, get rid of it.

Then the fourth one is the immune system of the brain. Now that one, they're called glial cells. They fire bazookas. They don't mess around. Anything that gets through the blood-brain barrier activates the glial cells and here comes the bazooka to destroy it, no messing around. Well, that's great, except if you've got B4 and there's a continual influx of new things into the brain that aren't supposed to be there, you're firing bazookas all day long. You get a lot of collateral damage, some of the brain tissue starts to get damaged; the brain cells. Then your immune system has to make antibodies to get rid of the brain cells, the damaged brain cells. Now you develop an auto immune mechanism of the brain. And that is very common scenario.

Now here's the kicker, EMF have been shown to cause B4; a breach of the blood-brain barrier. I haven't seen a study yet on 5G and the blood-

brain barrier. But I would wager \$1,000 that you're going to see that 5G is much worse at causing B4 because it's a much more powerful signal. And when you get B4; a breach of the blood-brain barrier, these molecules get in the brain, your immune system of the brain trying to protect you is going to destroy those things. But here comes all the collateral damage from the repetitive explosions going on in the brain.

Josh: Wow. Sasha Stone has a video out there called 5G you know, apocalypse extinction event. How do you see this level of risk, and you know, I'm a little bit hesitant. I'm a little bit on the fence and kind of trying to find that the best way to communicate to people the level of risk so that you don't turn people off and you don't alarm them or put them into so much fear that they run the other way.

Before we talk about communicating this, I wanted to ask you like; is that appropriate to be considering this as a possible or even probable extinction event if it doesn't get sorted? You're talking about basic neurological function being affected by the rollout of untested technology that's showing a link to those fundamental neurological conditions by that B4; by breach of the blood-brain barrier. Help us contextualize this, Doc? What are we talking about?

Dr. O'Bryan: I don't have enough knowledge to make a prediction about the impact of 5G whether its apocalyptic or not by itself, but the loss of tolerance. Because of 247 pounds of toxic chemicals per person per day. Every newborn child in America today has at least 200 toxic chemicals that aren't supposed to be in their blood. Every child is checked, just read the studies on this, and many of them are neurotoxins.

So extinction of the species, it's on the horizon. It's called the sixth extinction. And if you Google the sixth extinction, you see that our scientists at the National Academy of Science are saying there's no technology to fix this. 50 to 70 years from now, we won't. We don't know that humans can survive. And you read this and you go, "Wait, I can't listen to this. I'm going back to have a beer." Or you know, whatever people do.

We have to wake up. And then we have to have a protocol or a way of approaching these overwhelming problems that never before have humans had to experience; never before. We know, for example, there are five stages of change. The first stage is pre contemplation, you're not even thinking about the problem. I don't want to hear it. I got nothing to do with it, it's fine. And we've all said, if you don't know you don't know. You know, you're living in bliss. The second stage is contemplation. Now, you know, this might be a problem. Okay, it might be a problem. Maybe I should look into it. But I know that patients in my practice, we're going to be successful, that are in the contemplation stage. The ones that are going to be successful are the ones that are skeptics. Because skeptics

say, "I'm not sure I believe this. I'm going to look into a little more on my own."

And I always say, Thank you. Great. Just go for it. If you need some guidance, here are some things to read. But look for yourself. Great. The ones who aren't going to be successful in the contemplated stage are the ones that are cynics. Cynics say, "I don't know that I believe in it. Is not worth my time, is nonsense." So you know that there's a problem, but you don't believe there's a problem. You aren't going to put any time into it. They're cynics, they're not going to change.

The third place is taking action. You know, saying, yep, I'm in. I'm going to do something. The fourth stage, you get the results. You're feeling the positive results of what you've done. And the fifth stage is keeping it going. Humans are the only species on the planet that I know of, they find something that works and they stopped doing it. They're only species on the planet that does that. But these five stages of change were put together by two authors about 15 years ago. They looked at 1000 people who successfully dealt with addictions that were either alcohol, tobacco, or food and obesity. So 1000 people who were successful that did not go to psychotherapy.

So what did they do? What was the formula by which they were successful? They recognized that whatever stage they were in, in their own language, and they said, "You know what, I need a little learn a little more about this." Or you know what, "I just need to get going, let's just get started here. Let's get moving on this." But they recognize and these five states didn't matter, what stage they were at. So the key here is to first acknowledge where you are at in this topic. Meaning; "I don't want to hear about it. I'm going to bury my head in the sand Leave me alone."

And people don't say that. What they say is they go after the messenger. So you know, "You've all heard, don't shoot the messenger or the message." But they go after the messenger, as opposed to looking into this for themselves. So those five stages -- and it's so it doesn't matter what stage you're in. You've recognize where you're at, say, "Okay, this is where I am at right now. Maybe I should be somewhere else, but that's not where I am. I am here. I am in contemplation. And I am skeptical." Okay.

So let's just walk through this and let's get some more information." Or I am at the stage of action. What am I going to take? All right, I'm going to turn off the wireless every night in the house.

Turn off the wireless, or I'm going to paint the walls with that EMF resistant paint. So all these wavelengths don't penetrate through, or I'm going to get rid of wireless in the house. And we're going to have hard wiring in all the rooms. You know, whatever your decisions are of what

you're going to do, but you're taking action now. So I think it's critically important to recognize where we are as individuals right now. I think that's a very powerful empowering stance to have, and then move from there.

Josh: Good. Thank you. So just to highlight another aspect of this sort of bigger picture frame. We have in February of 2019 in a Senate hearing, top level industry executives admitted they're not doing any studies on 5G. They haven't done any, they're not going to do any, there's no budget that they've allocated to test 5G. Meanwhile --

Dr. O'Bryan: Excuse me. That's because there's no legislation that mandates that they have to prove it safe.

Josh: Yes, thank you. Meanwhile, the independent science on wireless is in the thousands of studies that have indicated there's a harmful biological effect. The 1972 US Navy report with 2300 studies, I believe. And then the bio-initiative report with 1800 studies as examples. And there are also millimeter wave radiation independent studies that show potentially even greater effect of these higher frequencies. Very serious problem, but you're right. There's no mandated law that requires them to do this. So we have essentially a corporatocracy or a technocracy or this kind of system that has been running to allow all these harms over the decades, right? Then you mentioned since the 1940s with a nuclear testing and through to the current day with 5G and EMF.

Talk to us a little bit about the weight of evidence principle and/or the precautionary principle. And/or how we can drive our actions forward, Tom, so that nothing like this can ever happen again. So how do you see that happening to ensure the safety of products and technology in this big picture, so we don't keep having to put out these fires.

Dr. O'Bryan: I don't see that that's possible. I think it's human nature to take advantage of opportunities and some, their consciences are left behind. It's unfathomable to me that we have people who are saying we need to take the filters off of the coal burning power plants, so more mercury can go into air. But that happened a few months ago and it was passed by our current administration. And they don't have to put these Clean Air Act regulated filters in coal burning power plants, and it's unfathomable. So there is no rationale for that except pure profits.

And those are the people in charge of the movement of dollars in our country. And they allocate as little as they can, but enough to our elected officials. So our elected officials pass legislation with no teeth, like the Toxic Substance Control Act of 1976, which is still the guideline on toxic chemicals. And there are no guidelines on electromagnetic emissions. We have no guidelines because Congress will not pass legislation.

So I don't know if we can change that dynamic. We have to demand more of our elected officials, they get some guts and stand up as they should. But then they say, "Well, good, thank you so much." But then they vote to their pocket way too often, but the only way that I know of to save the planet. And you know, this is a bigger picture view than just 5G, but it includes 5G. The only way I know up to save the planet -- Einstein is attributed to saying the problems we've created today cannot be solved with the same level of thinking that created the problem. We have to up our game. And all of our adults are locked into their neural networks, and how their brains think and how they process problems. So it's the next generation, is the children that we have to protect.

And we're doing a terrible job, because now it's one out of 26 are on the autism spectrum. When I came out in practice, it was one out of 10,000. And scientists; bio statisticians at MIT tell us within 10 years it will be one child in two on the autism spectrum. One in two, and we have our heads in the sand. We're not doing anything about this, you know, we're still driving our Cadillac Escalades. There's nothing wrong with Cadillac Escalades, but these big gas guzzling things that we don't need. And we keep using our plastic bag at the supermarket to put our carrots in and we get home and we throw the plastic bag away, as if they disappear. No, we don't use them again. We don't have a consciousness of not just saving the planet, but saving your lineage.

My three year old granddaughter will not be able to find a partner to meet with who will be able to mate. According to these studies, we've lost 59% sperm count in 37 years. What's going to happen in the next 20 years? Yeah, men will not have enough sperm to reproduce. And it's the extinction of a species. That's just one little, there's so many aspects of. But the bottom line, we have to protect the children. We have to protect the children so they can think outside the box. You can't put wireless networks in grade schools and allow these high power wireless towers next to a school night. 1979 kids within a quarter mile get higher incidence of cancer. They publish that back in 1979.

Josh: With power lines.

Dr. O'Bryan: Yeah, right. Just with power lines. Now with the cell phone towers there are so much more emissions. And now with 5G coming, is going to be multiplied much higher again. So it's the big picture and the big picture is, we have to have a paradigm shift. And this is what I'd like to kind of wrap up with. This is 1984, Barry Marshall, a microbiologist in Australia. He writes a paper and he says, "You know, sometimes I think ulcers are caused by a bacterium."

And the whole world said, "Are you a nutcase?" Everybody knows ulcers are caused by too much acid in the stomach and you have take antacids. That's why the antacid industry is always in the top 10 pills

sold around the world. That is billions of dollar industry, and everybody drinks Maalox. My dad had Maalox in the box of the carrot, reach over and grab take a swig every once in a while, because he had heartburn. I didn't know what it was. He was just taking his medicine.

And he was ostracized. He was not thought well of. So what does he do? He doesn't endoscopy. He puts a tube down his throat, takes a picture of the healthy pink tissue of his stomach. He then drinks a beaker of bacteria, a beaker of this stuff called *Helicobacter pylori*, or *H. pylori*. He waits a couple of weeks until he's as sick as can be, just really hurting. Does another endoscopy take a picture of his ulcerated stomach. Then he takes the antibiotics to kill the *Helicobacter*. Then he waits a couple of weeks until he feels good again, and does another endoscopy to take the picture of the healthy pig tissue of his stomach. Then he publishes it.

And then everybody knows he's a nutcase, because he had the courage to do that. But he proved that sometimes bacterial infections cause ulcers. And the World Health Organizations said this is so important. They mandated messaging going out to every medical association in the world. Why? Because the number one cancer in the world is stomach cancer, and it is caused by a *Helicobacter pylori* infection. So this is a way to identify the infection early and stop the development of all these cancers.

21 years later, Barry Marshall wins the Nobel Prize in physiology, and the top award in the world. And the Nobel committees says; this is word for word, "Who with tenacity and a prepared mind challenged prevailing dogma." Every one of you listening to this need tenacity. Meaning you stay at this, and I'll show you how in just a minute you stay at this. And you have to prepare your mind, because you can't trust what you've been told to challenge the prevailing dogma, because this is slowly killing us and it's not going to be so slow. When 5G is in your neighborhood, you're going to notice you feel sick, and it will take years to get that stuff out of there. So which tenacity and that is why the subtitle of this book is; *Just One Hour a Week, To the Best Memory Productivity and Sleep You've Ever Had*. It's not a cute title.

What that is, is the only way to success because this stuff is so overwhelming. When you start learning about it, you don't know what to do, so you do nothing; you're immobilized. So one hour a week is tenacity, every Tuesday night after dinner, every Sunday after services, whatever it is. It doesn't matter what it is, but every week at that time, I'm going to allocate one hour to learn a little more how to protect my family from EMFs.

We're going to learn a little more how to protect my family from toxic chemical exposures. And you're going to learn a tremendous amount but only one hour a week. And then one week, you're going to say, "You

know what, I need to get the pthalates out of my kitchen.” So let’s see, Dr. O’Bryan talked about glass storage containers to get the plastic containers out because you put food in a plastic storage container. The next day that you take food in refrigerator, it’s got pthalates on it, because this stuff leeches out of the containers.

So you go to the book and you see the URLs you go to *mileskimball.com*. And you go to Amazon and you’re like, “Oh, I like those more.” And you order three round ones and a couple square ones, and one for the pies and whatever. You pay with your credit cards and took you an hour, you’re done. That’s one hour a week, but now you will never poison your family with this minute amount of pthalates that get into the food from the storage containers. Give the Tupperware to your husband to store nails in the garage. It’s safe for that, right. And the next week, you’re going to do something about EMFs. And then next week, you’ll do something about flame retardants. You know, but every week, you just apply a little bit of time, one hour to learn. In six months, you’ve got this. In six months, you’ve allocated 25 hours of focus time to protecting you and your family.

And that’s the only way I know that we’re going to get out of this mess; is each one of us takes responsibility to maintain tenacity. An hour a week, preparing your mind to challenge the prevailing dogma, which is just to make millions and billions of dollars. That’s why that messaging is coming out. That dogma is just profit driven.

Josh: Yeah, thank you. It’s really about resolve, isn’t it? It’s about that. That decision that makes in each one of our individual hearts, a mindset that we make. And then the outcome of that, the learning, the changes, the actions, the choices from that. The relationships and the community from that. The willingness to speak and to share that comes from that decision. So I believe that we’re definitely feeling compressed as a species and many of our individual lives as well. It’s like, we’ve never been this sort of stressed, life just really intense. But I believe that this is an opportunity as well for that paradigm shift you talk about. For that truly like making a decision, that it’s kind of like hundredth monkey syndrome, perhaps. It’s like more and more people do that, the more, more momentum we gain, right? And we don’t need 51%, you know.

So thank you for your perspective, Dr. Tom. And thank you for your work and your dedication, and effort over the decades and your leadership and for joining us on the summit today. On behalf of everyone watching and listening, I really appreciate you, your work and your time today.

Dr. O’Bryan: Thank you, Josh. It’s a real honor to be on this summit with you. Thank you so much.

Effects of Wireless on the Human Biofield

Guest: Beverly Rubik

Josh: Joining us for this conversation today is Dr. Beverly Rubik. Beverly, thank you so much for your time, and I'm so glad you could join us.

Beverly: Thank you, Josh. It's my pleasure.

Josh: You're an expert on the body as an electromagnetic vehicle, I guess you could say, with a biofield and how that interfaces with technology, with fields, with our environment around us, with 5G and other wireless frequencies. You have a very solid academic credible background as a Ph.D. And so, we're really looking forward to this conversation and diving in and helping to connect the dots, and bringing it back to each of us, and each of our own energy and power and changes we can make. So, I'm looking forward to this.

I'm just going to share with our audience. I'm going to read a little bit about your background here. And then we'll dive right in. Dr. Beverly Rubik has a Ph.D. in Biophysics from UC-Berkeley and is internationally renowned for her pioneering work. In 1992, Dr. Rubik chaired a panel at the NIH, the National Institutes of Health, that introduced the term "biofield." And in 1994, biofield became a medical subject heading at the U.S. National Library of Medicine.

Presently she is conducting research to develop novel physical sensors for chi, to explore the extremely low-level light of life or biophotons, and to investigate the health issues of humans exposed to wireless communication radiation. So, that's really interesting, first of all, I have to say. Like I love this crossover work.

You're a pioneer, you have a Ph.D. and you're focusing on this very important connection. So, first, I want to ask you, having read Dr. Robert O. Becker's book, his seminal work, *The Body Electric*, and in just common sense he explains how we are electromagnetic beings. On this summit we're talking about electromagnetic radiation in everything outside of us. But we are electromagnetic beings. We often forget that, it seems. How foundational is an understanding of Dr. Becker's work, of that understanding, of that fact, that we are electromagnetic beings?

Beverly: Well, it's absolutely foundational. He worked on salamanders and mice and showed they could regenerate, especially when you applied extremely small fields to limbs that were severed. But he also was a person I worked with in committees at the National Institutes of Health, and I knew him personally. We wrote a paper together.

And I think today he would roll over in his grave if he realized the plethora of wireless communication radiation that is already on this planet. He was concerned about sixty Hz, the powerline frequencies, and childhood leukemia and brain tumors upon exposure, because schools were close to power lines and issues like that.

But today, we have something totally new that in his lifetime didn't exist. We have this plethora of cell phone towers and of coming 5G, with many, many cell phone antennas and even satellites that are going to be blasting the Earth with even higher frequencies.

Josh: You've done pioneering work with regard to complementary and integrative medicine. Can you tell us just briefly about your history and about some of the key areas of work that you've brought forward?

Beverly: Well, I'm especially excited about alternative and complementary medicine, because I'd like to see softer, gentler medicine used before the big guns of pharmaceutical and allopathic medicine. And I think it's quite the reverse now-a-days, especially for chronic disease and end up taking drugs, or getting radiation, and those are the big guns.

But why aren't we starting with softer, gentler therapies, especially when living systems respond exquisitely to very small energetic signals, for example, in energy medicine? There are things such as homeopathy that give infinitesimal doses of substances, that could be used instead of large doses of drugs. And exquisitely small doses of energy in the form of pulse electromagnetic fields or magnetic fields can simulate healing.

And I think we should use those first before we turn to the big guns of allopathic medicine. So, I've been exploring the biofield, the energy fields of the organism, to try to explain how these exquisitely small signals may in fact work. I'm not convinced that they work initially at

the molecular level. I think that that is part of it. But I think initially they seem to change the organizing field of the organism, the field that may regulate all of the biochemistry and physiology.

And, therefore, I focused on the biofield as the fundamental science that would help us explain both how energy medicine and the subtle integrative therapies may work, and, in addition, how the hazards from environmental radiation from the communication technologies may also impact us. So, I'm really interested in both questions. And here we're just discussing the hazards issues.

Josh: Later on in this talk, we're actually going to look at visual images that you have assembled from your work to do with live blood cell analysis and microwave radiation; so fascinating stuff. It's similar to how we didn't take back your power, but to see additional data on that is quite compelling. But before we get into that, let's dive into this understanding of the biofield. Is it akin to chi or prana or the force or the life-force? Tell us a little bit more of a definition. What is the biofield, the human biofield? And where does it come from?

Beverly: I think the biofield is maybe the closest that science can get to the notion of chi or prana. Those terms came from other cultures, from the East. And they have a lot of mystique around them. And they also relate to a universal life energy that's everywhere in the Cosmos. But with the biofield, I'm talking about something that science can address. That consists of electric magnetic fields of photon emissions of the real field of physics that we can understand and measure scientifically.

Josh: And you've investigated what effects wireless radiation and other electromagnetic radiation has on the human biofield. You've measured it. We can actually visually see it, right? Tell us about that.

Beverly: Yes. There are many ways to, let's say, approach the biofield. And there's no singular way. So, we're looking at the different fields emanating from the human body. Even the brain has waves. The heart has waves. But I'm more interested in the more subtle energies of the whole body. And we use an instrument from Russia. It's actually a camera. This one is called Bio-Well.

But it's based on a digital form of high-voltage electrophotography. What does that mean? If you've ever heard of Kirlian photography, it's related. So, you place your finger on a charged plate, one by one. And we're inducing a light emission from the high voltage. Electrons are emitted from the fingertips, which then simulate a light emission of gases around the finger.

And so, we're able to visualize then something about the energy field. And it really changes with respect to interventions, whether they're

medical or stressors such as bringing a cell phone near the body. And so, we can see immediately, within seconds, how the biofield changes in response to the stress of an electromagnetic signal.

Josh: Okay. But just to further my understanding, so, the body itself is emitting photons of light. And you capture these photons, or you can view these photons with your Kirlian light photography, a special technology that can photograph these. Is that right?

Beverly: Actually, it's not quite like that.

Josh: Okay.

Beverly: We have a different apparatus to measure the native light emission from the body. And that's called biophoton emission. And I have a figure of someone showing the natural light coming out of a couple of fingers from work in Japan. But in this case, that light is so minute, there are maybe forty photons per square centimeter per second coming out of the hand. And it takes hours to make an image. So, I'm inducing the light image with high voltage.

So, the person is placing each finger, one at a time, on a high voltage clear electrode. It's like a glass electrode charged up to five-thousand volts. And then something called a Corona discharge appears. This is an induced ring of light around the finger. And we're looking at the qualities of that light. How round is that image of light around the finger? How even is it? Is it sparky? All of those things tell us about the state of the organism, whether the person is healthy or stressed and relaxed.

Josh: Okay. Can you talk more about what these differences in our biofield are related to in terms of symptomology?

Beverly: Well, the Russians have a big database. They have many, many people. And they've also done what's called a sector analysis of each fingertip. And so, we know, for example, a particular finger, the sector at 2 o'clock, if you think of the round circle like the face of the clock, might relate to the thyroid. And so, they've looked at a lot of people. And they can see people with a low thyroid or a high thyroid with respect to the sector analysis of each of the ten fingers.

But I'm not using it in that way typically. Holistic practitioners may use it that way. As a researcher, I'm looking at parameters such as the area of the light emission, the symmetry of the left and right hands emitting light. And the quality of the emission—is it sparky, or is it smooth?

And I can compare, for example, a person who's practicing yoga or meditation frequently, who is extremely well-regulated in the energy body. And then I can look at someone who has never practiced yoga,

and I can see how they look. And I know what high level energy regulation looks like from studying a number of yogis and meditators. And then I know what stress looks like, because it happens when somebody's dog dies, and they are a regular client of mine, and they come in for measurement. And I see how stress looks.

So, it's been documented. There are large databases then, especially maintained by the Russians, who developed these cameras, who are able to, I can't say diagnose. In the United States, this is not a diagnostic instrument. But in several other countries, the camera that I'm using is a diagnostic instrument.

Josh: Okay. So, tell us about what happens when you observe the subject and their biofield in the presence of where this radiation, microwave radiation, or even have you done any millimeter-wave radiation sites? What happens? And what do you conclude from your observations there?

Beverly: Well, I've tested only 4G radiation from cell phones, from smart phones, so far. We don't have 5G available, but soon, probably. But in any case, what we see just after fifteen to twenty-five seconds of holding a phone that a call has been made, and the call is now trying to be captured, I already see changes in the biofield.

And as people hold on to the phone with one hand, there's a left-right imbalance. First of all, the phone is usually held in one hand for the sake of a phone call. And so that produces already this left-right imbalance. But then there are also reductions of the energy emissions, as well as increased sparkiness of the biofield, which indicates stress. That's classic. I've seen this in many cases.

And, in fact, it's part of the software analysis that this sparky image that results from stress is analyzed in the Russian software as stress or emotional pressure on continuum, from calmness to stress to high-level stress. And I've even seen electro-sensitive persons show enormous stress upon holding a phone for some twenty-five seconds to a minute making a call. So, those are very short-term exposures.

Now, if I do a little bit longer term exposure, say thirty minutes, which is not unusual, people calling or holding a phone in an airport or working, I see more profound changes in the biofield. The thing you can't miss visually, the differences between smooth, unimpeded flow of energy, round, perfect circles of light, to jumpy, sparky, distorted left-right imbalanced images coming from the fingertips.

Josh: Okay. What disease or chronic diseases or symptoms are associated with what you observe, from what you just described, the observations in the biofield?

Beverly: Well, chronic stress is at the root of virtually all chronic diseases. So, I'm looking at short-term changes. But people are utilizing cell phones throughout the day, constant exposure. Some of them are placing cell phones in their pockets, in their bras, carrying cell phones in the on position. So, they're constantly exposed. And that means that they're chronically stressed. And this is at the root of all chronic diseases, be it cancer, cardiovascular disease, autoimmune disorders, you name it. So, we're looking at the root of chronic disease here, with chronic stress at its cause.

Josh: So, have you done any studies with, you mentioned like someone holding a cell phone for up to half an hour. What about if the cell phone is right touching the ear, next to the head and brain? Have you done any studies like that? And if so, how does the biofield then look comparatively?

Beverly: Well, I haven't been willing to have subjects hold the cell phone near the ear for a long time because it really shouldn't be held near the ear. It should be at least an inch from the body. So, in the studies I had sometimes short phone calls by the phone, say within an inch of the ear. And we see the same stress patterns. But you don't even have to hold it near the ear. Just holding it in the hand, it's within the biofield. I'm sure that holding the phone near the ear is producing changes in brain waves and other aspects of the biofield. But I'm looking at the whole body biofield, something more subtle than brain waves, or heart waves, in this case. So, simply holding it in the hand, I get these changes.

Josh: Isn't it true? I've heard, I think, from HeartMath Institute or others that the heart, the human heart, has a field much bigger than the brain even. Is that true? What have you measured in terms of the different parts of our body and the fields created?

Beverly: Yes, the heart actually has a stronger magnetic field than the brain. The heart is the strongest electromagnetic emitter, then the brain. The brain is secondary. But then there is more.

There are the acupuncture meridians, twelve of them, six yin and six yang, carrying energy from the Earth, the yin meridians, and carrying energy down from the sky, and many portals to these meridians, called acupuncture points. And these are part of the energy anatomy of oriental medicine. And then there are the three dantians, the forehead area, the heart area, and the abdominal area.

And all of these change. I haven't produced that data to show you. But I have seen changes in acupuncture points, electrical conductivity, as a result of someone holding a cell phone in the on position. So, that's another measure. It's not highly visual, but we have seen the electricity then. And all of these meridians also shift into abnormal patterns.

Josh: Okay. So, on the summit we interview and talk with Dr. Martin Paul, Dr. Paul Hérroux, and others, but notably those two scientists on the mechanism of that wireless EMF, the mechanism of harm, or the mechanism effect that we see in the body. From your perspective, Beverly, would you like to add into this conversation about what's your understanding of the specific mechanism?

Is it, for example, that there's, as another researcher has described, like a low level electrocution almost, a micro-electrocution happening that is at the basis of the cause of the stress? Is it that the electrical impulses in our brain and our heart and throughout our body are somehow hampered by these artificial external electrical signals pulsating upon us? Can you talk to us about that from your perspective, and maybe dial into the mechanism, if you could?

Beverly: Yes. One of the things we know about the biofield, let's take the brain, for example. The brain can be trained to make frequencies in pace with some external stimulus. For example, you can sound Tibetan bells that make B-frequencies or hemi-sink with ear phones.

Josh: Binaural beats.

Beverly: Yes, Binaural beats, and drive the brain to make a specific frequency. So, external fields presented to the body, the body tries to pace to them. And some of these fields, of course, go beyond brain and heart. There are many little fields being made by molecules having reactions. Wherever you have a charged particle moving in the body, you have a field being made. Now, there are how many particles in the body? There are ions and there are molecules that are charged. And they're all moving around.

So, conventional physics says where you have a moving charged particle, you have a field moving. I'm looking at the energetic aspects of this, whereas people like Dr. Martin Paul are looking at the molecular aspects of this. And I think they're two different story lines. But I don't think one is more true than another. We have to think of the body as a biomolecular machine on the one hand as a flame of energy on the other hand. And I'm talking about these signals thwarting that flame, distorting it, making it uneven and low level.

I think about the biofield sometimes like, especially looking at these circles of light coming out of the finger, the gas flames on a stove. You can turn on the stove, and if it's skipping and not very stable, the flame may go out. It's not a good solid energy regulation. And so, you want to turn up that gas. You want to have steady light being made from the biofield. You want to have steady energy flowing; as the ancients called it, the smooth unimpeded flow of chi.

And so, I'm talking about that aspect being thwarted by these external fields that are so different from our biology. And here's another reason they're different. It's not just about the frequency of millimeter waves or microwaves. It's about the digital, highly pulsed nature of them. We are analog buildings. Our biofield is steady like a flame, a gas flame burning. And that's how we want our energy field to be.

But as you know, digital communications are highly pulsed. They are strong fields, big pulses, followed by periods of nothing, and then more pulses. And these are the communication between antennas and cell phones, and soon to be the internet of things. And that's the digital realm. We are analog beings. And there's no way living beings can adapt to this kind of digital signature of energy. It's impossible. It's just far too different from how we operate, with rather constant heartbeats and brain waves and continuous circulation of energy.

Josh: Yea. Can you talk to us a little bit about, you mentioned chi? Do you see chi as the same way, or is it slightly different to spirit or consciousness or electricity?

Beverly: Okay. According to oriental philosophy, they have linked those things. And they say where the mind goes, the chi flows, and the flesh and blood follow. So, what's primary, who is the controller or conductor of this symphony of energy, is the mind. It's consciousness. And then the chi moves. And thirdly, the flesh and blood follow. So, they would see any changes at the molecular level as being secondary, really, to the energetic changes.

And it's certainly true that the speed of electromagnetism is the speed of light, three times 10 to the eighth meters per second. This is huge, compared to say the speed of nerves, involving molecular movement at synapses about twenty meters a second. That's slow compared to the speed of light.

So, I believe that initial changes may be within the biofield. If it's the regulatory thing of the physiology and biochemistry, it then goes on to impact at the molecular and cellular and tissue level. But I can't prove that. There's got to be a lot more work to show that.

But certainly, I think that looking at life as an energy field is a viable way of understanding life, just as viewing it as a molecular organism is yet another way. And the two ways are really complementary. In physics, we have the view of the photon as a particle of energy, and also as a wave of energy, the particle wave duality of quantum theory.

And we can take that now into quantum biology and say on the one hand, life is a bunch of biomolecules. That's the classical chemical view. And on the other hand, it's a coherent field. And something has to tie it

all together. I don't see how the DNA does that. What ties it all together in a coherent way? It's the biofield, in my view.

Josh: Yea, thank you. So, you are very well respected within academia. And we talked about your work with the NIH and the other agencies. What do you say when your critics will say about you that you are practicing pseudo-science or trying to minimize your credibility because it's not their brand of science? How do you respond to that?

Beverly: Well, you know, I haven't heard those words out of anybody in many years. But in the past, I would say I am working on a new paradigm of life that goes beyond just looking at life as a bag of biomolecules. And I'm looking to see how the mind interacts with the energy, which then interacts with the flesh and blood. And all of that is very important, because we are conscious beings. And consciousness has been left out of conventional science.

And that's especially serious in biology and medicine, where the mind has got to have a big role. I mean we see that in the healing of amazing cases, when people shift their mind and go on to have spontaneous remissions, or use visualization. And so, we know the power of consciousness, at least in its early stages. I think we need to cultivate that and really understand it more and utilize it in our medicine.

But in any case, I think that there is an unfolding paradigm that's much greater than the conventional view. And I haven't heard those words seriously criticizing my work in many decades. I see this paradigm making headway in science. And many young people are quite interested in doing dissertation research in this area. And that's a very good thing. The paradigm moves on.

As one scientist put it, "Science advances funeral by funeral." That was Max Planck. And he was one of the fathers of quantum theory. And it just reminds us how difficult it was to introduce quantum ideas over a hundred years ago. That was radical. And today, we're introducing ideas of an energy body, of a biofield, and also being impacted by extremely subtle fields in our environment.

Josh: Okay, good. Well, let's dive into the blood cell analysis work that you've done, the live blood cell analysis. And we're going to show those two slides on the screen here, Beverly. So, talk us through. What are we looking at here, and how are these effects caused?

Beverly: Well, first let me say what is the design of the study. So, this study had ten subjects, ranging in age from twenty-seven to seventy-five years old. And first, they had to have very good-looking blood. So, they actually were eating a very, very good diet, because initially, if their blood didn't look good, I couldn't use them in the study. And most of

them were cell phone users, about eighty-percent. I did the study about five years ago.

And I first took an initial blood test from the fingertip, a drop of their blood placed on a microscope slide under a dark field microscope. And there you see at the baseline, in the upper left-hand corner, how the blood looks initially, without any exposure to cell phones. In this study, they had to fast and refrain from use of Wi-Fi or cell phones for four hours before they came to see me in the study. And then, after the baseline tests, I presented them with a cellphone, a smartphone running on 4G, that was turned on. But they did not make a call. They wore it in a backpack for forty-five minutes. The phone was in readiness mode to receive a call or text, but it did not.

And then I took another blood test. And in this case, you see there were changes in the blood, as shown in the upper right hand of the photographs. The red blood cells became sticky and stuck together in what we call rouleaux, or rolls, like looking at the edge of a roll of nickels. And with this, the peripheral blood circulation is compromised. The blood cells actually have to scrunch down in order to go through the tiniest microcapillaries in the body.

And so, when the blood is like this, it can't. So, microcirculation is compromised. Not only did I look at fingertip blood, because in some cases they were holding the phone later, I looked at blood from the toe, as far away as possible, and found the same stuck-together red blood cells. And after the second condition, which I call the carrying condition, then I had them use the phone for an additional forty-five minutes. They went online, on the internet. And they also placed the phone near the head for two five-minute phone calls.

And at the end of forty-five minutes, I took a third sample of blood and found even further disturbing changes in the blood, as shown in the bottom photograph. Now the cells were broken apart from the rouleaux. But they were distorted. The membranes showed shape changes, and in many cases were spikey and appeared like bottle caps or a spikey-like sea urchin. In fact, in hematology, these spikey cells are called echinocytes, after the echinoderm, the sea urchin. And they're not a healthy sign in hematology. This is a sign, again, of compromised peripheral blood circulation.

So, these are short-term changes due to, say, a ninety-minute exposure to cell phone radiation. But that's a small part of the day. And people are using these cell phones throughout the day, as we know, and also exposed to Wi-Fi and innumerable sources from the environment, which is going to be magnified if 5G is installed.

So, we have a lot to think about in terms of effects, not only on the

biofield, but on the blood. And I must also add that both of these tests that I've been doing, the biofield testing, as well as this microscopic view of live blood, are tests done by holistic or integrative practitioners who are assessing health and wellness. And when we see changes like this, we know that people are moving away from high-level health and wellness.

Josh: So, your studies are predominantly on 4G, correct?

Beverly: Yes.

Josh: What do you predict will happen with 5G?

Beverly: Well, for one thing, they're not getting rid of 1, 2, 3, or 4G. They're adding more. And not only are they adding more in the form of higher frequencies, they're adding a plethora, a huge number of so-called small-cell antennas all over the place, in our residential areas and everywhere, between two-hundred and a thousand feet, I understand, because these waves are blocked by water and vegetation, etc. So, they have to have many more antennas in place.

And in addition to that, they're planning on some twenty-thousand satellites up in the lower earth orbit, also producing various band frequencies of 5G and blasting the Earth. So, there's not going to be a place free of these frequencies as there is now. I mean you can go in nature now and be away from these frequencies largely, especially in national parks, I've noticed. So, I'm expecting more debilitating effects, both on the blood and the biofield as a result of this.

And it's really hard to predict. We don't know. Even though there are a lot of studies out there, and some of them have come from the military, because some of these bands of 5G have been used by the military, not only in radar, but in certain non-lethal weapons. I understand 95 GHz was used in the Active Denial weapon. So, perhaps there is knowledge from the military that we don't know.

But I heard a number of declassified documents, as well as papers from all over the world, showing and predicting effects from these radar band frequencies, which are not healthy. I would expect not only changes in the blood and biofield, but increased changes neurologically. Those are the things I am especially afraid of.

And we know that 5G will impact the skin and be absorbed by it. And the skin, of course, is one of the most important organs, and linked to the nervous system profoundly. And not only that, but in terms of receiving radiation, it's controlling a lot of our metabolism. So, I expect very dire consequences of 5G, if indeed it is installed. And I think we need to give this all a second thought.

There are a lot of studies already out there. And we need to reconsider this before we rush into installing this widespread.

And I think the fiber-optics would a logical alternative. I know it's expensive. And maybe we could not run things like self-driving cars. But we could run technology in homes and schools and industry with fiber-optics alone. And so, I would vote for that.

I know we need to continue expanding the technology and making sure everybody is connected. It's a global world now. And I'm not for throwing out our technology. But I'm for safe technology.

Josh: Yea, Dr. Timothy Schoechle on the summit, one of the things he talks about is the self-driving cars, and how even for those who see value and desire a self-driving car scenario, you really don't need 5G. You don't need instantaneous wireless communication from car to car. That's not necessary for self-driving cars. So, that's interesting.

Also, you mentioned Active Denial technology operating at 95 GHz as one of the frequencies. One of the criticisms of that is that all the intensity or power density used for weapons at that frequency is much greater than what would be used apparently for 5G. How would you answer that?

Beverly: Well, in a weapon, it's a very short-term use. But with 5G, we're talking about use around the clock, 24/7, 365 days a year. Nobody knows, really, the impact of long-term, low-level chronic exposure to these frequencies, because they've never been studied over the long term. So, we are the guinea pigs. And I think that's completely wrong. We need to have some sense of long-term chronic exposure in key experiments before we jump into this.

Josh: What hope do you see for the future for protecting people from 5G frequencies?

Beverly: Well, I've done a study. And I know there are certain numbers of technologies out there that claim to have protective effects against at least 4G, 3G, 1G, 2G, in the form of beneficial frequencies. Now, I'm also concerned that there are a lot of so-called devices on the market claiming protection that haven't shown me a peer-reviewed study by a third party. So, I brush those aside.

I did a peer-reviewed study on a technology that had some beneficial frequencies that were proprietary. I don't know what they were, and I'm not the inventor. But they showed an improvement of the autonomic nervous system balance in terms of the low frequencies and high frequencies emitted in the heart tachogram. The ratio of those frequencies is related to autonomic balance. And there was an improvement with this technology imbedded in cellphones and actually

coming over the internet.

And in this case, there were twenty subjects in my study. They were not even touching the cellphone. And yet, they showed an improvement in stress, just being say one meter or one yard away from cellphones with these positive beneficial frequencies. So, I think we have to explore, because there's no a priori theory for knowing which frequencies of this God-given electromagnetic spectrum might have beneficial effects on our health.

And certainly, it's not frequencies near the microwave oven frequency, which heats water. And one of the communication frequencies is very close to that. Heating water is not a good idea when you're seventy-percent water, which living things are. So, we need to explore what are the beneficial frequencies in the electromagnetic spectrum. And possibly we can use these for our communication frequencies. And if not, maybe embed them in our technologies to make them neutral, if not more beneficial to our health.

Josh: So, it's a multi-pronged approach. It's not exclusively mitigating through clothing and shielding. It's not just focusing on what's helpful technologies and protecting ourselves there. And it's not just trying to stop the advancement of 5G. It's all of this, and it's also spreading information, spreading awareness, making accountable our elected officials and the corporate executives. Would you agree that it's really a multi-pronged approach? And for anyone to say there's only one way to solve this problem, we might be cutting ourselves short, right?

Beverly: Oh, I certainly agree with a multi-pronged approach. And I think our leadership needs to listen very carefully to the scientists and medical people and the experts, and not just the industry who has profit motives above and beyond everything. And I'm frankly quite disgusted looking at the FCC. It seems to me it's a captured agency. It's captured by the industry. It's totally bending over backwards to serve whatever the industry says.

And yet the FCC is not an expert in health and wellness or the environment. So, we're losing a lot by allowing this small agency to dictate to us what is to be done. And that's my understanding, that they've made rulings back in 2018 that the federal government is moving forward. And local governments can't say very much about health and the environment, only about aesthetic issues. This is ridiculous. It's disempowering the purpose of local governments, the welfare and well-being of their constituents.

I also think prudent avoidance is very important to avoid chronic exposure, ongoing exposure, because we know that affects our cumulative. Just as with radioactive sources, you would not want a

constant bombardment of x-rays. You go to the dentist and you're shielded with a lead apron. And you want to work with shielding, too, perhaps for your home and for your body with protective clothing, and with sleeves to encase your cellphone so that it's not emitting if you're putting it in your pocket.

So, there are many things that we need to consider. And also, not least and not last, putting your cellphone on airplane mode, which really turns them effectively off, not even communicating with satellites, GPS. So, people need to take into account all of these ways to survive and thrive, if we're to move forward with this technology.

But I think we really have to revision this technology before we put it out. Unfortunately, our welfare was not taken into account. The profit motives were, it seems to me. And it's a race between Asia and the United States, so says President Trump. And that's a very short-sighted thing, because it's a race towards shooting yourself in the foot, in my opinion.

Josh: Well said. Within this summit, Dr. Timothy Schoechle talks about and he lays out how we do the wired solution. And also with the summit, Theodora Scarato and several others talk about the rights that local governments do have, and the strategies being used by local governments, both in the United States and can be applied in other countries to turn the tables, to basically fight back effectively against the FCC or whomever a country's governing agency is.

And they're having results. There are a lot of cities that are standing up and getting involved. In April of 2019, you may have remembered this. There was a California Supreme Court ruling affirming their opinion that San Francisco, and thereby any other city, has much more power than the traditional understanding that the FCC would like us to remain under, which is that local governments and people don't have any power. It's just all there.

So, even the supreme courts of states are encouraging us to not buy into the idea of being disempowered, to really think creatively, get together as communities, communities and local government coming together and solving this problem through education, through awareness, through holding our elected reps accountable. Not just informing them, though that has to come first, but holding them accountable.

So, yes, it's very encouraging I think in the bigger picture. But at this present time, I mean there are times where you just feel like it's an existential crisis, right? I mean whether it's 5G or like Monsanto or what's happening in the air or the water or the whole political system and just the division, the divide and conquer.

Do you have any practical suggestions here as we move towards finishing this conversation that people could use to move through this time of, you could say, compression or deep challenge that we experience individually and collectively?

Beverly: Well, I think it's helpful to work locally. But also think how we can connect these local organizational efforts, speaking out against this instillation of 5G, how we can connect to make a larger organized effort to speak out. That's something that concerns me, because I think that all the little efforts being made aren't sufficient.

So, we need to move forward locally, but then connect more globally to say, "No, it's not time to roll this out. It's time to rethink it before we roll it out." Because once it's rolled out, I fear that it's going to be very difficult for us to unroll it. So, let's work locally with our neighbors. Get them informed about what's going on. Make sure people know how to use their cellphone properly without hurting themselves. I think that's essential. And reduce their exposure to the wireless radiation as much as possible by using wired. Whatever happened to that?

And finally, connecting with larger groups to make an effort to stop this, because locally, I don't think we're going to manage, given the dictums from the federal government and beyond, who have made rulings that we only have so much power to handle aesthetics and placement. And this seems ridiculous. And I know there are lawsuits going on. But those lawsuits may drag out for a long time, as lawsuits tend to do. So, how can we take our local efforts combined to make a larger organized rebuttal? That's the question that I'll leave everyone with, because somehow that needs to happen. I don't have the answer.

Josh: Yea, very good. And just for the viewer out there, I would encourage you strongly, whether it's this talk or other talks by other amazing speakers in the summit, please send this out to your contact list, to your email list, to your social media list. Share this information with your friends and your family and your colleagues.

And what you're saying Beverly is that's the foundation, spreading the awareness, spreading the information, spreading the encouragement, that we are coming together and being the change. We're figuring this out together. We're open sourcing this. And we're coming together to do this paradigm shift that you speak of in your science so wonderfully. Any final thoughts for our viewers?

Beverly: Well, maybe this is the issue on which real global governance, by the people, for the people, and of the people will really happen. I hope so.

Josh: Beverly, you, as I understand, are involved in the development

of a new technology to measure the frequencies, measure the 5G frequencies. Is that correct? Is a new device being developed that you're a part of, too? Because currently, I mean it costs ten-thousand dollars or more to measure these high GHz frequencies. And so, those testing devices are not in the hands of everyday people. Can you tell us more about that?

Beverly: Well, my understanding is, from what I've discovered, the measurement devices for the 5G millimeter wave frequencies are tremendously expensive. You can pay a hundred-thousand dollars, up to a quarter-million dollars, if you really want to measure this, because it's military grade. And so, there's nothing on the market. Nobody is going to be able to assess what is the level in their neighborhood or their home, unlike 4G, where you can buy a small handheld, two-hundred dollar or less meter to assess the 4G bands.

So, this is a tremendous problem, because we're going to have to rely on just a handful of experts to measure that. And so, yes, I'm involved in an endeavor to try to make a simple device that we can measure at least some of these bands of 5G as we move into the millimeter range.

Josh: Excellent. And what's the estimated price point, do you expect, the range of costs that it could be once this device is ready?

Beverly: Well, I'm not certain yet. But let me say that we're in need of further funding to make this happen. We're in an early stage. Just procuring the equipment to produce the frequencies is very expensive. And we've procured most of those devices that make the 5G frequencies. And now I can't really predict the costs of this device. But we're hoping that would be less than one-thousand dollars.

Josh: Well, very good. That is tremendous news. That will be a very valuable device. And so, please do keep me and my viewers posted upon that.

Dr. Beverly Rubik, I just want to thank you for your work in the world, your pioneering efforts, everything you're doing, and your wisdom and information that you're sharing with us by coming on the summit today. Thank you.

Beverly: Thank you, Josh. It's my pleasure.

Informed Consent: Who Owns Your Body?

Guest: Ty and Charlene Bollinger

Josh: Joining us on the summit today are Ty and Charlene Bollinger, famous for and best known for “The Truth About Cancer” docu-series. Ty and Charlene, welcome. And I’m so glad that you could join us today.

Charlene: Thank you, Josh, for having us.

Ty: Thanks, Josh. I appreciate it. Looking forward to the conversation.

Charlene: Yes.

Josh: Absolutely. So, I’ll just share before we dive right in. I’ll share with the audience a little bit about your background. Most of our audience are already going to be aware. But for those who aren’t yet, Ty and Charlene Bollinger are documentary film producers, best-selling authors and leaders in the field of natural healing.

After losing several family members to cancer, including Ty’s mother and father, they refused to accept the notion that chemotherapy, radiation, and surgery were the most effective treatments available for cancer patients. Their quest to learn about alternative cancer treatments and the medical industry is powerfully documented in their series, “The Truth About Cancer.” They have since produced “The Truth About Vaccines,” followed by “Eastern Medicine—Journey Through Asia.” And their work has reached more than twenty-million people worldwide.

So, thank you, first of all, for just being so courageous and bold and just putting your faith in action to get everything that you’ve done out into the world. I really appreciate that.

Ty: You know, Josh, it’s our mission to educate. So, we appreciate the kind words. But it really goes way back to twenty-plus years ago when all

of this started for us. I'll let Charlene share a little bit about why we do what we do. I figure your audience will probably be interested in that. But it's very personal to us. Please.

Charlene: Absolutely. For Ty and myself, we had this storybook romance, perfect love. He's my brave heart. We fell in love immediately. And six months later to the very day of our first date, we were married. Even on our honeymoon, we were living the perfect, most wonderful, happy life. And we go back home, and we just can't believe how happy we are and how good everything is going.

And six months into our marriage was when his father was diagnosed with cancer. We took him to the emergency room thinking that he had gallstones. And they opened him up and found stomach cancer. The doctors two hours into that surgery came out to us in tears and said, "It's cancer. It's so advanced, and he's so young."

This is over twenty years ago, and all we knew when we heard the word cancer was, "Oh, no, he's going to die," because that's what we were programmed to believe. We knew nothing but that. We knew there was chemo, radiation, and surgery. And, of course, we were offered chemotherapy. It didn't give us much hope, but we weren't interested in chemotherapy even then in doing research.

But within twenty-five days later, Ty's precious father died. And it wasn't from the cancer. It was from the surgery. He bled to death. And back then, we thought it was the cancer, because we were ignorant. We believed what the doctor said. And so, six months later, we lost his father's father, and then his father's brother to conventional cancer treatments, and his cousin, too. And then three years later, we lost his father's mother, and then her father.

Ty: Mother-in-law.

Charlene: Yea, my mother-in-law, Ty's mom, in 2004. And that was it. That was the straw that broke the camel's back. We had been researching all the years from 1996 to 2004 about how to heal our body. So, in 2004, we realized we had to get into action. We had to write this stuff in a book, get it out in the world, and save lives.

We knew that we needed to reach every man, woman, boy, and girl around and say, "Look, there are options outside of the big three." So, in 2006, we published our first book, *Cancer: Step Outside the Box*. And it went to the top of the charts. We did really well with selling it. And it was theory for us back then, but it's still evidenced-based information.

In 2014 was when we started making our documentaries. Today, we have lots of testimonies of people that read the book or now watch our documentary that helped them understand what they could do. They were sent home to die, a lot of them, by conventional doctors, who don't have this information either, but today are alive and cancer-free due to the information. That's like all of our dreams coming true.

So, we realized the value of losing our closed loved ones and then putting this information out into the world. Really, it's beauty from ashes. From our ash-heap of tragedy and death, we've been able to produce a life-giving product and information into the world. And now people are alive as a result of our suffering, our research, and now our work. And it's a joy. We couldn't look at ourselves in the mirror and do anything else. We know the information. We can't unknow it. So, now we get to bring it to the world.

Josh: Wow! Isn't it amazing? Before we dive here into cancer and 5G and sort of the related conversation, we're going to go, I think, pretty deep here. Isn't it amazing how the areas in which we're challenged the most, if we just persevere and have faith, those are often the areas that we can be such a conduit or channel of blessing in the world?

Charlene: Yes, absolutely. I think it is through our deepest valleys that we are stretched the most and we use to the great capacity to help mankind. And it is a blessing that what looks like hopelessness, despair, really is life on a massive scale. So, yea, those lemons turned into lemonade, for sure.

Josh: Wow! So, in your work in exposing and covering all of this, both the solutions and system of how it works, what have you learned in terms of the harm that can ensue when big corporate interests put profits before people.

Ty: Well, you know, Josh, the harm that can ensue is pretty much limitless when corporations put profits before people. And that's what we've seen over the last hundred years, at least, probably longer. But it's very well documented over the last hundred years here in the United States, specifically in the area of medicine. You can talk about big tobacco, and you can talk about things corporations knew were harming people, and they didn't talk about it because of profits.

Big tobacco is a great example. The doctors knew, the scientists knew. They knew that cigarette smoke was causing lung cancer, and they didn't tell people. And tens of millions, if not more, have died of lung cancer, because corporations were silent.

But specifically in the area of medicine, when we're putting profits above people, then it's really unfathomable what the amount of harm that's been done here in the United States over the last hundred years, because of the fact that corporations are trying to make money, pharmaceutical companies are trying to make money selling drugs, selling vaccines, you name it, selling their products.

When it comes to vaccines, they have not been proven to be safe and effective, but the CDC requires them. A lot of the pharmaceutical drugs that the FDA approves may kill. A hundred-thousand people a year in the United States die from drugs that have approved. So, when we talk about the damage that has been done, it's probably hard to calculate the amount of damage that has been done because pharmaceutical

companies and other companies are putting profits above people.

Charlene: Yea, that was one of the first things that Ty and I were researching and could not connect the dot on. We saw that the people that were running the medical machine—sometimes we call the medical mafia—they knew what they were doing. And it was total greed. But we thought, “How could you be that greedy, to willingly allow people to die, and to even cause their death for money?”

And so, the deeper we dove into this information researching, the more we realized it’s more than just greed. It’s an evil agenda. And we have an enemy in the spiritual realm that’s working against us. And he came to kill, steal, and destroy. He’s using the medical system to do that. And so, what we’re doing is on the opposite end of the spectrum. And we’re infusing the world with the light of truth, which truly does set us free. “You shall know the truth, and the truth shall set you free.”

So, that’s what we do. We have been infusing the darkness with the light of the truth, which then ignites life. So, there’s a spiritual warfare going on. And we’re fighting dark forces of very evil of epic proportions. And that darkness is growing. But the light is really being fanned into such a beautiful blaze right now, because so many people really are waking up. And that’s why there’s so much censorship.

Ty was featured on the Today Show. And he did a hit piece of vaccines. They had no science on their side, no facts. They just had talking points. And people believe them because they don’t know the truth. So, they’re trying to make an appearance of Ty and I are brainwashing people. And we have a lot of followers, and it’s dangerous. That’s the talking point. It’s vaccine hesitancy. That’s the new talking point.

And they’re scared. We have them scared, because people are waking up. And so, they have to do whatever they can to discredit the messenger, because they cannot discredit the message, because the message is truth. And the truth, no matter which way you come at it, is still the truth.

Josh: Yea. On your website, thetruthaboutcancer.com, you’ve posted, you’ve written about micro-radiation, millimeter-wave radiation. How do you see 5G? You’ve been studying this. We’ve been talking about this before our call here. But how big of a risk do you see this? And how do you relate it to other agendas that you’ve already exposed?

Ty: Well, Josh, 5G is basically a big giant experiment on humanity. That’s kind of the way that we see it. It’s interesting. When you look at the 2G, 3G, 4G, these types of radiation, they use a frequency that’s anywhere between 1 and 5 GHz. Okay, when you think of radiation, damage is done based upon at least two different characteristics of the radiation. It’s based upon the intensity and the frequency.

Before 5G, you had 4G. The frequency was anywhere between 1 and 5 GHz. 5G uses anywhere between 30 and 300 GHz. So, we’re talking about anywhere between six to twenty times, if my math is right,

between six and twenty times—no, between 6 and sixty times what we're using right now. Okay, we don't know what that's going to do.

But we have seen what 4G and 3G have done. There was a study that was done in London back in the early 1990s. And this was before we even had 3G or 4G. This was when cell phones were brand new. And people that had a cell phone, they were like huge football-looking cell phones. They were enormous. And cell phones were just coming around.

But they looked at the people in this one particular apartment complex in London that was on the top floor. And they were right by the cell tower. And they found out that over a couple of years that they watched these people that those people had ten times the rate of cancer that the rest of London did. And this is before 2G and 3G and 4G. This isn't the first wave of radiation from cell phones.

The thing that's scary about 5G is that with millimeter-wave radiation, it's a much smaller wave. And it doesn't really penetrate through objects well. And so, they're saying now that they're going to have to install many towers, every three hundred meters. Now you have cell phone towers every few miles, maybe; in the big cities, every half-mile or every quarter mile. But in order for 5G to work, they've got to have many towers every few hundred meters, which is like every five houses or every six hours. I mean, it's insane.

So, there's going to be a mini-tower really close to you, no matter where you are, if you're in a 5G area. And so, because of that, and because of the fact that radiation damage is due to proximity to the radiation and due to the intensity of the radiation, we're going to all be closer. If you're in a 5G area, you're going to be much closer.

So, the proximity is closer. And the intensity is higher, and the frequency is higher. So, it's like worst of all worlds when it comes to 5G. You're closer to the source. The source is more intense, and the source uses a higher frequency. We don't even know the damage that it will do.

I mean, we do know there was in Italy what's called the Ramazzini study. They looked at about 2500 Sprague-Dawley rats, which by the way, the Sprague-Dawley rats are the same rats that Monsanto used to study GMO corn. It's the same type of rats. But they looked at about 2500 Sprague-Dawley rats, and they exposed them to much lower radiation than we're being exposed to and we're being told is safe, much lower.

They found it was causing heart cancer in the rats. And heart cancer is almost unheard of. You don't find much heart cancer. It's very, very rare. But they found out that this low-chronic exposure to the very low levels of radiation caused heart cancer in rats. We're a giant experiment with 5G, and we don't what the results will be. And that's kind of the scary part.

Josh: Yea. In this summit, we talked with Dr. Ronald Melnick, who designed the NTP study, that twenty-eight to thirty-million-dollar study

that was initiated by the FDA. The FDA asked for it in the late 1990s. And they concluded cancer and other very serious results from this.

And so, for the full story on that, I would just encourage everyone to watch that conversation with Dr. Ronald Melnick. He talks about how once they came out with the results of that study, the FDA just said, "No, we don't want to deal with those results. We're not going to do a risk assessment. They're not applicable to human beings," which is crazy.

Ty: Josh, let me add this real quick. Here's where the amount of radiation that the scientists in Italy used for the Ramazzini study was much lower than the NTP study. So, the NTP study showed heart cancers and other, I think brain tumors. But the Ramazzini study now is much lower than that study. And this is just from a year ago. And they're showing it at even much lower levels, cancer of the heart, brain tumors, and so forth.

Josh: Yea, yea. Thank you for that. And in the summit, we also talked to Dr. Devra Davis and Sayer Ji and others, who talked about the independent science that already has been done on millimeter-wave radiation. Meanwhile, the industry is saying, "We're not doing any studies. We don't want to do any studies. We're not going to fund. We're just going to push it forward." How significant of a role do you think wireless plays in causing cancer, based upon all the cumulative research that you've done so far?

Ty: Yea, that's kind of a tough question, because it's such a new phenomenon, the exposure to this electromagnetic radiation that we're producing, in other words, the cell phone radiation and so forth. So, anything that we would be say would be just kind of a guess. What we can say is that we've consistently preached over the years that cancer results from a lack of nutrition, a deficiency of nutrition, coupled with an overburden of toxicity.

And so, in that toxicity, it's just within the last couple of decades that it's not just car exhaust that we're talking about. It's not just toxicity that can be caused from inhaling cigarette smoke. It's not just toxicity maybe from pesticides on food. Now we have this invisible toxicity that we would consider to be this radiofrequency, the electromagnetic radiation, cell phone radiation, however you want to call it. That's part of that toxicity that can result in cancer.

And I honestly think, and I think Charlene does as well, that this exposure to this invisible radiation, this invisible toxicity, the wireless radiation, this could dwarf the danger from all the other toxicities combined. For instance, with your diet, if you don't want to eat conventional produce and you want to buy organic produce, well then you go buy organic produce, and you're not eating the pesticides, right? If you want to stay away from the additives in the water, you know the fluoride, the chlorine, and so forth, you get a filter, and you can eliminate that. If you don't want to inhale cigarette smoke, then you don't smoke.

But you can't not be exposed to radiation when you're out and about,

unless you have certain devices that can minimize that. We can talk about those.

But I think because of the fact that it's ubiquitous and you're almost at the invisible mercy of the electromagnetic waves, and especially in big cities, which is one of the reasons that we live out in the country. But you're always being exposed. It's chronic exposure 24/7. And so, I think that in the end, it could be way worse than all the other toxicities. We just don't know at this point.

Charlene: Yea, I just want to add to what Ty is saying. And I talked to you, Josh, that there are some remedies. You can get something in your home to mitigate that Wi-Fi, the EMF, so that if it becomes visible or not, it does affect your body. I also have something I put in my purse, and I told you about that. I still need to get you those leads. So, you've got, Josh, follow-up with that. That's my action item here.

But also, I agree with Ty that EMF and the frequencies are really damaging, and 5G is horrific. And we need to wake up. And I think it's great that you have a call to action, what to do, who to get a hold of, in the government, in city, local, and statewide and federal levels. So, we certainly need to do that, to do all we can in activism to stop this.

There's also a big concern of ours, the vaccine program, pushing vaccines. That's another thing that's an outside force that they're forcing on people. And we should be able to opt out. We should have a choice. And so, we have choices taken away, whether it's vaccines, which are very damaging. It's an injection into your body. And those are very damaging toxins in those vaccines. And then the EMF, you couple those things together, those two things together, and that's a nightmare.

So, what we're seeing with the 5G and when they rolled it out in Europe, we see that there are stillbirths, depression, anxiety, sleeplessness, all kinds of things happening. It affects some people more than others. Why is that? It's because the individuals, some are more toxic than others. So, we have to all collectively get together and learn how to be healthy, because we are living in a very unhealthy world, unhealthy food, and so many things around us.

How do we deal with sicknesses when we get them? Are we dealing with those sicknesses with toxins? Or are we dealing with those sicknesses with natural remedies. So, there's a lot to the whole picture and the scope. Why do some get sick from this and why do others not? The bottom line is, some people are actively working on their health. And so, things like that don't affect them as quickly as the one that has no understanding or concern about the toxicities that are going into their body, that they're putting there themselves.

Josh: Yea. We talked to Dr. Klinghardt in this summit, and he talks about the link between wireless and vaccines, the metals in the vaccines, and how they work synergistic to our detriment. And he mentioned, when you brought up vaccines, it made me start thinking about the

commonality between the vaccine program and 5G. It's violating informed consent. How important is informed consent, that we draw a line upon it as humanity, and we preserve that basic fundamental right.

Charlene: Well, it is a fundamental right. You hit the nail on the head there. It's not a right that any government can or cannot give to you. It's not something that they can take away. It's a right given to us by God. The founding fathers in America just reiterated that in the Constitution. They said these are rights given to you by God. But here it is in law. And so, we do have the right.

And one of the framers of the Constitution warned us that if you don't write medical freedom into law, you will soon have medical tyranny. It's kind of where we are today. Now, it goes against the principles of freedom, the natural God-given principles, but also the principles of freedom written in America, into our Constitution and into our law. They are pretty much taking our Constitution and slowly shredding it bit by bit. Our freedoms are being taken.

And it's the mass media that they control. They own and control our thought processes and our belief systems. So, basically, from the time we're born, we're saturated in their agenda that they put out through the mass media and through the education program. It's all connected, the system of doctors, the medical system. Children go to preschool now, and pre-preschool. They're always learning this agenda.

So, with people like us, they're facing people like us, especially college kids today who have gone all the way through this indoctrination. Then they hear what we say, and they're programmed. They don't even have time to think. There's no logic. There's no critical thinking. There's just a reaction. They've been taught to react. "Well, that's conspiracy theory. Those people are kooks. That's crazy."

But they're not realizing that their thoughts didn't come from their own hearts. They didn't utilize critical thinking or logic. That's been stolen from them. They're just parrots now. So, what we are trying to do is infuse the world with the information that has been taken from them on purpose, so that they can once again think.

It's like *The Matrix*. In *The Matrix* we see that people are pulled into this system and beliefs. But remember *The Matrix*, there's a guy that's on the outside that he's eating his steak, and he's saying, "Now, I know this steak is not real; but man, it looks good and it tastes good. I'm going to take it."

And that is what is happening somewhat in this world. The indoctrination has been so successful, that we have a whole generation of kids growing up believing the lies. But we're seeing a really healthy, wonderful trend in the really young kids who are in high school who seem to be going back to roots and principles of freedom and truth, and they're researchers. So, that to us is very encouraging. We have a lot of kids that follow us and love what we're doing. They're educating their

friends. So, there's a new wave of truth hitting the world. And that is encouraging.

Ty: Yea, and Josh, let me address that as well. I want to hit informed consent specifically with vaccines and with radiation. Informed consent is the cornerstone of medicine. It's supposed to be the cornerstone of medicine, right?

So, specifically with vaccines, when you have physicians that are injecting children with vaccines and the parents are not given informed consent, it violates the very cornerstone that the medical profession has been built upon. In other words, you don't have doctors letting parents of children that are getting the MMR vaccine know that this has been shown to cause increased rates of autism. They're not told that. There's no informed consent. It violates the very foundation of medicine.

And when it comes to 5G and radiation and to the cell phone towers, like I said from the beginning, we are a giant medical experiment. There is no informed consent. We are not told, if you live in a large city. Like for instance, they're rolling out 5G in Dallas and Atlanta right now and other cities as well. They have not been told exposure to 5G radiation is at much higher frequencies than you've ever been exposed to before. And studies have shown that this may cause cellular damage that result in cancer and so forth. They're not given informed consent. So, by definition, in a society where we're not given informed consent, by definition we are a medical experiment.

And so, therefore, that violates the Nuremberg Code. The Nuremberg trials put on trial the war criminals in Nazi Germany that performed medical experiments on prisoners. And the rulings at Nuremberg were that it violates what they codified as the Nuremberg Code, if you experiment with medicine on people without telling them that you're medicating them and without telling them of the potential negative consequences.

That is why with 5G, that is why with vaccines, it's not just a giant medical experiment, it directly violates the Nuremberg Code, which if I understand it correctly, it governs the entire world, not just the United States. It's a worldwide code that the countries agreed to after World War 2. We won't violate this.

But we are. We're violating it every time we vaccinate someone without telling them that you could be permanently damaged by this or you might die. And we're violating it every time that we roll out another 5G tower without telling the citizens, "You may get cancer because of this."

Charlene: And so, I just want to jump on to what Ty is saying. He's absolutely right. But that's why what you're doing, Josh, is so important. That's why we do what we do, because we're not getting informed consent. We haven't gotten informed consent for quite a long time. It's not a new thing. It's been going on for centuries.

Government is doing whatever they feel like. And they're controlling

people, and they've got an agenda. They don't tell us about the agenda. They meet with each other. We've got the world leaders coming together annually meeting on this agenda and then rolling it out in their own countries. But they're not telling us about it. So, what do we do?

Well, we have to educate people, because it is so successful at seeping us into their system by indoctrination and their education. I put that in loose terms. It's schooling. We educate our children. School is an institution where you're indoctrinated into the government system. That's what it is. And they're very successful at schooling kids. And so, you have a lot of disciples. Their disciples are everywhere.

So, what we're doing is we're undoing the damage. We're educating them. And we're getting the truth out there. We need to reach our legislators. Not all legislators are there. A lot of them are bought and paid for. You know that. But there are some that are not, and we need to reach those ones in order to make a difference.

But it's like that movie, "A Bug's Life," I think, where the grasshopper throws down a pebble onto one of other grasshoppers and says, "Did that hurt?" And he's like, "Oh yea!" He said, "What about this?" And he throws a whole big giant pile of gravel and pretty much kills him. And he said, "That's what it's going to be if the ants find out what we're doing. They'll come and they'll get us."

And the truth of the matter is, there are so many more people, good people on this Earth, that if they knew the truth, they would band together and do what's good for humanity. And so, Josh, we really appreciate you putting this summit together to help people understand the dangers of 5G, because that's on the biggest, if not the biggest danger, coupled with vaccines, that we know to humanity across the globe. It's no certain language. It's everywhere.

Josh: Yea. Okay, so many people, including myself, would like to believe that President Trump and his administration are fighting for the people. They're not just in the pocket of corporate profiteers. In light of this, what is you guys' perspective on Trump and his administration as apparently 5G, pushing for American control of 5G, calling it "a safer 5G," but doing nothing to say, "Whoa, whoa, whoa! We need to slow down and look at the science." They're calling for kind of an arms race to win the race of 5G against China.

Ty: Well, I'll chime in first and then you can follow up. One of the things we try to do is to be intellectually honest, no matter what the subject. So, we have been Trump supporters, because we believe that he does love the country and is trying to do what is best. And we don't believe that he's been bought and paid for like a lot of politicians.

With that being said, I'm very, very disappointed in his position on 5G. It's not a safer 5G. It's not a better 5G. It's 5G. And so, I don't know what is fueling his desire. And I'm sure there are corporate interests that are involved. There's probably a lot of U. S. pride involved, wanting to be

the first to be able to say that we're 5G. I don't what all is involved, but I'm very disappointed in that. Much like one of the things that Trump mentioned when he was running was doing more studies on vaccines to make sure they're safer for our kids. And then at first he had Bobby Kennedy as his, what was the position?

Charlene: You know, like a vaccine czar.

Ty: Yea, vaccine czar, the head of that.

Charlene: Safety, vaccine safety.

Ty: Yea. But then was kind of disbanded. And so, on both of those areas, I'm very disappointed in the direction that he's heading, and I wish that he would reevaluate, especially when it comes to 5G. So, you know, I still have supported him in many areas and still think that he's trying to do what's best for the country. But those are areas where I'm just not in favor of his position on those, and I'm very disappointed.

And I think we can use this kind of as an object lesson. We would admonish or encourage people that are watching to try to be intellectually honest with what's going on and not be so staunch as to have an R or a D next to your name, that everything your guy does is great and everything that they do is bad, because that's just not the way things shake out. There are some good things that people do, and there are some bad things that people do.

And we think a lot of the problems that are caused today in our country is because people are so intellectually dishonest. And they either love somebody so much or they hate somebody so much that all of their judgements are warped by support or hatred towards a certain person, as opposed to let's just see what they're actually doing. And we can support the good stuff, and we can oppose the bad stuff.

Charlene: Yea. And I could also add with Trump, we see a lot of evidence that he's not bought and paid for. He's got a lot of opposition by the machine. He is draining the swamp. He's been very successful. But like Ty said, in this area, we just have to wonder, "What is he doing? What is he thinking?" Of course, as President of the United States, he's got his hands in everything.

I mean, as CEO of our company, there's a lot that goes into that. And I have to know everything. And if I don't know everything, so, I have to trust people. I've got advisors that come to me and tell me what's going on in their department. So, I think that there's a possibility there that Trump has got advisors, and he doesn't have time.

I have doctors who say, "Not all doctors are corrupt. Most doctors that we know are fantastic. But they do not have the time to research the medical system. So, they're depending on the ones that are giving them information: the textbooks, the journals. They don't write or do research, but they are depending on these things. And they don't know that it's corrupt.

So, I suspect that with Trump, right now his advisors are giving him all of the benefits. Like Ty said, all of this patriotism. "You're a patriot, Trump. We're going to be America first. Make America great," and all this tag-on. So, that's just our assumption.

I would love to get this information to Trump. I would love the Trump administration, Donald Trump specifically, to see this information. There's a firewall. We have people from the inside of the Trump organization that used to be able to reach Trump that can no longer reach him.

There's literally a firewall around Trump where the people that used to be able to reach him for truth and goodness on vaccines and Bobby Kennedy and Andy Wigfall and stuff like that, those people can't reach him anymore. So, there has been a big wall built around Trump, where we can't get to him with these important issues.

So, we encourage people to pray. And God says, "If my people who are called by My name would humble themselves, turn from their sins, and pray, then I would hear them from Heaven and I will heal their land." That is in the very fabric of the universe. And so, that's what we're doing.

You know, we're all fallible, and none of us is perfect. But in this area, Trump has got to wake up. And how can he wake up unless we help him to wake him up. And I haven't lost hope in this regard.

Josh: Very good. You mentioned educating Trump, educating doctors. Doctors don't know. They haven't been trained in the real science, the facts, in some specific areas in which there are corporate agendas. I interviewed as part of the summit, a great conversation with a guy named Raphael Mahaim, who is a politician, a statesman I would say, not a politician, in Switzerland, who actually spearheaded the first moratorium against 5G in his canton or his state.

And he specifically said, "Us elected officials, we don't know. We don't have the time to get educated on all of these topics. So, we need the people to kind of like do their job of holding us informed and accountable. That's why, if you're watching this, you're going to get an invite. It's very important that you engage your elected officials. We're going to make it super simple for you.

Also, I wanted to kind of go into, we talked about the fact that this is an experiment. 5G is an experiment, because industry is saying, "We're not doing any studies. We're pushing it anyway." But also, if you go back to the 1970s, there are already thousands of studies showing bio-effects of microwave radiation, even millimeter-wave radiation back to the 1970s. So, many people are waking up and actually questioning, "Is this being done on purpose? Is there a depopulation agenda?"

We're looking at, like you said, Charlene, the machine of a system. We're being confronted with this beast of a machine. And it seems like the machine's intention is to divide and conquer the people, right? Like you said, put an R or a D next to their name, and have people self-identify

and self-label and x out everyone that's not in their camp.

Charlene, you and I were talking about this the other day. How important is it that we rise above these artificial divides? And what can we do to dissolve those divide and conquer tactics that the other side is using?

Charlene: That's such a great question, Josh. And I've really enjoyed our conversation. We've found that you're a great guy. We appreciate the heart behind what you're doing. We know that you just really want to help humanity. And you're just a kindred spirit with us.

Our daughter, Brianna, she just graduated high school, along with my son. They graduated this year together, 2019. And when Brianna gave her graduation speech, she said just what you were saying. She exhorted the kids that were graduating and everybody in the audience. She said, "Today, we have so many labels. And you're not a label. You don't have to check off, 'Okay, I'm this, and everybody else, you're not a part of my club. Go out in the world and make a difference. Don't live by labels, but live by what's right. And God uses people. Go be used by God and do something great."

And so, we encourage people. We see as we have done our very best to educate people and help them, it's our job. We believe we were called by God to give every answer we find to the people, and let the people make the choices best for them. What works for one may not work for another. But there are lots of choices. We're all so unique and wonderfully created by our Creator.

And so, what cancer protocols, for example, what works for one may not work for another. Their body chemistry is different, and so, they need a different kind of diet or a different kind of cancer-killing protocol and so forth. What we have seen in this health realm, specifically, our leaders, some of which are our friends, are attacking us because we're teaching one of many things, one little thing that they don't understand or don't agree with.

For example, the ketogenic diet, that's a hot button right now. Some people love it. Some people have researched and understand the science. And Ty has been engaged interviewing doctors that are healing thousands and thousands of people utilizing the science in that diet, the ketogenic diet. It's starving cancer. It's healing the body. It's remarkable what's happening. Mental clarity is coming back, and so many great benefits. People are losing toxic extra fat in weeks and healing body diseases, not only cancer, but other things as well.

And we have a lot of people that follow us that utilize the keto diet, along with a few other things and heal their bodies. And it's remarkable. But we have leaders in this industry won't talk to us, because we talk about the ketogenic diet.

And I exhort everybody out there, whether you're a leader or whether you're just somebody underneath praying for the world, or you're a

mother shepherding little precious children, whatever it is, whatever station of life you're in, do not allow the enemy to come in and divide you over things that really are non-issues.

The issue is we have a machine that's working to divide us and through that division destroy us. We have to be united. These dark powers, make no mistake about it, they're united. There's no such thing behind closed doors of a Republican or a Democrat. I mean, digging on Fox News or CNN, they don't like each other.

But I know that once the camera turns off, they go out to the bar. They're drinking, toasting, and saying, "Isn't that funny. This is all on them." And they're all friends. They're playing their role. It's a big stage for them. But they're paid to do their part, to divide and to conquer, and then promised rewards, whatever those things are. But it's a sham.

If they can get together and organize and have their agendas successfully come to pass, well, our purpose is so far greater and more noble. And we have the strength of our Creator on our side, because what we're doing is right. And we are truth-bearers and light-bearers. And so, I just encourage all leaders to put aside petty differences, things that really don't matter. Think about the people that you serve and come together, so that we can together make a massive difference, a tsunami of truth.

Kids are growing up now learning and understanding the truth like never before. And the digital dark ages, because that's where we are, the digital dark ages, people are waking up. So, again, I exhort the leaders to come together. Put aside petty differences and realize that your coming together is going to save many more lives. United, we are so much stronger.

Josh: Well said. So, just kind of wrapping up here, I know you guys have to go. We're almost out of time. Whether it's on the physical plane, in terms of like a specific actions, or whether it's on the soul realm, what would you both suggest that people can specifically do in terms of action, in terms of what to do with this information, how to process the fear, perhaps, at this crucial time for humanity?

Ty: So, number one, I think the most important thing, when we were talking about 5G, right? That's why the summit is for, actual 5G. Whether we can stave off the tidal wave, or whether it comes in five years, the likelihood is it's coming.

I think that the likelihood is that 5G will be ubiquitous within the next decade. There's a hope that we can stave it off here in the United States. But realistically, I don't think that will happen.

So, I think that what we do is we prepare to be able to mitigate the damages from 5G by living a healthy lifestyle, by keeping our bodies healthy, and by becoming more well-researched on the possible devices we can use and different technologies that will become affordable to mitigate the damage. I think that's very realistic. And I think that's where

we should be heading, is to figure out what we can do to mitigate the damage of what's likely coming.

And there are good technologies. There are different types of masking technologies. There are technology products that create an electron field around your body. There are a lot of different technologies that are going to be created and developed to help to mitigate the damage that could be done from exposure to this 5G radiation. I think that's really where we should be heading.

I don't think anybody should be in a situation mentally where we've given up and say, "Oh, 5G is coming. We're doomed." I don't think that's the case at all. If 5G comes, there will be brilliant minds out there that create different devices and different technologies that allow us to mitigate the damage that's done from 5G, just like there are different technologies that allow us to protect from all other kinds of exposures.

And so, I think that's where we should head, is to educate ourselves on number one, here's the damage of 5G. Let's do keep the fight up and contact representatives and let them know that this is potentially damaging to not just us, not just you, but our children, our grandchildren, the world at large. And let's continue to contact them. And we can push this off. Maybe 5G isn't rolled out nationally. Maybe it's just in the big cities. Maybe everywhere else is safer. There's certainly that possibility.

But then also, educate ourselves as to what we can do to mitigate the damage. I think that's where a lot of our efforts should be. And I know that's where a lot of your efforts are going to be as well.

Charlene: Yea. And I could just add to that, one of the tag links that we really truly believe and try to remind people of it, is as long as there is breath there is hope. And so, no matter at the end of the day how dust settles, as long as there's breath, there's hope.

And so, we want to encourage people not to give up, not to think, like Ty said, "Oh, we're doomed. It's coming." No, do all that you can. Get a hold of your representative. And you along with so many others can really make a difference. We can push this off. That is possible.

But at the end of the day, God has a will, and His will is perfect. And we don't have to fear a thing. I mean, we have had death threats. We were chased out of the country. But you know what? And they said how they were going to kill our kids, and what they would do to them. And as a mommy, I'm like, "Don't touch my kids." If it weren't for the kids, like, come and get me.

But God released me of that fear. I know that I have a perfect Heavenly Father, who is "able to do exceedingly abundantly beyond all that I could ask or think." And if God chooses to take me out of this world because of Jesus, I know where I'm going. I'm going to Heaven. I'm going to be there forever. And in Heaven, there's not going to be 5G. It's not going to be forced vaccines. There's going to be nothing unhealthy. There's not going

to be anymore tears. That's the beginning of my real life, in Heaven.

But while I'm here, I'm a servant to my precious husband, my children, and to humanity, to deliver them the truth and do all that I can. And every day we work to do all the we can to make a difference in this world. But again, at the end of the day, I am not the one that controls the world. I can do a lot to help. And I have some amazing friends like you, Josh. And we can come together. And we can together make a difference. We can infuse the world with light.

There are many people alive today that otherwise would have died without the information that God has blessed us with. And we're so grateful for that. But we can't fret and fear over things we really have no control over. We do have control over a lot, but not everything. So, when all is said and done, if we have done our very best, no matter the outcome, we can go to bed and have peaceful sleep, because we really truly did use our life for the good of humanity, for what's right.

And as the pieces fall where they may, we have peace that surpasses all comprehension. And so, that's what I encourage everyone out there. As long as you're doing your very best, enjoy your life, and just be a blessing and bloom right where you are.

Josh: Wow! Beautifully said! So, it's right action, connecting with our Creator, in service to our family and to the world, but without that attachment, without the fact that it's all on our shoulders, like it's all up to us, right?

I've been learning that, too. And Ty, you mentioned specific solutions. I just wanted to give a shout out to several conversations I had on the summit for those wanting to dive deeper.

Dr. Timothy Schoechle talks about cities and towns can get wired and how it's already happening. Larry Gust talks about mitigating, reducing the effects, the harmful effects within your home, how to have a safer home. And Terry Stotyn talks about a revolutionary new technology to cut dirty electricity or dirty power at the fundamental level. So, there are solutions.

Yes, be mindful of what's coming. No, don't go into fear and stay there. We're all doing this together. Humanity is coming together at this time. Hey, you guys. I mean like are you seeing that? It's kind of like a self-organizing tribe coming together, yea?

Ty: Yea, no doubt.

Charlene: Yea, absolutely. And the more we infuse the world, the more people we reach, the better off we all are.

Josh: Yea. Well, thank you so much, Ty and Charlene Bollinger, for your time today, for your work in the world, and just for being leaders, and just, you know, modeling faith, that faith, that trust, that it's going to work out, that we're loved in this world, in this universe, and just going forward in that love and speaking truth. So, thank you again so much.

And we look forward to hearing more about your work. Just really quickly, what's your website? Where can people follow you, and sign up for your updates?

Ty: Yea, thank you Josh. We appreciate it. We both enjoyed the conversation today. People can find us at thetruthaboutcancer.com. Sign up for our newsletter there and follow up. We have thousands of articles, and we publish articles every day.

Charlene: Yep. And we're on Facebook, "The Truth About Cancer," on Facebook. And we have another Facebook that's under fire. It's "The Truth About Vaccines Docu-series." And so, follow us on both of those pages. We're on You Tube, The Truth About Cancer, You Tube. And we have a global outreach that we do bi-weekly. There's a lot of good stuff going on there. So, you'll find it all at thetruthaboutcancer.com.

Josh: Awesome! Thank you both and enjoy the rest of your day.

Charlene and Ty: Thank you, Josh! God bless you!

EMF and New-Paradigm Physics

Guest: Tim Sandars

Josh: Einstein said you can't solve a problem with the same level of consciousness that created that problem. So today we're going to be diving into a new level of consciousness with an intention to get to the root of the problem, shift some things in our understanding, perhaps which have been misaligned over the decades. And really dive into some fun topics here. We're going to explore a new paradigm, one, which is very, very promising. And with us today is Tim Sanders, a researcher working closely with and translating for a scientist who is carrying on the work of Nikola Tesla, and who has been studying radiation for 40 years.

And Tim can speak to this new paradigm technology that is coming and even is here now. Tim says, "Without the correct founding principles and concepts in science about the atom, and what radiation is, we will never understand what is going on with microwave radiation or millimeter wave radiation and be able to reverse its health effects." So in this conversation, we're going to be talking about new level solutions, including things like light rings, toroids, electrical currents and all kinds of fun stuff. So Tim, welcome to the 5G Summit.

Tim: Thank you. Pleasure to be here.

Josh: Yeah. Before we dive in, I want to ask you; how concerned are you from a research and science perspective about 5G?

Tim: Well, it's hard to quantify, obviously, until it's here. But from all the research that we've done about how immediately 4G affects the human cell in terms of the live blood analysis, in terms of the Kinesiology. And

then obviously from all the reports that I've read, the peer reviewed on DNA strand breaks and you know, the links to cancer and Dr. Martin Paul's work about the VGCC and so on. And voltage gated calcium channels and the oxidative stress disorder that that causes. And then yeah, of course, if you turn that up by 30 to 50 times, you've got chaos. The cells are going to be what we would say vibrating in a very negative balance. Yeah, very concerned. And even more concerning is the zero dollars that's being put forward towards safety testing, which I think everyone in this debate is baffled by. So yeah, it's a worrying time. It's a strange, strange time.

I often tell a story about how, because I'm a musician, I do even music. I went to play some music in a local college. And they asked me to fill in 15 pages of health and safety checks. That was to play some music. And now we've got a \$17 trillion network out there pumping out pretty aggressive frequencies and zero dollars is being spent. So it's strange times.

Josh: Yeah. What's the perspective shift that we need to make in order to actually comprehend the problem and resolve it?

Tim: So we at Omnia through the science of Ilija Lakisevic, we believe that --

Josh: Sorry to interrupt. That's the protege. That's Nikola Tesla's sort of protege who's carrying up/following through his work, right?

Tim: That's right.

Josh: Can you say his name once again, please?

Tim: Yeah. Ilija Lakicevic.

Josh: Okay. Thank you.

Tim: Yeah. Dr. Ilija Lakicevic. Yeah. So through him, I've understood that we really need to look at everything from, as Tesla says, the perspective of energy frequency and vibration. And he's brought forward new concepts of the atom itself, and how it behaves. And in particular, how your cells in your body behave that I think, warrant a lot of attention in this debate, because we can talk a lot about the biological effects like the VGCC and so on.

But do we know why that happens? Do we know why the membrane around the cell is particularly sensitive to these electromagnetic fields? Do we know why excess calcium in the cell causes oxidative nitrosative stress? And he has the answers to those two questions. So I think that's a really important thing to consider. And so we come at it from the

perspective of looking at a cell and an understanding what it is.

And he's like, given me quite a few moments on this, because when you look at a cell under the microscope, or whatever, what you can actually see is a toroidal field, a kind of donut shape. And you can see that there's a black hole in the middle of that. And that's where he says is the zero point. So the zero point is the central point within each atom of everything whether it's a table, a human being, etc.

And what it's doing is it centering that light ring. So effectively, what we're saying is that from that zero point field, which is a magnetic field, which is actually a still charged, so there's no charge going on in that field. And from that field emanates a light ring, which constitutes the cell in your body. So it's effectively the science behind how we are actually light beings.

And that electrical current, or that light ring follows certain laws of nature. And the laws of nature that it compresses the light ring to form it, or constitute the matter in your body. And then it expands that light ring and discharges it to the ether. So it's following in rapid succession, this process of almost living and dying, living and dying, living and dying.

And that's happening in this table that my computer is on as well. But the difference between the table and me is that I have a mind moving all the atoms around in my body and making decisions and so on. So the same processes are happening, but at different frequencies. And what's interesting is the radiation is actually a natural part of that, what we call rhythmic balanced interchange between the compression and the expansion.

So radiation is kind of the expansion side to that equation. And the way I like to try illustrate that is to liken it to breathing. So you'll see that in everything that he teaches, there's a mirror, nature's mirror if you like. So when I breathe in, I breathe in prana, oxygen, life force that makes my body that makes my cells. And then when I breathe out, I breathe out discharge, toxins and heat.

So when I breathe out that stuff, that's what I've used. And it's the same with the cell, or the toroidal light ring, if you like. Pulls out the energy from the magnetic still zero point to make the ring, and then discharges it in rapid succession. So once we understand that the balance between the compression and the expansion phase of the cell is vital to human health, then we can start to look at why radiation is a different wave field to the human cell, in terms of vibration, energy, frequency, or whatever. So why is microwave radiation from phones specifically, why is that going to cause imbalance to a human cell? And that's what I'm here to tell you about; why microwave radiation is different to, for example, the sun's radiation? And then why that can harm us vibrationally?

Josh: Well, some of the, I guess, skeptics about microwave radiation being harmful, say that, the sun is radiating us all the time with the whole band of frequencies. So tell us about that, from this perspective; this body of research that you have. What is the fundamental difference between manmade radiation and the sun?

Tim: So I'm going to bring something in which is possibly controversial, but I'm going to try and approach it from the logic side of things, which is that in order for anything to be created, there has to be a creator. Like, this table that I'm working from didn't create itself. Human beings, obviously, create themselves in the procreation sense. But if you zoom out from that, then someone must have created the human being as well as the animal kingdom, the plants and the trees, and so on.

So it's really not from a religious point of view that I say that. It's just from a logical point of view that I say that. And assuming that I haven't lost anyone on that, maybe people could dispute that. But our belief is that there must be a creator, or some kind of conscious awareness that is basically creating every cell in the body. And if you think about it, in human terms, it's like, how my fingernails growing? Well, I'm not telling them to grow. So there must be intelligence, another field of intelligence that's basically running the operating system in the body.

And the reason I say that is because I want to draw the comparison between things that are naturally created, and then things that are manmade. And the reason for that is because the sun is naturally created. Therefore, we would say that the compression and expansion balance is actually aligned, and the zero point is dialed into the middle of those wave fields. Therefore, they are not as imbalanced as manmade radiation, and therefore they don't resonate with the human cells.

Sure, there's a heat element to what some provides, so that people like me get some burn and that expands the skin, and everything else. And you know, there's no doubt about that. But in terms of sort of temperature and so on, which is the only thing that we know that the mobile phone industry measures right now, it's just thermal effects. They don't measure for anything other than that, despite the 6,000 peer reviewed studies that have been done showing all of these biological diseases. So they just basically separate out ionizing and non ionizing and then just close the book. But everyone in my space, or things like maybe me and you do, knows that not only is that not true, because there's a massive evidence showing that disease is showing up.

But then also, the we need to work out why that level of radiation is actually causing harm. Now, from our perspective, we make the distinction between the sun as a balanced wave field, and manmade radiation as an imbalanced wave field. And just to sort of try and draw that with my fingers, if I may, what we're talking about is a human

cell. Imagine that toroidal view of the human cell as a circle, and dial geometrically into the center is the zero point or the mind point, or the awareness field that actually centers that light ring, and makes it into that beautifully balanced toroidal field that we see.

And along comes radiation, and it has zero point that's moving around the middle. And it's almost like agitated energy. And what happens when that cell meets that agitated energy is that this cell starts to resonate with that microwave energy. So what it does is it adopts the rhythm and the imbalance of that agitated energy. And that's all about the law of resonance, because it's in the same frequency band, therefore, your body adopts that imbalance.

Now, that imbalance is stuff that you can see in the life blood analysis that I've done, many other people have done, where your blood sticks together straight away and forms rouleaux. So that is the imbalance that we're seeing on an electromagnetic level. Because the radiation that's man made is imbalanced. And we actually can tell you why that radiation, that type of radiation is imbalanced as well. So if we're getting more into the Tesla's stuff -- if you really want to get it that way.

Josh: So I just want to recap like make sure I understand. First of all, the model of understanding, I have heard of a perhaps a similar model of understanding for a number of years, where everything has a black hole at its center, everything is both compressing and expanding. This is being increasingly, you could say, accepted within quantum physics and new science, right? Like, is your understanding. And can I call your colleague, Laki, for short -- is that what you said his nickname is?

Tim: We can call him Laki. He calls himself Laki. Yeah, it's easier.

Josh: You told me his nickname is that -- it's not a derogatory, I'm it getting from you.

Tim: But you have license to do that. And you love that.

Josh: So in Laki's model, is it very similar to like Naseem hair mines model, for example, where there's a black hole at the center of everything, as you touched on at the start earlier in our conversation?

Tim: Yeah, absolutely. And that black hole in the center, the zero point is a connected field and that is the only energy field. We always talk about energy fields or whatever. That is the energy field, because as the still magnetic field that exists that's connected within each atom, that is the free field from which all electrical potential by life is born. So that is why we call it the creative field. That is why we call it, if you like, the God field. It's a source of all life. And what I was trying to say here is that when life is created naturally by the Creator, it follows certain laws and principles.

And the laws and principles dictate that the compression and the expansion of the light ring, that looks like a torus, you know, kind of doughnut spinning field of light. It follows certain principles, as in the compression is equal to the expansion. So one thing that Laki spends a bit of time on is looking at what the traditional conventional scientific world is saying, and then just picking holes in it, and proving where they're wrong.

And one really good illustration of this is an example on YouTube, which I think is got millions of hits, where there's a cathode and anode. And they're sending, allegedly, the electron down the tube, which is evacuated of all air and filled with the gas so that you can see the actual movement of the, what we would call the light ring.

And what should happen is that, like lots of little pellets should be going down. You know, lots of little electron pellets, that's conventional science. That's how they would have you believe in their textbooks. What actually happens is these beautiful light rings go down the tube, and they're moving really rapidly, and they're moving, expanding, pressing.

And it just underlines his theories, his thinking, his concepts, etc. And he has a nice phrase to sum that up, which is like the mass hypnosis of the science world, where they look at one thing and say, isn't this amazing the electrons going down the tube. But they forget to realize that it's behaving differently. And it's because they've been reading these books for 20 years, and they just accept that that's the truth.

Josh: What's the implication of how it's behaving differently?

Tim: Well, it's the idea that instead of the electron, the proton and neutron, whatever model that you might have the emergence of a light ring. And that the electron could actually be a ring of light. And I'll send you that video to illustrate it. And what I'm going to do with him his record his views on why that makes a difference. And I think that'll be a lot more popular than me explaining it.

Dr. Lakicevic: So officially the model, you have shown here the officious model of the atom, with a nucleus, protons and neutrons. Positive charged particles and neutron particles in the nucleus. And negative charged particles, electrons cycling around it, that is official Rutherford model. But we will see later that it has nothing to do with the truth. If that official model there is true, we will see. Go to the next slide. We would see balls like a sphere, like a ball of the negative charged particles, which are electrons moving from the negative cathode to the positive anode; from the left to the right.

Tim: Think about this screen here and think about what we would expect to see which would be like little balls of electrons moving down

the tube. We're going to show what the real experiment shows now. Okay. This is the tube and then on the left hand side we got the cathode.

Dr. Lakicevic: Yes, you see on the left side, that is cathode and stop here. And you can clearly see the light rings spinning around the around their axis, which is connecting a cathode with anode. And there are no balls, there are no sphere, there are no electrons as they imagine that. Obviously, there are light rings spinning fast from the cathode to the anode. But there are some details we can explain that later. But for now, it's enough to see how scientists are having in front of their very eyes light rings spinning.

And they are interpreting that in a different way of electrons and everything else what cannot even be seen in movies. There is more of these. It's enough for everybody, but there are plenty of these measurements and everybody can find and see this, and those who are working in the laboratories. I've worked in laboratory for many, many years. And I know that, so the challenges here.

Tim: So this is a new one by the way. This is another video that we pinch from YouTube.

Dr. Lakicevic: That's wonderful one. You can see the light rings.

Tim: So just to show that it's not an isolated incident, there are many experiments going on like this which are clearly proving.

Dr. Lakicevic: Okay, you can find the German scientist, also very nice pictures of the light rings spinning in front of his eyes. And himself talking about what he hypnotized with this black space, bright space and so on. And here look that's a wonderful picture. Whole light rings stuck on that axis between cathode and anode, and spinning around that axis at the angle of 90 degrees. And that is what electric current is; a light rings spinning around the conductive wire, if it is about wire or here and in the evacuated gas phenomenon.

Tim: Yeah, is there a relationship between this and radiation fields?

Dr. Lakicevic: Of course, when we understand properly the concept of atom particle and cell, then we can properly also explain the radiation. But there are other measurements, which confirm clearly that the cell is not that what is believed. And please you place now that measurement of the red blood cells showing also light rings with a centering zero point, black point or black hole, how they call it.

Tim: Okay. So we just saw a demonstration of the light rings that are moving down the tube. We want to bring that into a real context. So to bring that into a real context and give you a real life example of how that

replicates in our bodies, we're going to show you this. So I'll hand over to Laki to explain what this is.

Dr. Lakicevic: Yeah, this is a recording of the red blood cells. Microscopic (photo) with a high resolution. And obviously, we see the light rings like a doughnut, like a torus with a black hole in the middle. And there is one beautiful measurements also confirming that the electric potential in the cell is increasing radially from the center to the outside (perimeter). So in the very center, it is expected that the electrical potential is zero. And we call it the zero point as you can see on the picture. And in the middle is that zero point which is in the geometric center of that light ring if that cell is absolutely balanced.

Tim: So what we're saying is that blood cells are actually light rings, similar to the electrical current that we just saw passing through the tube.

Dr. Lakicevic: Yes, but from that comes right concept of matter; all matter is made of light rings spinning around centering zero point, which is the source of energy from which light rings are borrowing energy to move and spin speed. And that is totally new and total breakthrough in science to understand the real nature of the matter, because matter is made of light rings centered by the source creator of those rings, which is the source of power source of energy, intelligent source of energy.

Tim: So yeah, if I was to summarize what we were looking at here and what we've just proven in that experiment, where one person thought that it was electrons moving down to a tube that actually we've shown that it's light rings moving down a tube. And we then showed how those light rings also inside our body, and therefore how everything in the universe is made of light rings.

Dr. Lakicevic: Because scientists also found the black holes in the center of the galaxy. And they have confirmed here that black holes in the middle of the atoms and cells. And so they can conclude generally that there is only one way of creation in the whole material universe, that is everything made of light rings small or big.

And the only difference is difference in volume. The same rules apply to the micro or for the macro. And that is totally opposite from what is believed in the science, but this is a small introduction for all those who are open minded and who are open for truth to think about it. And then we will guide them later through measurements confirming this, because this all can be also experimentally confirmed and measured, approved. And I have done it.

And I will share gladly with them all because I love science. I love

this huge potential to make a new civilization because they are restricted only from the wrong concept. They can do wonderful things experimentally and do wonderful things and work wonders, but they are limited by the wrong concepts. And with the right concept, they could make, just in one decade, anew civilization of the happy people and make amazing technological progress. So for creation, the first rule is a mental process. It's a process of imagination and the light rings are imagined and they compress huge volume of space into the small volume of matter. And then expand that small volume of matter, again, back into the space.

And that sequence of compression/expansion is everywhere in the universe. And every piece of matter (every light ring) has its own frequency of the compression/ expansion. So that frequency of an atom, they are all different (there are many frequencies) is roughly a few billions gigahertz or 100 gigahertz, whereas in galaxy billions of years. But compression/expansion takes a billion of years on the level of the universe.

And then we know this, and then we know the true nature of electricity compression/expansion sequence, we can easily explain that gas discharge phenomena. These cells and particles, and everything else explain what radiation is and why the division is imbalanced. Why the imbalance radiation is causing imbalanced cells (in the body) or diseases, and how it happens and how we can consciously prevent it, knowing how to communicate and address this conscious, still zero point and bring everything (even radiation fields) in to balance.

Tim: Fascinating. So I mean that is such a positive message. And what we didn't see is this, we did not see that. We did not see electrons moving up a tube. So we didn't see that. And so what we're saying, basically, is this model correct?

Dr. Lakicevic: In correct. Invalid. You could place here the measurements of DuPont Company from Chicago, some 30 years ago where they magnified atom of tungsten 2.7 million times. And then they found hexagonal structure with a black space in the middle; no protons, no neutrons, no nucleus. And that is also wonderful confirmation by measurements that this model is actually incorrect.

Josh: Wow. So everything that's aligned with natural law or everything in nature, it expands and contracts, has a black hole at its center. And the radiation that emits is harmonious with other life, is that right?

Tim: The radiation from the sun?

Josh: The radiation from basically anything either natural or align with natural law, and the differences --

Tim: Yeah, that's why we can't live without the sun, we can't live without sunlight, we can't eat without the sun. You know, because those sun rays come into the food and sort of bless the food chain that comes through and so on. And yes, the distinction is that, basically man is also created because we are made of lots of atoms, and we have a mind and we can actually connect to that field and make our own solutions. You know, I can make a sandwich, I can make a song, I can make table.

But here's the distinction, and this is really important. My intent, my conscious human intent is recorded in everything that I make. So if I make an electrical grid that is an extraction payment system. And I roll it out to the whole of humanity saying, "You want power, you have to come and get it from me, and I'm going to charge you for it." Charge being the operative word. And all the rest there's charged I paid for. There's a charge that is electric, static charge or whatever.

And so if I put that grid out towards humanity, like if I compare myself as a human being to, let's say, a horse in a field. Does the horse in the field pay for his energy and his sunlight and everything else? Not really, that wasn't the creator's way. Does man have to pay another man? Right, and therefore, have to go and work and everything else in order to get his electrical supply? Well, yes, he does. Is that a libertarian way of doing that? I don't think it is.

So the conscious human intent that's encoded in the electrical grid is something that our bodies resonate with. It's not something that we resonate well with. And that's the point we're trying to make here, is that all electrical grids are encoded with those vibrations that the human body picks up and doesn't like. And as those vibrations get stronger and stronger, in terms of 3G to 4G to 5G, our resistance gets challenged more and more, because it's bringing more and more of those bad vibes into contact with our body.

Josh: Yeah, so it's both the vibes, you could say, from the intent for it to be an extractionist model largely based upon death, based upon burning oil or burning coal or, you know, not based upon natural sources like sunlight and decentralized energy technologies. In fact, obviously, the use of take back your power, and anyone who's paying attention knows that the patent office seems to exist in order to suppress patents. There's more than 5, 000 securitized patents. Many of those could be used to free humanity. So it's the system that's extractionist model, and the harm that it does from things like smart meters, and now 5G. It seems to be resonant with that harmful intention that extract and harm intention. So it seems to be almost working together symbiotically on two different levels of reality, I guess you could say.

Tim: A hundred percent. You know, we are natural beings, as part of the natural creation. And yet we've put in this unnatural system of providing

for each other, which is not born from, let's call it love. It's not a love principle, it's an approach --

Josh: Taking care of each other, of everybody. There's enough for everybody, you know, like the sunlight.

Tim: Instead, it's based on greed. And I think that's the key thing that everyone has to realize. It's like the sun is not asking you to pay for the sunlight. And an electrical grid is saying, "You want to use it, you take it off. It disappears, and you pay for it." And we've got some really exciting new developments as well, as what I just talked about, which is a progress towards an energy type that never runs out and could be free.

Josh: Excellent. Well, let's get into that. Okay, you've explained some of this new paradigm of science. Maybe we can continue to lace in additional elements of this understanding, this paradigm of science, but let's get into where the rubber meets the road. How could these; your discoveries and Laki's discoveries and this body of new science help us to resolve the radiation crisis, 5G and everything related there?

Tim: Sure. First of all, we approached it in two ways. And this is when I partnered up with Laki. Because first of all, he had a product, and secondly, he had knowledge that could set us free. I know, that's a bit of a cliché. But the product is basically something that you put on any radiating device. And what it does is it carries the instructions to return that imbalanced wave field, back to a balance.

So it's almost like the zero point of the patch, talks to the zero point of the wave field and says, "Hey, get back into the middle, into a harmony or into a vibration and a resonance that can't cause harm to the human cell, can't disrupt the balance of the human cell." So we've tested that and that works. You know, you can put it on your Wi Fi routers, on your smart watches, tablets, phones, everything. And we've done kinesiology tests on that and the body stays super strong. And we've reversed rouleaux syndrome with just by putting it on, which is significant for us. But it's also tested by Dr. Emoto's Hado Life institute.

So we took three samples of water and one of them we held phone that was radiating over some water. And we sent that along and it was chaotic in structure. And then we put the old patch, we call it all on the radiation balancer. We put the old patch on the phone and did the same. And that came out beautifully crystalline hexagonal structure like a snowflake, which denotes a balance of nature.

So it's almost like, our bodies are always looking to get back to balance. You know, no matter what toxins we throw at it, whether it's being to alcohol, fats, or whatever it is. The body is always looking to get back to that balance. And that balance is represented, at least in the water

content in our bodies by that perfect hexagonal snowflake structure. So we know that our patch almost turns the phone into a kind of wellness too, because of the positive impact that it has on water. So that's the quick fix.

Josh: Can I just jump in? I'm curious in this, I'm skeptical about it. I'll just be honest. I've heard of a lot of people having stickers and pendants and different things. And I've tested them with the cornet electro smog leader, and I've never seen something actually reduce the radiation. So that has kind of led me to believe that most of these kinds of technologies, which is why I haven't promoted any, are perhaps some of their efficacy is in the mind of the user, you know, like the placebo effect.

That being said, I am open. And I think many of our viewers are in a similar position. You know, we see the gimmicky stuff, and we also feel like there's -- got to be some real and sincere and effective such technologies that do actually bridge to this new body of science and field and energy that actually function. So tell me a little bit more about the testing that you have done? Like, is it on the market? What's the name of the product? And how can you help people to bridge, to understand it on a deeper level and see that it actually does work?

Tim: Yeah, sure. Well, first of all, I've tested a few of the products that you might have mentioned and some of them don't work, at least from a kinesiology perspective, as well. And yeah, everyone is trying with their best intent to try and solve this issue. And one of the things that is a bit of a misnomer is the idea that you could take a radiation field and then reduce the radio frequency and still receive the data. That is not logical. If you've got something that's blocking radiation on your phone, it's most likely that the signal isn't going to come through.

So we liken it to -- and it's the same with deflectors and blockers, and all these sort of things that claim to reduce the radiation right down. If you've understood what we've said so far about the fact that it's the quality of the wave field, and the fact that that wave field is imbalanced, then you don't need to reduce the volume of the wave field, you need to tune it up so that it is balanced. And it doesn't cause dissonance with the human cell.

That is the principle behind what we do. And I liken it to -- because obviously, that's a bit of a headache for most people. I liken it to an orchestra. So let's imagine that you're walking down the street, or you got your phone in your pocket or whatever. And there's an orchestra that's playing really loud, because you're receiving all your data and stuff like that. You're connected, you're getting all these wave field and blah, blah, blah, but it's playing completely out of tune.

And what does your body normally do when you hear an auto tune stuff

you normally like, "Oh, my God. I don't like that sound." Now, you don't have anything in your body to pick up whether that sound being played by radiation is good or bad for you, because of evolution. Because evolution is -- we've only had these things in our pockets for the last 20 years. There's no time for evolution to start picking up something in your brain that says, "Hey, get away from that phone or radiation field."

And also, even more worrying is the heat that microwave radiation actually generates goes inside the body, and there's no sensor for heat inside the body. It's like I put my hand on a stove, it hurts. That's because of evolution, because evolution has taught me that radiation on a stove is actually going to burn the skin on my hands. So over time, we learned all of these. Your body is adapted to the elements. And now we have this new phone that comes along that delivers all this internally, and then we don't have anything picking up stuff in our brain, which might be cooking.

And that's why outside is on the open and all these brain cancers are forming, and so on. So we liken it to the fact that you've got an orchestra playing auto tune that you can't hear. And our patch will dial into that orchestra and just tune them up. It won't turn the volume down, because you need the volume for your data. But it knows how to tune it in. And the reason is because we worked out why radiation fields are imbalanced. And we also know the importance of balance to the human cell as a spinning light ring.

Josh: So you're saying from your and Laki's scientific perspective, it's not the specific frequency that is causing the harm. It's that its source is imbalanced.

Tim: Correct.

Josh: So it's coming from like a disjointed or not a natural or not a harmonious point or source, whether it's the transmitter. Are you talking about, like the actual antenna on the transmitter that your technology can affect what's happening at that point of transmission, like measurable level?

Tim: Yeah. I've got to tell you, this is the hardest product I can imagine to sell. Trying to explain to anyone how it works is why --

Josh: I'm just like, on behalf of --

Tim: You know, put your Tesla hat on.

Josh: On behalf of all of our viewers, I'm kind of being a bit of a skeptic right now. So hopefully, it's not putting you off. But I really want to understand and comprehend this. And if you can also, perhaps, tell

us about how it could be used on a larger scale as well. Okay, I'll just say one more thing and then I'll let you share. My concern is that it's -- just going to help us to cope or mask a problem, which really needs to be solved at its fundamental level. We don't need 5G frequencies and towers every 2 to 10 houses and so forth. That's my current understanding. So what can you share us about this product at its fundamental level, how it works and also in the bigger picture? Tell us.

Tim: Sure. Well, first of all, I'm against 5G just for the record. I don't think we need it. I think it's a deliberate offense on the human body and the vibration of the human body. I think we could do perfectly well with 4B. But as you know, all my tests so far, are showing that 4G is very bad for us as well. And the reason for that is because of the wave field. Like I said before, it's the evolutionary side of things that we've never walked around with this amount of, we call it magneto electric radiation, because it comes from the magnetic field. It is electrified and so not the other way around, but you know, both work.

And microwave radiation is probably easier to say, but we've never had this in our lives. We've never been fronted by this. And the reason why it's imbalanced, I mentioned earlier on is because it's coming from the greed principle. And if you look at 5G, it's got the added human intent that the people that are rolling it out know, that it's harmful and they're still doing it. So it's got that added extra kind of like life destructive element to it or vibration to it, which is harming us. So I don't know if that answered your question. If it didn't, then please ask it again.

Josh: It helps. In my mind I'm still trying to understand more of the technical sort of, you know, left grid, how does it actually affect the transmitter? But what you're saying is kind of in the quantum field, it's in the almost consciousness field that gets shifted from -- I don't know.

Tim: Yeah. That's a good question. So what we're talking about here is the power of conscious human intent. That's exactly what we're talking about here. Because when we adopt the role as creators, and we dial in to that zero point field, and we actually say, "I'm going to bring something out of that zero point field that's going to benefit everyone." Then we can have that effect on the radiation field.

We can almost become the creator beings that we need to be, but it's not something that you just wake up and you go, "Oh, I tell you what, I can do this now." Laki has been studying this for a long, long time. Now, there's one important omission that I haven't mentioned so far, which is that there needs to be almost like a vessel to transport that conscious human intent, and keeps it running. It's almost like a motor that just never turns off. And this is really exciting, because it's the precursor to free, abundant, limitless, and inexhaustible energy, which is really fascinating.

Now, we call this the Deca, or Laki calls it the Deca. It's a unit of energy, which is invisible because it's so small. And it's arrived in our atmosphere only since 2007 I think. So that's only 12 years. So he picked this up and understood it, and was meditating and found access to this tiny little unit of energy. It's dodecahedron. So it's has a geometric form. It has 12 cones of spinning energy within it, which never run out. And because it's a dedication, which is a 12 sided kind of cuboid or pentagram, I think Pentagon or one of the two.

And that is a very powerful shape, because it houses all of the other plutonic solids. So it's one of the most powerful geometric shapes there is out there. Now, this is the key piece of information that I'd like to tell people. And I know that they're going to put their whoo whoo hat on and you know, Red Alert, Red Alert. But I have to tell you this, because this is the way that we're getting the results that we're getting. So the proof is in the results that we're getting. And this is how it's happening.

We instruct -- because the Deca responds to conscious human awareness, we can program it to do what we want it to do. So if you imagine that, because of the law of resonance, the human body has no choice but to resonate with that imbalanced vibration of radiation. We just do, we're programmed to do it, it happens. There's nothing you can do that just says, "Hey, I don't want to react to my phone today." You just do, right? We've actually got almost like a superior unit of energy to the radiation.

And we're programming that superior unit of energy to dial in to the zero point field of that radiation field and say, "Hey, get back in the middle, get back into a balanced rhythmic interchange between compression and expansion, so that you don't harm the human cell." That's how we do that. And that's what's contained in the sticker. You know, everyone is going to say, "Oh, it's just a sticker." But actually, it's an active sticker. You know, we mentioned before that all atoms are making themselves, discharging themselves in rapid, rapid succession.

Well, what if you've got these Deca units inside the atom with an instruction inside it, that says, "I'm going to meet every radiation field that I come into contact with, because I'm stuck on the phone, and I'm going to balance them out." And that's what we're putting in there. And that is our technology.

Josh: So it seems like it's -- I asked the question earlier, perhaps some of these technologies and the quantum, you know, with the holographic and the sacred geometry, and the intent that was put in them, might be activated by our belief. And then the other idea is - well, they just work regardless, perhaps it's both. Is what you're saying, like here's an object that's been embedded with this higher level energy frequency intention, sacred geometry, for a specific purpose that is based upon, you know,

40 years of understanding radiation and its effects what you talked about. But also, that it's designed -- you said something interesting a few minutes ago, it's a technology designed to continue on and -- I can't remember how you said. It's like perpetuating higher levels of human.

Tim: Never runs out. So rather than the extraction payment system, if we can learn new techniques to use this new unit of energy, we can then start to command it to do lots of different things. So the next product that we have that we want to develop is an air conditioning unit, which maintains a temperature in a room, right. Because we've shown and proven that we can have an impact through the Deca technology on the wave field of radiation, which is invisible.

Now, we want to prove that we can have an impact on the air particles in a room and keep that at a constant temperature, whether it's 35 degrees outside or -2. So we can say this Deca, aircon unit, or temperature control unit is going to control the temperature in the room and make it 18 degrees. So that's the next. And that'll be a lot easier for people to accept, because it will be very measurable. It's like, did it -- you know, I got my meter here, is it 18 degrees here? Yes, it is 18 degrees. And we can measure it when it's cold outside or warmer outside as well.

So that will be more proof that this decade is here. And this is the super good news that I have to share with you today; this Deca is here for us all to design solutions to take us into a new era of energy, a new era of energy based on love and balance and harmony with the planet. So in my dreams, we can also replace these cell towers beaming out these imbalanced wave fields, with something that's actually harmonious with the planet. We've got a little way to go, obviously, but using shows like yours, and I'm super grateful for the opportunity to come on here.

This is a chance to share this information and see who wants to come and join this tribe of people who want to develop these solutions, because that's the way I understand this era, this new era of consciousness is going. We are here to develop or replace the old model with new solutions that create the new earth, which is based on free energy, compassion. And understanding of the creator field, which hopefully, will stop everyone fighting against each other, because we'll all realize that we're just one.

And that's what people say, you know, then everyone agrees we're all one, one love, everything else. That's great, but how about some science that backs that up and to knowledge that once we realize that we should all have a collective aha moment. And actually work towards something that is balanced and unhealthy.

Josh: It's interesting that in this new scientific paradigm and quantum physics, even just as a whole. It's interesting how the scientific method

and consciousness or spirituality actually emerged. You know, those artificial divides between religion and science are dissolved in this new understanding, this new scientific truth.

Tim: You could say that the institution have not particularly served us well, whether the institutions be a religion or a physics academy, or whatever it is, because either they've hidden the truth, so they've gone down slightly in the wrong path. But overall, if we understand that there's a new truth and we can prove that there's new truth. I mean, one of the central proofs that we have is that we do a simple one -- when I say we, I'm talking about Laki, obviously. But he does a very simple experiment, which we can send a video to, I should say, where we prove that right in the middle of the atom is a zero point with zero charge, right? No charge. So the whole model about the nucleus being in the middle, as you knows proton, neutron, and electron around the outside. Well, we can challenge that with a simple experiment.

You know, and there are many other experiments that he's done that back up what I've been speaking about. So these are available, we can all explore them together and work out collectively what our truth is. I'm not trying to say on this interview that this is the truth, that is the only truth. I'm trying to say there's a new outlook and a new perspective, that allows us to understand everything a lot better. It explains why radiation that is previously classified as non ionizing and non harmful, explains exactly why that is harmful, and why that is causing disease.

So it allows us to then work out how to correct it. And we feel that we have a very good product that corrects it. If anyone else wants to test it with other things, then we welcome that. And if anyone else has ideas about how we can improve it, we welcome that too. You know, it's like open source kind of healing technology, really. That's what we're on about. Because in the new era of consciousness, it's not about me selling all my units, so I make lots of money. You know what I mean? That's not what it's about.

Josh: Interesting. So, you know, it's not a closed system. Perhaps this is something that has been holding science back. We want to observe something in a closed system and see what the results are. And it needs to be duplicatable. And it needs to function exactly as how mind wants it to function. But what we understand from this quantum physics, this new body of science that you and Laki are helping to bring forward. It's not a closed system, because like our intention, actually interacts with that which we're creating, or that which we observe.

And we are essentially, you know, you talked about everything has it's center connected to the hole, so at its center is infinity. And even I would say that aligns with my understanding of who we are really, even at the soul level, like there's -- Somehow there is a unified field, and

we connect in ways that the logical mind can't explain, that we can tap into that infinite field. So it seems like through, this crisis, what would you say? Is it that we're kind of being shoehorned or whatever, steered very forcefully in one way? And another way, perhaps it's like a natural awakening process, but to really tap into [inaudible] manifested 5G.

Tim: Yeah. Exactly. How about that? How about humanity for its betterment has manifested 5G? I wanted to speak with people on Skype in Singapore live, thank you very much. I manifested that, I put pressure on, you know, whatever. And we've made it happen. But there's a consequence, right? The consequence is that all of those transporting frequencies are actually causing a lot of harm in my body. So being the creative beings that we are, we created this monster, now we go create something else that gets us out of it.

And maybe that was always meant to happen, so that's where we come from. Is like, we're manifesting this situation. Everyone can go running around in fear and terror about 5G and everything else. And I'm not saying they shouldn't, because people should be aware of it. But let's give equal energy and thought to how we get ourselves out of it. And this is where I'm opening a door to say, we've got some stuff here. You know, we've got some information here that needs to be looked at.

Josh: And it seems to be helping. It seems to be actually helping people and working.

Tim: The results are good so far. And we need to -- I mean, we've only developed one program, which is the Omnia Radiation Balancer. And you stick that on your phone, and it seems to work. The next step up is we're actually going to create a water bottle where you stick a patch on the water bottle, and it structures the water inside. So that will be very easy to prove as well. And then the next one will be the air conditioner unit. And so with products, we hope, you know, seeing is believing and measuring is believing. And people are starting to realize that we are onto something, we're not just talking. We are on science or whatever, we're proving what we're saying. And we've got it backed up by science that makes sense to me. At least I mean, I think I've told you that I'm not a scientific background, but I've been very, very interested in finding out everything.

That there is to know about the zero point and everything else, because I'm curious. I think I've got that natural curiosity to go. You know, what is it? Tell me more about the creative field? You know, it just fills in a lot of gaps for me, which is why I find it so interesting.

Josh: So do you see, like it kind of, perhaps your technology or similar technology facilitating a bit of a technological transition? Where once there is enough buying from investors or just companies or people

that realize the harm and actually begin to shift their model of doing business and the way they do business? To then what, for example, use your technology to harmonize the frequencies from all transmitters everywhere, all cell towers and smart meters and Wi Fi routers. Do you see that as a potential wide scale application of your technology once the awareness reaches a critical threshold? Share with our audience your vision in the long term for solving this problem.

Tim: Sure. Well, I mean, the host is bolted. We're all glued to these things, and they're pretty much running our lives. We've got to start with that fact. You know, we've let things get way out of hand before we've realized that there's a problem. And the problem is that we are vibration beings, and we're not artificially intelligent sort of mechanical, whatever. So we are in this situation.

My plan would be -- you know, it's not that my plan is the only plan. But my plan would be that we need to fix up what we've got, because you only need to see what that's doing to fertility, and causing of mental disorders and all sorts of other things. I'm sure you've read all the reports, just as I have. You know, the DNA strand breaks and everything else. We need to fix that up first. And then we need to put plans in place to work out, first of all, whether 5G serves us.

I think it's pretty conclusive that it doesn't, that's just my view. I don't want to get into too much trouble with any corporations or, whatever, personal view. And does it serve us? I don't think it does. We're pretty okay as it is at the moment. And secondly, can we start some kind of think tank that works out how we replace the emanating source of power as in electrical field with something else that is in harmony with the human cell? Can we start to put that forward, and get likeminded people around the table who all want to pursue that goal?

So I would say three things. Firstly, we need to patch everything up on 4G and below. Secondly, we need to stop 5G. Maybe that's the other way around. Sorry, stop 5G then patch up everything else for 4G and below. But much of a muchness, pretty much, both in first position there. And then thirdly, pretty urgently after that -- yeah, we want data in our lives. We manifested this. I love talking to you in the US, and recording this and putting on YouTube. Now, this is what we want to do. We want to share this information so we can evolve, and so on.

But that third bit, we would like to be very actively involved in because we feel like we have something of a solution in the way that we can manipulate this new unit of energy through conscious human intent. And that could be a real breakthrough. So we don't want to attract your old fuddy duddy you know, physics professor who studied Particle Physics for the last 30 years into that equation, because he's just going to spend the whole time humbugging and trying to cut it down. We want

people who are excited by Tesla, expanding consciously aware solutions to come and join us. And get a little think tank together and think our way out of this.

Josh: Yeah. It seems like it'd be really a worthwhile idea to consider to get the inventors, the new technologies together in an organized way. Maybe even a synchronized, intentional, meditation kind of way. You know, having that and even just doing experiment. Doing big experiments and having certain intentions or groups of intenders put their focused creative energy, supportive energy into projects, like what you're doing.

Projects like what Laki is doing, because I think there has been a bit of a silo. And a lot of these inventors having to deal with pushback from the oligarchy, and not being welcomed in by the structures in our world. So they kind of maybe feel alone, they feel like they have to do it on their own.

I mean, when I'm working on a project, or video, or article, or whatever. You can feel when there's positive supportive energy coming towards you, and you can create and manifest much more effectively. So maybe it's even something like that is -- People can contact you and tap into your work, Laki's work and other resonant, creators. And just get together and support you in a way that's engaging the viewers creative.

Tim: Yeah, absolutely. And we're going to set up a membership site, so that we can share this knowledge because the knowledge doesn't just concern the atom. I mean, there's a 70 page document that he submitted, called the true concept of the atom, where he details all of his experiments that back up his version of the truth about the Creator, the creation, everything, which I think could blow a lot of people's minds open. You know, could explain a lot of the unexplained things from ages gone.

And he claims to be able to tell us truly what gravity is truly, what magnetism is and beyond. So this is exciting. I'm not saying we should just latch everything on the back of one scientist. But yeah, you're absolutely right. We need forums, and I want to create a membership site for people who want to come and learn from him, and then start to develop these solutions together. But even above that, we need a kind of connected group of advanced thought leaders to show the new way without electricity.

Because I hope I've done one thing on this call, which is to identify what the cause of the problem is, potentially. We all need to agree on that still. But here's one version of that, which is the imbalanced field caused by an electrical current, which has intent of extraction, payment and greed. Is not something that the human body binds well with, right?

So let's find something that it does vibe well with, and test it. It really could be that simple. It could be like let's find a source of power that the human body resonates well with, test it with some simple phone masts and cell towers, and whatever. There you go. It could be that simple. I don't know.

Josh: And phones and smart meters. Yeah. So we could even have people just do an experiment, try this out, then let us know. Then come on our site and comment on this technology. Like, we want to hear feedback from this. So let's just open this up.

Tim: Put it all on the blockchain, so everyone can see it. Make it auditable. Make it open. So, yes.

Josh: It's Omnia Resonant Technology. So that's available now, correct?

Tim: Yeah. You can find us at *omniaradiationbalancer.com*.

Josh: Okay. And then the other technology you mentioned you guys are working on is air conditioner that balances at 18 degrees Celsius. I just want to clarify, what stage is that at in development? And it doesn't use any electrical energy, it doesn't plug in, it doesn't use solar, doesn't use any harvesting energy. Just really quickly in a short amount of time here, as we close, let us know the status and basic function of that?

Tim: Status is very easy, looking for funding, because it's going to take Laki about four months of intense work to find the right materials and combination of geometric shape of the unit and so on, it's really just testing. So between four and maybe maximum six months of getting that right. But the principle is a funny one, because it's like we are programmed to understand that something that produces cold air has to have an electrical circuit attached to it to perform the functions that cools the air.

But if you understand exactly how areas heated up and cool down according to the true concept of the atom, then you can work out that it's more to do with pressurized conditions, and vibration than anything else. So you can get inside that with the Deca, and actually create instructions that are passed. Because the Decar is like a vessel that allows us to make these changes that were once thought had to be powered by an electrical thing caused a functional turbine style thing to cool something down. Right now, actually, with new physics, new understanding, we can replace things that, let's face it, cause a lot of damage in our environment.

I used to live in Singapore, there's an air conditioning unit. There are six on every house pumping in this horrible air and pumping out and pretty nasty stuff as well. So there you go. That's a big problem and a

big environmental problem potentially right there. But yeah, look, it's a funny thing, because you mentioned it earlier, it's like what these scientists need.

Well, I think they need some funding. We do need some investors to come through because we're still living in a world where money runs everything. Laki, and to some extent myself, living in relative poverty trying to get this information out there, which is why I'm so grateful for the opportunity today. And yeah, we just need some people to come forward and actually just make it safe for them to explore these things. We need people who understand the importance of this, rather than people who just come in and go, "I want my money back 10X in five years." That's not what it's all about. There has to be some investment in the future, investment in a new era of energy.

Josh: Yeah, good. I see a lot in this conscious awakening that's happening. Awareness and awareness to problems is one aspect of this. But I think that something new is happening, and those of us who are choosing to respond to the call, however, you would describe that. And so yeah, I do see a lot of people on an increasing basis, putting their energy, putting their time, they're volunteering, they're funding into things that could really shift the situation here. And it's out of, I think, an inspiration, but it's also out of just looking at the situation that we're in. Thank you, Tim, for coming on the 5G summit and for sharing your perspective, sharing your insight and your technology. And we'll look forward to hear more from you. Please, definitely keep us posted.

Tim: Thank you so much.

The Legal Action Process, Part 2

Guest: Raymond Broomhall

Josh: Welcome to the summit. Today we have Raymond Broomhall, barrister at law in Australia and Tasmania, join us for part two of this compelling empowering, really transformative discussion. And you need to see part one if you haven't seen it already. So, Raymond, thank you so much for joining us again.

Raymond: Thank you for having me.

Josh: So what we're going to do is we're going to walk through step by step Ray's three page; I believe it's 22 points on this steps to remedy document that he has, walking us through his legal process. So this is hugely exciting. Ray, thank you for offering this to everyone for free; pro bono. I just want to take a moment and honor you and your intention in doing so. You know, like you said in the previous talk, your hourly rate is \$400 an hour and you've put hundreds of hours into this process. So thank you so much for offering it for free. May you be compensated richly, financially and in all other areas that matter. But so let's dive into this process.

We're looking at the document that Ray has prepared, called Non ionizing Electromagnetic Radiation Steps to Remedy. And point number one; Ray, please, if there's anything you want to say about the process, overall, before starting, please do so. And then we'll dive into each one of these point by point.

Raymond: So basically what this is really about establishing evidence, putting notice out and preparing for litigation. So that's really what this is

about. This is preparing, okay. And giving you a little bit of an insight as to what direction it might take, if you wish to go down that road.

Josh: Now somebody is looking at this and they're wondering, "I don't know if I want to litigate." Can they still take the initial steps and then decide later?

Raymond: Yes, very much. So that's what this is about. So it's just basically getting evidence together, putting the carriers or the meters on notice. And that's really what it's doing really, in essence.

Josh: So what we're looking at here again is the process that Ray has used with colleagues and with people and communities to reverse 1600 planned deployments of small cells throughout Australia and to uninstalled/actually remove 900 additional small cell sites. So this is a process that is very, very strongly indicating as being effective. Ray, please dive in. And we'll go through this document as efficiently as we can here in this conversation.

Raymond: So step one would be; first of all, common sense would be to identify the source of non ionizing electromagnetic radiation. All the proposed emissions, where is it coming from, is it a mobile based, mobile phone base station, is it a communications tower, is it a 5G small cell facility, is it a smart meter, is a Wi Fi router. It could be in schools free, it could be your neighbor, etc or any other device. Really just identify what device you want to target, okay. Then you just could identify the site where the emissions or proposed emissions will be irradiated from.

So for example, is it upon your home, your workplace, is school, hospital, retirement home, public transport etc. Then the third thing is measure and record the distance between you and the ER mission device and/or facility. And that's important because you need to know the actual distance that you are from a particular tower and you can look at various reports to find out the actual volts per meter. It's very important to get that.

Josh: Okay, now for 0.3, it says, measuring and record. What devices would you recommend people can use to make measurements and then record the distance?

Raymond: Google Earth is a very good tool to use. So you just use the measurement device from the Google Earth. So you would identify -- okay, the tower could be a kilometer away, it could be 500 meters away, it could be just next door. So you can just use a simple tape measure, but you basically need to know what the distance is for identify the emitter or the proposed emitter, the installer, public relations, local council, and the landowner. Names of involved corporations and their

respective ABN numbers, and also include the names of directors of such corporations. Now the reason we do this is because we're actually identifying who's liable. So in essence, this is the people that we're targeting.

Josh: Okay. So who are those people? Let's just identify who someone would send to.

Raymond: Okay. It'd be someone like, you'll find if you go to a pole, whether they put a little notice they're saying that we're going to build a tower here or something like that will put a small cell facility. It'll have a name of who the public relations company is, where you've got a contact. Well, they're all part of the process. So you need to identify them, they actually acting as an agent for a major telecommunications company. So you need to include the telecommunications company, and we need to think fine things like their addresses, who they are, where they are, etc.

Josh: So you want to send to the address for the head, like headquarters of the Verizon or, whatever is the carrier, right?

Raymond: Yes, that's correct. And usually if it's a corporation in Australia, for example, we have to have what's called an Australian Company Number. And we need to find out what that number is. And you can go and look at the corporation's facilities such as -- in Australia, we have these trans securities and commissions where you can actually do some searches there. In other countries, you'd have a different set up. But basically, it's just anything that identifies who the parties are, who are joining forces to radiate against you. And that's really what it's about.

So step 5. Now, I'm not sure what it would be for any other country, but I assume that have a very similar setup. But in Australia, you can find your mobile communications tower on the RFNSA website at <https://www.rfnsa.com.au>. And once you get on to that site, you type in your suburb identify the tower, click on it and retrieve the EME report and the compliance certificate. Now, the EME report is what's known as the Electromagnetic Energy report. And in that, it will have the particular exposure levels and limits that are coming from that particular device. And actually has the measurements. So it'll tell you if it's the hundred meters away what the volts per meter will be, if it's 200 meters, 300 and so on.

Josh: Now in the United States, I believe it's just limited to United States, there's a website called antennasearch.com.

Raymond: Okay.

Josh: Do you know anything about that website? Would that be where people in the United States go?

Raymond: I don't know. I've looked at them personally. But I assume that that sounds better. Right?

Josh: Okay. So we'll do some legwork on that and find out what the website is for United States, and we'll put that on the screen. So, yeah, please continue.

Raymond: Okay. Then step 6; Is it an existing installation? So if yes, most likely it has already been approved by council, or in the alternative, it did not require development approval. So I suggest that you contact the council to confirm it.

Josh: So when you say contact council, that's your local town or county council, is that correct?

Raymond: Yes. That'd be municipality council, the municipal council, it could be your local council, your local government, whoever looks after your bylaws and your rights, and your sanitation, that sort of organization. Yeah, whoever approves development applications for these things.

Josh: Now, is email fine, phone call, written letter, what type of methodology can people do?

Raymond: You can just -- usually phone call is enough, sufficient or you can email. It's really up to you how you communicate as long as -- you just want to find out. Do they have to go get development approval for this particular facility? In a lot of cases they do. And a lot of cases they don't depending on the impact. Is it a high impact facility or a low impact facility? And usually, if it's already on an existing tower, they don't need development approval that's particularly here in Australia. So if you've got a 30 meter tower, and they want to start putting extra antenna on there, they don't have to get development approval for that. If they want to put a small cell facility on an existing power pole, they don't have to get development application for that. So you need to find out what is going on.

So again, if it's a proposed installation, which means it hasn't even been installed yet and they're thinking of putting it up. And you've heard on the grapevine it's going to happen, or you see some notices. Firstly, you need to -- it doesn't require development approval again, you've got to contact your council if development approval is required. Ask the council for an expiry date, that any objection submission out of this is submitted, and that's very important. So if the council tells you and says yes, it does require development approval, they'll give you an expiry date

and you must get your warning notice etc, medical opinion, legal advice etc in by a particular date, very important.

Now, step 8; Sometimes the emitter or proposed emitter will advertise to the public requesting submissions, inclusive of deadlines concerning their installation as part of an industry public consultation process. Now verify whether they consult consultation process forms part of a legitimate council development application or not. You know, sometimes you'll find that the telecommunications companies will do a public consultation just as a spin. They don't actually have to do it, dude. But they just do it to find out what's out there and, are there going to be any complaints against their development, even though they don't have to get development approval. So it's really their way of toying out to see what the opposition is going to be like, but still take advantage of that process.

Josh: Now, how would someone specifically verify that? Would they ask their local town council?

Raymond: Yes, that's correct. Or even within themselves, they'd say is this going for a formal development application process or is it just really -- you're doing the right thing by doing a public consultation process with us. That's basically what you do. Yes.

Okay. Step 9: If the emitter/the proposed emitter has been in contact with you via letter, notice etc. then collate all correspondence, including all correspondence you may have sent to the emitter also. Now that's extremely crucial. So in order for a lawyer to work this out for you and you can get any lawyer to do this. You don't have to get me, you get any lawyer. But basically what you need to do is put it together, it's all your evidence. It's crucial because you don't know what you have said, you don't know what the emitter said. The lawyers need to know exactly what has been communicated between the two; very, very important.

Josh: So it says if the emitter/proposed emitter has been in contact with you, where do other parties involved, regulators -- yeah.

Raymond: Exactly. The regulators motive written to, for example, US the FCC or what in Australia written to, for example, in the U.S. the FCC, or wherever it might be, ACMA. Any regulatory authority even if it's to a minister, and you sort of done a lot of precursor stuff about making an initial complaint. Any correspondence that you've sent out, it's crucial that you put all that together.

Josh: Okay. So have a folder and just put everything in it. And then at the appropriate time, you're going to use a copy of all of that correspondence.

Raymond: And the other thing too is, diary entries are very important too. They are considered to be prime evidence. So anything if you're having a telephone conversation, just write in your diary and get copies of that and get that to your lawyer as well. I think that's important.

Okay. Step 10. And this is probably the most important part of the law: Obtain a medical opinion as to whether or not the EMR emissions or proposed emissions are/or could pose a risk of harm to your health. If risk of harm to health is advised, then request that the medical practitioner advise on recommendations as to what needs to be done to remedy the situation. Examples of recommendations might be that you are not to be exposed to EMR emissions from the tower or device, etc, use cable instead of Wi Fi, to turn routers off, etc.

To assist, you may wish to provide your medical practitioner with a link to the Bioinitiative Report 2012, which is updated 2017. And it's called A Rationale for Biologically-based Public Exposure Standards for Electromagnetic Fields (ELF and RF), and you can find that at the link at bioinitiative.org. And the following link to Physicians for Safe Technology - 5G Mobile Communications, and you can find that link at mdsafe.org.

You can also ask your doctor to refer you to a specialist medical practitioner who consults EMR patients on a regular basis, and even better, one who has appeared in either in court or tribunal on EMR issues. Your lawyer may also be able to refer you to a medical specialist if needed. And please note; attached are two samples of medical opinions that may assist your medical practitioner. So I provided those if you wanted to take those to your doctor to have a look to get an idea of how other doctors put them together. The one that you're seeing is obviously a specialist in EMR, so that might assist.

Josh: Okay. So let's talk about this. This is a big part of the process, step 10. So the first step is for someone to make an appointment with their doctor, whether it's you know, medical doctor or a naturopathic doctor or whoever their primary health care provider is, correct?

Raymond: Yes. I'd prefer if you had an actual medical doctor, someone that's recognized as authorized medical practitioner. You can get integrative practitioners who obviously practice mainstream medicine but also do the integrative approach where they actually use not necessarily mainstream sources. But the issue is that they've got to be a medically qualified doctor.

Josh: Okay. So perhaps and before that appointment, you're saying that you would email your doctor those two links; the bioinitiative.org and mdsafe.org. And if there is any other information you want to tag on to that, correct?

Raymond: You don't overload them because you might find that they can't, it's a bit too much. I mean, there's a lot of science out there talking about potential risk, etc. And there are a lot of studies, but the Bioinitiative Report seems to be a lot more concentrated. I think there's thousands of studies in that particular document. But also the *mdsafe.org*, which is the Physicians for Safe Technology, that's actually doctors that have all got together. I think that's a US site too, by the way, so they might be able to assist there. And they will have doctors there that you can talk to and possibly get some advice from.

Josh: Okay. Now, so you make an appointment with your doctor, you send the doctor these couple links in advance and any other info you have. And then you have your appointment with your doctor. You talk about your concerns, and what happens if -- they look at those sample letters or whatever. And if your doctor is not willing, Raymond, to sign a letter or to do what you need them to do, how do you handle that?

Raymond: Well, you can always ask the doctor to give you a referral to someone that does specialize in it. And then you could maybe given a suggestion as to some of the doctors that are known to do these sorts of advices. So ask for that referral. If that doesn't work then you may go see another doctor, or contact some of your local EMR groups, 5G group. And they might be able to assist you on some medical practitioners out there.

Josh: And I was thinking, contact your local building biologist. Go to the building biology website, find out who is local, contact them and then they might you know --

Raymond: They're very helpful. You'll find building biologists right into this, and they obviously provide a lot of shielding etc. And obviously do testing of your property to see what the emissions are. Yes, they would be able to assist there, I would say as well. The more networking you can do, the better. Once you find a doctor that's actually willing to do this, they usually like gold.

Josh: Yeah. Now would you recommend when somebody goes to that appointment to the doctor, their first appointment, right? Should they bring a printed out already customized letter for their doctor to sign? Or should they just bring the sample letter and have their doctor sort of fill it out?

Raymond: Yeah. The sample is -- what I'm giving you is extremely detailed and there's a lot in it. And I guess it's designed to sort of educate the doctor a bit when they see it solidly in medical. I mean, these particular advises that you're seeing, were actually presented. And you'll notice that one of them is specifically for -- this doctor had two other doctors who were his clients. And you'll see quite clearly that it's

designed for doctors to interpret. And that's what they're for. It's sort of an educational tool, really.

Josh: Okay. So how about this, Ray; before the appointment, somebody sends those two links, and if there's any other info and attach an editable word document copy of one of these sample letters.

Raymond: Yes. I think that might assist in some way.

Josh: Yeah. Okay, good.

Raymond: But I can't tell a doctor how to diagnose or treat or whatever, that's up to them. It's just to let them see that there are other doctors out there that I prepared to come out to explain the situation.

Josh: Excellent.

Raymond: And I might also give you a simple medical advice as well, because I think it might overwhelm a doctor to follow what I'm giving you. So I'll give you a very simple one, which is just the very basic saying in my opinion. I think that this person, their fear is reasonable but I don't believe it's safe. And I recommend that don't get exposed to that. Yeah, just something simple like that is enough.

Step number 11 then would be: If the EMR emissions are from an existing installation, obtain witnesses who have mobile/cell or internet coverage in your home. So for example, when they visit your home, do the witnesses have reception from the carrier? If yes, reception indicates that your home is being irradiated by their carrier. And witnesses can swear or affirm their testimony as evidence in an affidavit format or a statutory declaration. And you'll need to see your lawyer in regards to putting one of those together. But that's an important thing. So getting evidence from an independent person, not from yourself, but somebody independent. They can say, "Yes, I've gone to your home. I've got this particular carrier. There are bars on my phone, they clearly irradiating your home. I can see it on my phone." And then you just get them to testify in writing that that's what's going on.

Josh: Okay. Now, is one with such witness sufficient or would you recommend two affidavit?

Raymond: I think there got to be people who are prepared to attend court to give evidence that they to your home and they looked on their phone. And yes, there was. My carrier is such and such. And I've got my laptop and I'm getting coverage from my internet provider. Here it is.

Josh: Okay. So one affidavit from one witness is sufficient, but two is maybe preferred. Yeah.

Raymond: Yeah. Well, two, three. The more the merrier, actually. That's good. The other thing is then step 12; Contact the building biologist to conduct a report as to the level of EMR missions in your home. Now, that's pretty important because what you're doing there is basically working out with the ambient or the current levels of electromagnetic radiation or exposure that you're being exposed to at the current time. And then if they then decide to -- or everything files and I think decide to put something up and you can then go and measure it.

Then you can sort of see that there is a clear difference between the electromagnetic radiation. But not only that, the emissions biologist can look at, we then also refer it to the EMA Report. It should indicate what the proposed emissions will be from that electromagnetic energy report that's been provided by the provider. And we can sort of assess exactly how much increase in dosage that you're going to be exposed to. So that's important.

Josh: So everyone can look up the website for Building Biology Institute, find the local rep, or contact the company, the organization if there are no local reps, right?

Raymond: Yes.

Josh: So what about if somebody you know, either can't afford to bring in a building biologist there? You know, some of them are fairly economical, not too expensive, but if someone still is in a position to not do that, can they take those readings of EMR those measurements themselves?

Raymond: Well, they could. But it all comes down to how persuasive that evidence actually is. It's best to have an independent person do it, which in essence, that person be an expert, and that'd be considered an expert witness. But if you did it yourself, you wouldn't be. So the reliability of your evidence wouldn't be exactly strong if you want to take that to court. It would help, but it wouldn't be very strong. We already have the proposed submissions anyway, from the EMA Reports that will tell us what's there. But as I said to you before, sometimes the industry to ensure that they're being regulated, it'd be nice to measure it independently. So that's basically what that's about.

Number 13: This is an interesting one; obtained quotes for shielding purposes, such as shielding mesh, clothing, shielding paint, etc to shield not only your home, but also your house inclusive of land. A building biologist should be able to assist in this regard also. And this will provide evidence to claim compensation for damage to property. Because how it works is, if your home is being irradiated, let's say they for some reason you file, you can't stop the telco, at least you can still take them to court and say, "Well, I need my home shielded to protect me from the

contamination of the electromagnetic radiation that's on my property. This is how much it's going to cost."

Now, the beautiful thing about that is it does two things as well. One; it set you up for civil litigation, so you can seek compensation. You could apply for this for compensation if you wish. But also, under certain environmental laws, it can be classed as a serious environmental nuisance, or if it goes over a certain dollar range.

Now in Australia, for example, if it goes over \$5,000, it can be classed as serious. So in essence, you can go through and have a look, work out what it is. To give you an idea; to build a large Faraday cage over the entire property is going to cost a fair bit of money. So you can imagine how much if everybody started flooding in and saying, "All right, if you're going to build these towers, I want to be protected by shielding." That's where we go with possibly class actions, etc possible independent civil litigation in the civil sphere. So that's pretty important to do that if you can.

And it's just getting a quote, that's all we asking. So that's not going to cost you anything. It's just say, "Excuse me, Building Biologists, how much is it going to cost to shield my home?"

If you have the funds, you can also obtain (this is step number 14) and independent radiation to dosimetry reporter as to radiation levels emitted from the device or facility and SAR levels entering yours or your children's body. Now, that's a specific absorption rate. And basically what you're doing there is measuring that. And that's again, the pre and after. So you do that before any tower was built or anything like that. And then you can do another dosimetry report after the tower was built, just to see exactly what the absorption rate is.

Josh: And if a tower is already up by the time you're doing this process, then obviously having it at the time is sufficient, right?

Raymond: Yes. As long as you got something to indicate what's going on. Are you absorbing this?

Josh: So that kind of report would include the power density?

Raymond: Yes.

Josh: The measurements from the testing devices, and also the specific frequencies.

Raymond: It works out the absorption rate. So how much electromagnetic radiation is your body actually absorbing.

Josh: Is the building biologist certified professional do that kind of report as well?

Raymond: Usually get the dosimetry expert to do that sort of work. You just have to look around and you can even contact your regulators as to who does those. And you can even contact Department of Health just to find out who actually does those. And that's if you've got the funds, and those sorts of reports are usually quite expensive.

Josh: So optional, but again, it's just one step but -- this is all about making your case strong, legitimate, well documented to basically put in the time and energy to go through these steps. Do as many of them as you can to the best of your ability. But this is still an optional step.

Raymond: Yeah. So the most important thing is just the medical opinion and legal advice. The rest of it is only extra, if that makes sense. Getting witnesses fee affidavits in regards to the missions into your home. That's important. But the rest of it like the building biologists to get a quote, not necessarily important, but it probably would assist you in the future if you want to.

Now, once you've done that (step 15): Collate all your documents as mentioned above, and forward copies of evidence to your lawyer or your attorney. Okay. Then what you do (Step 16): Instruct your lawyer/ Attorney to draft an advice for you on their letterhead as to your legal position. Your legal options, the legal remedies, chances of success and the pitfalls etc. The advice may include opinion as to remedy concerning laws that apply the precautionary principle.

And as I explained here, the precautionary principle is an integral component, is a type of federal policy. And is usually found embedded in the majority of state and federal legislation. And the precaution principles, as a rule, should be action when an activity raises threats of harm to human health and environment. And precautionary measures should be taken even if some cause-and-effect relationships are not fully established scientifically. So therefore, health risks associated with EMR though not fully established scientifically at present, would still require precautionary measures to be taken by emitter and governmental decision makers.

So that's sort of assisting not only you, but also if you wanted to show this to a lawyer that understand where that's coming from. So that's why I put that in there.

Josh: Do you have any suggestions for how someone could find a suitable lawyer or attorney?

Raymond: Someone that has got a bit of an environmental law

background and also criminal law background, so you want to have somebody that's got that behind them. And somebody that's got some experience in doing restraint applications such as domestic violence applications or apprehended violence application, peace and good behavior. There are different names around the world, but that's basically what you're looking for. Keep the peace orders, those sorts of thing. There are people that deal with Magistrate's Court.

Josh: Okay. And then building biologists might also be able to recommend people in the environmental area as well.

Raymond: You can also contact your environmental defenders offices on the issues of those around. You contact the committee legal centers, they might be able to assist. Some of those centers do it for free, so it all depends on who you see. You can also contact disability advocacy organizations, they can also assist. So really, this is a general assistance thing for lawyers out there. Just going to see local and say, "Excuse me, help."

Josh: Yeah. And what about having your lawyer watch this specific talk?

Raymond: If they wanted to, yes. I think that would be very helpful.

Josh: Okay. And so when you're trying to establish a relationship with your lawyer, you looking for the right one, would you suggest that people get a price quote in advance? Is find out an hourly rate?

Raymond: Yes, that's important. So there's usually an ethical reason that they have to do that. They have to disclose what the rate is, how much it's going to cost. Those sorts of things. And usually have a little thing called costs agreement, you know, through that process. You know, just get a quote to say, "Hey, look. I want this done. How much is it going to cost for you to do an advice for me?" With me, I'm actually what is called a barrister. So a lot of lawyers will refer me to give an advice. It all depends on how you do it. So in most countries like say Canada, you'll find them in UK, Australia, Hong Kong, those sorts of places. But how it works is you'll have a solicitor who is your lawyer or your attorney, and then they'll brief what's called a barrister, which is someone like myself, to do an actual advice. And when they say settled by counsel, that's what they're referring to.

I'm not sure how it's done in the US, but I think you'll find that you just get your advice from your lawyer or your attorney. And they might have -- but there are very many specialist lawyers out there that deal with them. But the basic principles are there. So as I said, it'll be things like assault principles, restraint applications, those sorts of things. Nuisance, into nuisance law, that'd be very handy.

Josh: You know, I just want to understand this point clearly, because are you receiving the advice, the document from your lawyer. And that's from them to you or are they writing it specifically for you to send to the offending parties? Does that something -- help us understand the specifics of it? And secondly, Ray, do you have like a template of this advice document example that you could include?

Raymond: That's a toughie. I've got -- this is -- I'm going to be very careful, but that's an advice. So it's got a letter ahead. My advice is a 28-page, as long as a rule around that, you're in.

Josh: Got it.

Raymond: So they're very detail and explain all the liabilities in there.

Josh: It's tough because this is something that maybe you might not be comfortable putting out there as a template, right?

Raymond: Well, the problem with this legal advice, they have to be specific for each -- So this one here for examples, just for Queensland only. So my other advices we have for New South Wales only, they're all different. So each state has different laws. And that's where it gets complicated because you've got to sort of fit in your legal opinion to suit each particular site.

And if I got something like this, it would just be a basic. I'll do what I can, I'll put something together just to give you a redacted version of what my advice would probably look like. You know, but it's not an advice. It's just an educational tool only. And someone would have to then tweak it to suit whatever or use it as a bit of some sort of educational tool, really.

Josh: Okay. Thank you so much for that, Ray, for your willingness to include a redacted version of that. Obviously, it's pretty understandable and we all get why. You know, you would have to only include part of it, but thank you. That's helpful. And also, I just wanted to mention the link that's on this page. Now, that also is a very suitable organization for people to financially support, as you mentioned in part one of your talks. And secondly, they should be able to, we're hoping. If the documents are on the website, then yes. You can contact them and ask some specific questions such as; you know, what do I do for my country or state or province or whatever.

And so they'll be able to provide like, at least those initial questions. But at the same time you guys, please, support that organization because we want the energy exchange to go both ways. So everyone, when you go to that website, specifically for the document templates and guides, we may also -- because we're all creating this in the moment, is so timely. And we're helping to move everything forward.

Keep an eye out for like specific instructions, there might even be a specific instruction by that time your country. So, Ray, please continue. If there's anything else you want to say about that point or go to the next one.

Raymond: Okay, sure. Number 17: Once you have a legal advice, send the said advice and the medical advice to your counsel and all parties such as the emitter, installers, the land owners, inclusive of directors of the emitting companies involved. Attach a cover letter to your advices and call it "objection notice." Now actually draft it as something to assist. I'll actually call it "a warning objection notice" that might assist in some way.

Josh: That's in the document, in template pack. So that's provided.

Raymond: Yeah. So you just attach that to your -- put your legal advices to it. Your lawyer might want to change that. So this is just something to assist, but as for educational purposes. But always see a lawyer before you start playing around with this sort of stuff, is a rule. Now, attach a cover letter to your advices. In the objection notice, state that you do not consent to be irradiated with their EMR emissions, and that you have established a reasonable belief and fear and/or apprehension that the emissions pose a risk of harm to health and a risk of damage to your property. And then send that by registered mail. Okay.

Now, I won't read all this out, but this is very -- this has been -- I took a while for me to work this out and put it together, and it sort of covers everywhere. The warning objection notice. Now what you're going to understand too is that sometimes council is on the land where the tower is going to be built or the power pole is or whatever. The issue is that they are technically liable if they approve if it's on their land. Does that make sense?

Josh: Yeah.

Raymond: So you also include them as part of it. And number 18 --

Josh: So you're sending -- So just to be clear. You're sending that to the city council members as well, or just the council, the city as a whole, like as a corporate entity?

Raymond: I'll do both. And to the councilors because they're the ones that vote on this. And usually they're the ones that will basically say, "No, we want a moratorium. We don't want this bill until approved. Until there's been some clarification as to more evidence that it's safe. We at the moment we don't believe that there's enough science out there to indicate that it is safe, and we just want a moratorium to establish that it is safe, not the other way around."

Josh: Okay. So it's again, recipients of this process; the carrier, any regulator such as the FCC, or whomever is the regulator, whether it's a state or provincial or federal, correct?

Raymond: Not so much the regulators because you really go into the local level here, you don't really need to involve the regulator here. So like you have a lot of power, believe it or not, they can abate and it does explain it in here. But basically what a council can do is they can say, well on a health grounds or on nuisance grounds. Even though we've approved last week, we've now come to the conclusion that this thing possibly is a risk of harm to health. We can then simply abate, which is basically means to stop. Put a notice, it's a bit like if you got weeds in the backyard and the council wants you to mow your lawn. It's similar to that. So if it's a risk of public health, then they can come in and do that.

Josh: Okay. So are we sending this step to the carriers? And if so, is it like the CEO? Or is it the legal department, who is it addressed to?

Raymond: Well, usually send it to whoever is the PR person. They usually take over and so all of this is -- and it's usually a separate company that always do that. But then you find it, okay. "He's go straight to the top, I'd go straight to the head office and the CEO around. You know, who are the major directors of the company, and that's who I go for. Because they're the ones that ultimately liable because they --

Josh: And to clarify that, in their individual capacity or in their capacity as an actor within that corporate? Is it to the corporation, or is it the individual capacity?

Raymond: To the corporation itself and then to the individual, yes.

Josh: And you can accomplish that simply by -- when you address and send. On the letter it says their name and then comma, you know, their role director, whatever CEO of Corporation, right? Or do you have to do anything else specifically when you actually send.

Raymond: You can send it specifically to the corporation, to the site, to such and such, because they can put an entity. So there are legal entities, the corporation. If you send it to a director, then it's still technically being sent to the company anyway. And when you send it to a company director, it also includes some in a personal liability issue as well. So just simply to a director, and also to the head office, and you should be following.

Josh: So head office, attention legal department, let's say, and also to the CEO?

Raymond: You'll find that on -- look for all the documentation to find

out who it's to be sent to. Because you'll find that a lot of corporations, for example, have about 20 or 30 different companies that they're all operating under. So you want to get to the crux, find out from your regulator, who is actually responsible for this tower. Who's responsible for this smart meter? Who actually is it? And then get confirmation from the county; again, who is responsible for this thing? It takes a bit of legwork. If you could do it yourself, it'll save a lawyer doing a lot of running around. But that's basically what you do.

Josh: Okay. So let's say, on average, are the typical process could be to the head or whatever company is responsible. And secondly, to the CEO of the carrier, like if we're going to standardize the process.

Raymond: I'll go straight to the CEO. Yes, the Chief Executive Officer or the Director.

Josh: And then this piece not to the regulators, but you also sends it to the city or the county or local municipality and the council.

Raymond: Whoever in charge of the development side of things, so usually it's your local council. You go to them, because they really going to be the decision makers. Because you want them to get the opportunity to look at it, and the more councils you make aware of it, the more they'll realize that, "Okay, a there is a concern. Particularly here we're going to adopt this report says it is a concern." And with the reports that I've got, there's where it says an extreme risk of harm that should be taken lightly.

Josh: Now if there's a local government with a mayor and nine councilors, who do you send to? How many?

Raymond: All.

Josh: Yeah, all of them, okay. So like the city and then the mayor, and the nine councilors if there's that many. Just send it, they will all get a copy.

Raymond: Yeah, everyone gets a copy.

Josh: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

Raymond: Because usually, you'll notice that when you read the medical opinion, you'll see it actually explains all the science that goes through all the studies and where it's found harm. And it's all there. So you want the councilors to be educated because a lot of them don't realize what this stuff does. "Oh, my God, I didn't know that." It's an education process.

Josh: Okay, good.

Raymond: So that's number 18. Then you lobby your councilors/ aldermen. And send your objection notice to each councilor and alderman within the council and try to meet with them to explain your situation. Now councils are usually pretty open to that sort of thing, and sometimes even at public meetings to assist that. And they might even call the carrier to come into the chat. So try and encourage that if you can.

Number 19: Hopefully after receiving your objection notice, the emitters will tactfully withdraw from installing the facility and/or the council will issue an abatement notice against the emitters and/or reject any development application. So that's hopefully where it sits. Okay, up to that point. The next part of it is where they don't do that. Okay, the councilors is, "I'm not going to do anything. I'm not going to listen to the advice I've been given by you, I've seen a letter. The emitters are the same." That's where the next bit comes into it. Do you want to explain it?

Josh: Please.

Raymond: Okay. So number 20; However, if the emitters and/or council decide not to heed your objection notice and make it known to you by a response letter to your objection, and/or by conduct, such as commence building and installing, that they intend to proceed with the installation or development, then you may have various legal options available to you. If such an intention to proceed is made known to you and their intention to proceed cause you discomfort in the form of fear of harm, that they'll irradiate you and your family, then such action would constitute a threat to assault. And in this particular case, under Section 75 of the Criminal Code Act, 1899, Queensland, I've just put that in there just to give a bit of a reference.

Now number 21: The objection notice should provide the requisite evidence to enable you apply various legal options and remedies. And in the State of Queensland, for example, options and remedies include (but are not limited to). So I've gone through and explain what you can do. Now first one that can be done is what's called a suit. And the civil side of it, you can do an abatement notice which comes under environmental nuisance, in your personal injury claim (the psychological injury). Damage to property claim, because your home is uninhabitable that requires shielding.

You can seek a mandatory injunction. Now, what a mandatory junction is, is a court order to force the council to abate or to prosecute the emitters. Because the council have an obligation and duty under the local government acts to abate if there's been an environmental nuisance, so there's a possible damage to health or is to health. If they don't perform their civic duty to do that, you can seek what's called a mandatory injunction usually in the Supreme Court. But you'll need to

have a good talk to a lawyer about that.

Josh: Now, does that hinge on the accountability and the liability sort of built in to elected officials to look after their constituents as health complaint is brought to them?

Raymond: Exactly. Mandatory injunctions can also apply in the hierarchy alongside with your ministers, with decision makers, etc. So it goes all the way up the ladder. And the people can if it's unconscionable what's going on, if there is an option that might be available to somebody to seek a mandatory injunction. I'm not sure if they apply particularly in the United States, but they certainly do apply here. But you need to talk to a lawyer about that.

Josh: Okay.

Raymond: Number II; is you can go into the Quasi Criminal jurisdiction. And here you can apply for court ordered restraint orders, such as peace and good behavior orders, also known in other states and territories. This is in Australia, as protection orders and/or apprehended violence orders or keep peace orders. Now this is the -- it's not actually criminal yet. What a Quasi Criminal means is that someone is threatening to assault me, I could either get them charged under the Criminal Code, but I don't want to do that. I just want to get them to stop and keep the peace.

So I go through a Quasi Criminal side of things. That's what the restraints are. The thing is, it's only a civil sort of remedy, in a funny way. But if they breach it, if an order is being made against them to restrain, a letter to do this, you've got to stop emitting for two years, you know, stop. If they breach that, then they committed a criminal offense. And that's what that's for.

Josh: Wow, this is excellent.

Raymond: Number III, okay. That's criminal. This is now the criminal jurisdiction. Now, in this case, you can then go for prosecution of various criminal offenses for what's known as trespass against the person. And in essence, an assault is a trespass against my person. Exactly what the electromagnetic radiation is doing. Its trespassing against my person, that's one of the assaults, is. I've already explained before about assault; so I won't repeat that, but there's a section it does talk about assault here. In this particular case all you need is personal discomfort. And please note that threatening to apply for such as electrical force is considered unlawful and that it is not essential that a person threatened should be putting fear, and apprehension or expectation of assault is sufficient.

Josh: This is a really important part of it because that brings ones own perspective on one's own wellbeing backed up by their doctor's opinion. It really brings it into -- it's finally applicable. It's finally have leverage in that.

Raymond: Yeah. I listened to your advice and they go ahead and say, I'm going to build this thing, and you see them start build it. Well, they're technically threatening to assault you under the code. So is threatening violence, which is another -- I won't go through it, but I've already explained that to you. But that also includes a two year imprisonment. So this is in Queensland. And if the offense is committed at night, the offender is liable to imprisonment for five years.

Endangering life of children by exposure. Now, Section 326 of the Criminal Code. "Any person who exposes a child under the age of 7 years, whereby the life of such child is/or is likely to be endangered, or the child's health is all likely to be permanently injured, commits a crime and there's a maximum penalty is 7 years imprisonment there." Then you are going to have assault occasioning bodily harm. Now in this particular case, I'll just read this very quickly. "An assault causing any hysterical and nervous condition is an assault occasioning bodily harm."

Josh: That's significant.

Raymond: That's significant. So now I've got a quasi called Aaron Miller, which is 1954, two coins minted in 282. And this is an English case that would apply in Australia, and clearly would apply in the England, UK. Now, another thing you got to understand is that, bodily injury occurs if pain has lasted for a couple of days and the body have suffered the damage as defined in Brown and Blake 2000, Western Australian Supreme Court of Appeals 132. So even there, if you've got pain, you go to the doctor. This thing's hurting me. I'm getting bad headaches. I'm getting, you know, whatever it might be, then that's bodily injury technically. That might be a little bit iffy, but I think the trick is to go down certainly the hysterical nervous condition side of it in regards to fear. I think that would apply very much.

Now serious assault, which is Section 340 of the Criminal Code. "Any person who commits an unlawful assault on the person who is 60 years of age or more, and assaults any person who relies on a guide, hearing or assistant dog, wheelchair or ever remedial device is guilty of a crime and liable to 7 years imprisonment." So that applies it to a serious assault. Okay. Then you also have negligent act of causing harm. And the duty of a person in charge of a dangerous thing, and a duty of a person doing dangerous acts. Now, they're very, very important. And the other one that's a criminal issue, believe it or not, is a common nuisance.

And I'll just read this to you. This is Section 230 the Criminal Code

(Queensland). So, you know it all depends on which state or country you come from. "Any person who without lawful justification or excuse, the proof of which lies on the person, does any act, or omits to do any act with respect to any property under the person's control, by which act or omission danger is caused to the lives, safety, or health, of the public; or without lawful justification or excuse, the proof of which lies on the person, does any act, or omits to do any act with respect to any property under the person's control, by which act or omission danger is caused to the property or comfort of the public, or the public are obstructed in the exercise or enjoyment of any right common to all Her Majesty's subjects, (remember I talked about, either right to the quiet enjoying my lane. That's what that's covering) and by which injury is caused to the person of some person; is guilty of a misdemeanor, and is liable to imprisonment for 2 years."

Josh: Wow, that's significant in and of itself. So you've quoted case law, and it's specifically applicable to Queensland, Australia. Some of it is applicable internationally and everywhere, but I just want to ask specifically, it's up to the individual and/or their lawyer to identify which of this and identify how, you know, quote the laws and quote the case laws, apply them to their region. So don't just take this and copy it because it says Queensland.

Raymond: Yeah, that's correct. And number 22. This is important. Okay. Commencing legal action can be a complicated process. It has many pitfalls and can be a costly exercise, especially if you don't mean your case. It is highly recommended that you seek legal advice to clarify your options and position before you take any steps and/or proceed to a court of law. So let's just sort of a very basic step by step process, and I gave a very basic understanding of some of the civil liability. So in essence, I mean, it's sort of got some of what I would advise in some way in here. But it's doesn't really cover a full on legal advice, but at least that's enough to help you out or will help somebody out.

Josh: Yeah, excellent. Ray, this is incredibly valuable. And thank you so much for taking the time to walk everyone through this. Now we're going to be making all these documents available on the website that's linked on this page that Ray's talk is embedded on. And so that website will be providing sort of first line support, but please, please consider a contribution to that website on that website, as Ray has mentioned.

And we've talked about here a couple times that is going to help to continue to -- you know, the more resources we have to put behind this, the more resources go to the people that are doing this work on the ground, the bigger this thing can go, the more people can be put on it. So I just want to encourage everyone as they go to the website and download their documents, download this 22 step guide and the document templates. Please do consider that. Ray, just wrapping up

here, any final thoughts for our audience?

Raymond: I just wanted to quickly read the very first paragraph on this warning and objection notice. This is to the emitters, to the council, to everybody. "So take notice that the warnings and objection contained in this notice is intended not only to protect myself, my family and my property, but is intended to also protect you and to warn you of your duty of care and to warn you of the possible consequences that any of your actions or emissions in regards to the emission of any non ionizing electromagnetic radiation onto my land, from your facility and situated that is either in your possession, charge and/or directly or directly under your control or under your management. That failure to heed this notice has the potential to place you in jeopardy of being both criminally and civilly liable for any actions or missions that cause harm, injury and damage."

So that's basically part of the notice itself. And that's about it really, and I just wish everybody good luck. And you know, the more lawyers we can get involved in this, the better and hopefully -- I can't guarantee that this will work for you or for your listeners, but you know, I've had some success with it. I'm not saying that I've been successful everywhere but I've had success with it. And then the least, and just wish everyone good luck. And everybody, they're empowered I guess. Thanks for everything you do too, by the way, Josh. Wonderful. Thanks.

Communities Using Fiber Optics Instead of 5G

Guest: Dr. Timothy Schoechle

Josh: With us today on the 5G Summit is, Dr Timothy Schoechle. Dr. Schoechle is a communications technology expert. A Ph.D. with an international consultant in computer engineering and standardization. A former faculty member at the University of Colorado's engineering college. And a senior research fellow at the National Institute for Science Law and Public Policy.

Dr. Schoechle's works "Getting Smarter About the Smart Grid" and "Reinventing Wires, The Future of Landline and Networks" are uniquely positioned to help provide a roadmap for real solutions to the problems associated with the hasty and untested deployment of 5G and small cells.

Dr. Schoechle, thank you so much for being with us on the 5G and Beyond Summit today.

Dr. Schoechle: Thank you, Josh. It's a pleasure.

Josh: So, Dr. Schoechle, what is 5G? And what are its stated intentions or stated objectives?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, 5G means the fifth generation of cellular telephone network. Roughly speaking, every ten years, the industry has come up with a new generation of cellular phones. And this is the one that's being introduced now. It's not ready yet. It's really in its earliest stage and prototype essentially. It's being tested in a couple of cities. But there's really no such thing yet. The technical standards aren't finished. And the spectrum hasn't been allocated yet.

Josh: Okay. And what are the claim benefits of 5G? How is industry

pushing this through and getting the support?

Dr. Schoechle: Well the goal is, as the industry states, is to have higher speed connection and less delay in the message response. So, that when you push a button, there is a certain delay and what they want to do is cut that down. They want to minimize it. And they have promised a lot of new applications that range from being able to use this for the Internet of Things, whatever that is, the autonomous vehicles, and virtual reality. But I think inevitably it's going to be faster video and particularly more ads.

Josh: Okay. So, are there other perhaps hidden real reasons that maybe different than what we are being sold? What are the real reasons of 5G, if they are different than what you just said?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I think if you look underneath all of this, you find that they need to sell more phones, they need to sell more chips, and they want to collect more data. That's what the industry is really about. And if you look at the statistics on the sale of smartphones, it's really backed off in the last couple of years, very dramatically. Even Apple computer, who has made a huge amount of money on this is still seeing a decline. They have a two year now decline in sales, particularly in the developed world. They need a new generation to get people to buy a new phone. That's basically the bottom line. You have to buy a new phone, build more chips, and find new ways to get consumers more addicted to this service.

Josh: Yeah. So, it's money, control, and profit. Data of course as you mentioned.

Dr. Schoechle: Yeah. And they promised all these applications I mentioned. But really it boils down to advertising. It is the primary function of the whole network. It's delivering ads to you. And pinpointing you, targeting you, and collecting on data on you. So, that those ads can be better targeted. And that's what 5G is going to be about too.

Josh: So, in addition to data collecting and advertising more directly, I guess, with more granular data. What are your concerns about 5G? And about the direction that the wireless industry is going?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, there's a number of concerns. I guess, for one thing, 5G and 4G are kind of wedded together in a way that isn't true of the earlier generations. Because 5G doesn't even promise to do voice service. So, to have a smart phone that has voice communication, it will have to be both. In fact, the 4G will be used 4G LTE it's called, long term evolution. Which means ten years. It is about coordinating the 5G. And then the 5G will be the actual high-speed download, data download part. It will be managed by the 4G.

So, there's another important factor though is the 5G uses a whole different or will use, or least is promised to use a whole new frequency range that is very new. And never been used for this before or for much at all. It has unknown characteristics. And that is what they call

the millimeter wave, which are gigahertz. The range and propagation characteristics are so different from the frequencies presently being used down around one gigahertz. To under one gigahertz to nine hundred megahertz. The 5G frequencies will be way up into the twenty, thirty gigahertz and they will be much shorter range. Instead of a three to five mile range, they will have only a few hundred feet maybe. As a result, they will have to put in more cell towers or cell sites.

So, they came up with this idea of the small cell. Which is the idea of putting a cellular transceiver in every lamp post. Maybe as close to a hundred feet or less. In every neighborhood to saturate basically the entire environment with these millimeter wave frequencies in order to get adequate coverage for people and certainly for any devices in your vehicles or moving objects. So, what is much different about it? In order to do that, they could not afford to license all those cell towers if they had to go pay for it. So, what they did is they got laws passed, at least half of the states, to preempt local regulations. So, that the industry will be able to get access to the public right of ways to put these things on every street, lamp post, or where they want, park benches, buildings, anything. Without having to really pay the full cost. And then externalize that cost onto the community.

Josh: Are these the ALEC laws that you speak of? Or is this a different set of legislation?

Dr. Schoechle: There were really two strategies. One was to get the ALEC Organization, which creates model legislation. They put forth model legislation and I think it was adopted in over twenty states so far to enable this, to preempt local regulation.

Josh: And that's the American Legislative Exchange Council, correct?

Dr. Schoechle: Right, the American Legislative Exchange Council, which is a libertarian think tank that creates model legislation on many, many topics. But this is one of them. And then as a backup for that, they got the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate the same set of rules at the national level to preempt local regulation. Because of the chair of the Federal Communications Commission is a guy from Verizon. So, you know, that's their agenda.

So, that is being challenged in Court. And these laws are being challenged. Everything's being challenged right now. It's up in the air. Because when people finally woke up to the fact that this was happening or starting to happen, there's been quite an uproar that has emerged. And then there's a whole a different dimension to it. Aside from the preemption of the rights of local communities to regulate the health, safety and environmental quality. Is this issue of the big questions around electromagnetic radiation. And we know that the existing cell phones, there is a potential hazard there. Because research has just come forward in the last couple of years. It has been around a long time.

But some recent research has really reinforced that. And then those

concerns. And then there's the added fact that the 5G is even yet in a newer also employs, not just the old frequencies but new frequencies too. They are a completely mystery as to how they behave and what they do in the biological effects of all that. Health effects are completely unknown. So, it's a mass experiment on a huge population. That is being put forward here.

Josh: What's your take on, earlier in 2019, Senator Blumenthal was grilling reps from the senior representatives from the wireless industry who basically admitted in that Senate Hearing that they haven't done any testing on the health effects of 5G frequencies and they don't plan to. There's no budget. They don't plan to assign a budget. And they're proceeding anyway. What's your thoughts on that? And how do things kind of get to that point?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, in the past, everyone has deferred to the FCC emissions limits. But the problem is those are so far out of date, decades out of date. And they were based on old issues around radar, microwaves, and heating of tissue. But in recent years, there's been a huge body of evidence that it's not the thermal effects or the heating effects that are important. That there are other effects that have to do with non-thermal effects, non-ionizing radiation effects, that may create a health hazard.

But the FCC has absolutely no capability or even interest in studying medical issues, biological issues, or epidemiological issues. They're not quick to do that. And don't plan to. So, the FCC is kind of like lost in the woods here. And they don't really know what to do. And then they don't have any staff to deal with it. So, it's a big question. And the industry is trying to sweep it under the rug.

Josh: So, there's the data harvesting, the mass increase in data harvesting that the 5G plan is really associated with. There's the health and environmental effects that we don't really know about. But they are proceeding without having those tests. Meanwhile, the independent testing is indicating there's very likely a problem. And then there's the passing of laws that you mentioned. Both at the federal level, the FCC, and at the state level with the ALEC laws.

You quoted in your recent paper, "Reinventing Wires." You said, "The Internet has become one of the defining technologies of our society. It is our central medium for commerce and communication. And more importantly for our public discourse, engagement and democratic governance. However, it has been hijacked by the commercial motivations that have come to redefine and constrain the availability, quality, content, and media have high speed access in the United States."

What is the danger? What is kind of the pathway that we need to be aware of and maybe take action on of this hijack? Can you just kind of paint a picture for us with your decades of experience in leadership within the communications industry? This being hijacked by commercial

interests that seem to be just passing laws and seem to be just going ahead even without any testing. What are the dangers of that? What are we looking at?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, the original concept behind the Internet was something much different than what we have today. And believe it or not there was a time, about 1995, that it was completely non-commercial. And there was a debate at the time about whether it should be commercialized or not. Or whether commercial activity and advertising should be allowed on the Internet. Then the government at the time decided to just basically productize the whole thing and let it go. It was a government owned and operated network. And we've seen it evolve now. It's almost hard to imagine kids growing up today with their smart phones, that wouldn't have any inkling that that was ever true.

What I mean by hijacking is by far the primary business model of the Internet is advertising. And that's far from the original concept. It was communication. I don't know what can be done about that or anything could be done about it. But there are some really excellent books coming out now. Scholars are looking at this. Books like, *Anti-Social Media*, is one of them. Another one I just got is a book by a Harvard Law Professor called, *Surveillance Capitalism*. It's about a concept that this business model when it's morphed into this Frankenstein machine that is taken over. And these Gargantuan corporations that have unbelievable political power and wealth, is reshaping our whole society.

And you know, here again, I'm not sure what to do about it. But one element that I have addresses is that it's creating this disparity between the rich and the poor. The people that have access and the people that don't. And my feeling is that they all ought to have access. And it should be basic access, not based on access to wireless phone industry. But basic access through optical fiber networks in every community. At least that evens the playing field a little bit. And it's not so as intensive or focused on the commercial purposes. But some of the other purposes that are more important to cities and towns can be incorporated into it.

Josh: You mentioned, triopoly instead of a monopoly with what's happening. As we know this 5G deployment and planning is happening worldwide. But in the United States, you talk about a triopoly. Can you just share with us your perspective on that? What is the triopoly and what are the threats of having such a thing in place?

Dr. Schoechle: Yeah, I think you make a good point that it's different in the United States and everywhere else. But the one difference is the completely privatized system we have here, in virtually everything from electric power to communications.

But the triopoly essentially, back in the mid-eighties we divested the telephone system, the Mob Bell System because it was a monopoly. And it had prevented technical innovation and preserved high prices. It also preserved, you know, high standards of performance. But more

importantly, it prevented innovation. So, the idea there was to break up that monopoly and get innovation back into the system.

Well, that worked. But unfortunately, what has happened since then and particularly with the Telecom Act of 1996, the restructuring of that. In the name of innovation, they completely unleashed wireless and at the same time they throttled back the wired networks. The old networks and any kind of new networks that were hard wired. At the time, it was a copper based network, copper wires. And now, it's all based on optical fiber. But the fiber going to your house is regulated differently than the fiber going to the wireless services you get.

So, wireless basically got a free ride. And so, all the Telecom companies converted themselves into wireless companies. My paper, "Reinventing Wires", talks in some detail about how all that happened and what the sequence of events was. But basically, it restructured the industry with a completely un-feathered, unregulated capitalism that resulted in the reconsolidating the Bell Companies, to create a new triopoly that is even more powerful than the old Bell monopoly. And the triopoly is Verizon, AT&T, which are really the remnants of the telephone Mob Bell System. Plus, the cable industry. It's all morphed into one huge triopoly that dominates internet access in this country and maintains artificially high prices, poor service, and constrains any kind of innovation.

Josh: I wanted to ask, where do you see this whole driverless car aspect of 5G going? It seems like an incredibly ambitious initiative to have driverless cars controlled by wireless signals and radiation. And I know, I've already seen news reports about crashes and things going wrong. How do you see this whole thing unfolding?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I'm very skeptical about it. There are two aspects. One is the driverless car itself or the autonomous vehicle. And then the other is the use of 5G. There's a fundamental problem. It sounds nice to talk about an autonomous vehicle. But if you really think about it, why do you want one? What is it for? What is it good for? Is it just another way because this is a fad and that it's another way to sell integrated circuits? And so, cram electronics into cars? To collect data on people that can be monetized, in one way or another. Or collect data on whatever. Is that what it's really about? Why do we need an autonomous vehicle? People like to drive their cars.

And you can come up with scenarios where they can sit back and read a newspaper and get ferried around, sure. There are a certain number of people that might like that. But I don't think it's a market. I think it might be a fleek market. And then the technical challenges around it are in incredibly huge. It requires precise mapping of every square inch basically where the car might go. And keeping it current. Not just mapping it but keeping it current. Because the car can't drive down the road where the bridge has been removed. And the car does not know that. But the economics of it don't make any sense to me. Who are going to buy these cars? Why would somebody buy them?

You hear about Uber all the time. "Uber, oh they are going to move to self-driving cars." But the basic business model of Uber is about externalizing the cost of the labor and the car onto the labor force. It's basically taking advantage of the labor force. What they call a sharecropper model of labor, post-slavery. In other words, it's even worse than slavery because the workers have to not only feed themselves, pay their car insurance, and maintain their car. And then they chisel down the workers to the absolute minimum that they will stand before they quit. That is the business model of Uber. The benefit to Uber was that they didn't have to buy the cars and they didn't have to maintain them. If they go to autonomous vehicles, they would have to do both of those things. They wouldn't have the benefit of the labor shouldering the costs of their fleet. So, why in the world would they do it? Well, it's hype. It sounds good to the stock market. It's about selling stock.

Josh: Castles in the air.

Dr. Schoechle: It's about selling stock to the stock market. And going public like they just did. And people are getting a little bit antsy about that because they look at what happened with their stock offering price. Same thing with Lyft.

Okay, we will translate the issue of the autonomous vehicle market overall. I think that Google really started this by frightening General Motors, all the other car manufacturers, Toyota, and everybody into thinking that the car of the future was going to be able to cram electronics into a car. They all had to get on that bandwagon, or they were going to get left behind. And they didn't understand that bandwagon. Google did. And the Silicon Valley guys understand selling chips, software, and apps. They know how to do that. So, they frightened the car industry into joining their club, into their bandwagon. And it's like a giant Ponzi scheme. They keep upping the ante and so now everybody's on this quest for the autonomous vehicle. But nobody really knows what it is needed for.

Josh: Yeah, exactly. So, 5G, autonomous vehicles, Internet of Things, potentially Internet of People, the way that these corporations are seeing this, and AI. Right?

Dr. Schoechle: That's mostly right. And AI is a similar thing. AI is just another word. It's a wine in new bottles. It's like the same story. We've had that term, AI around since I started in this business which was in the 1970s when I got interested in computers. It was about what we called AI at the time, I guess. But AI today, is a buzz word. It's a way of hyping stock. And all it is making computers and algorithms that run in computers. It's nothing new. There is some new stuff I should say that neuro network is really the cutting edge of AI. That's a whole discussion in itself where that may or may not go.

Josh: It seems like this could really, I'm starting to see this. This whole

thing could be the next bubble burst.

Dr. Schoechle: Yeah. It's mostly, that's what I think it is. It's a bubble. And it's mainly about investment in the stock market. And positioning startup companies for stock offerings. At some point in the future and Silicon Valley hyping its wares to the rest of the world. And, I think there's a skepticism that has just emerged in the last year, or in the last few months more.

If you look at it, the people are starting to wise up a little bit about Silicon Valley and the big corporations like Google, Facebook, Amazon, and Apple even. Apple is probably the least onerous or the least offensive of both that I have named. But at least the CEO of Apple has tried to give us some misgivings about all this. And he's written those down. But the other guys are just getting the money. And Zuckerberg is the epitome of the go get the money. You know, just get the money. And tell them whatever they want to hear.

Josh: Now, your papers, both of these significant works that you've done. First the, "Getting Smart about the Smart Grid" and "Reinventing Wires". They get into actual solutions. And you are touching on them there with wired networks. Help us understand. Because I think there is a perspective that wired networks and landlines are sort of antiquated or somehow no longer useful. Correct me if I'm wrong, but in the early 2000s there was a huge investment and there was a build out that was starting with fiber optics, with high speed wired networks. That was sort of hijacked as well. Help us understand, what are some of the major discoveries and ideas that you are helping the world really solve this problem with 5G within your published work?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I call it "Reinventing Wires" because when I say the wires, I mean both copper cables, particularly Ethernet is the technology that we all use on copper, mostly. But we have the old telephone DSL networks and stuff like that. And then the other thing is fiber. And optical fiber has come to be the dominant means of sending information. Even for cellular networks. There's this illusion, I think, that people have that their cell phone is somehow talking to the cloud directly. And they don't really know how it works, it just works. They don't realize that cell phone is going the last hundred feet or the last mile if you will, or the last maybe maximum of five miles, to a cell site that is then connected by optical fiber to a global network. And that's how it works.

What I'm advocating is simply that the bottleneck in that system is the wireless part. But there is one thing about wireless that is so handy. Wireless is good for things that move. And so, if you are going to move, it's very handy. Otherwise, if you are not moving, then you get a far better performance and better service by having a wire. Instead of just running those fibers to all these cell sites, let's make sure that fibers go to everybody's house and everybody's business. Then it will be a fair comparison. There's a movement that the triopoly has constrained the

development and they diverted all that fiber construction to their cell sites.

There are some huge lawsuits now over that because they've expropriated billions of dollars. They should have got their rate payers paid for their phone service that should have gone to upgrade their service. And it did not. It went to upgrade the cell sites. What I'm calling for is a new movement that's well underway for every town, city, and community in the country. To build out their own fiber as they would their own sewer system, their water system, and their streets. And they need fiber to everybody as well. Because it's a necessity of modern life. You can't file job applications. You can't get any public documents without it. And why should we be dependent on a proprietary wireless network to do that? Because the fiber networks are not proprietary.

Josh: Talk more about the benefits that will be gained by doing that? By wiring to the building level?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, everybody would be able to get this high performance access in their home and then you could work at home. Because you could have symmetrical service with fiber. You can upload stuff just as fast as you download it. So, the older systems of DSL and cable systems don't provide that kind of symmetry. Mobile systems don't either. They are built for downloading ads, movies, and things like that. They are not built for symmetrical service. So, the nice thing about fiber would be that you could have a server in your house. You could run a business out of it. And your business would work better.

And the other factor is that there's a lot of automation coming. Particularly, let's take the example of energy management. It's an area that I work in a lot and that has to do distributed solar and storage. We could convert our entire energy system off of coal and fossil fuels to solar energy and with storage batteries. But it becomes very important to be able to control the flow of electricity in a local community in real time basically. And trade that power back and forth to optimize the performance of a distributed system like that. We call solar microgrids. But they need high-speed communication to work and optical fiber would be ideal. And, interestingly enough, a lot of the fiber systems have been installed around the country.

And particularly our neighbor next door here, Longmont, Colorado, has the electric company which is owned by the community. They have also installed optical fiber there to every customer. So, the customers can get, not only electricity, but they can also get internet. They have over fifty-five percent subscription rate to that and those customers can get gigabyte internet access, symmetrical service for \$49.00 a month. You can't beat that. It's like having indoor plumbing, right?

Josh: Yeah. So, you talk about in your previous paper, "Getting Smart about the Smart Grid", the solutions that you bring forward. You've termed, instead of a smart grid, it's a wise grid, right? Can you talk a little

bit more about that? And in particular, include if you could, the metering side of things? What kind of utility meters would we need to have? What would you recommend making this locally controlled solar integrated, new energy technology integrated wise grid most effective?

Dr. Schoechle: Yeah. Well that's sort of what I was just talking about a little bit. If you have a power grid and a parallel fiber optic that links everything together. It's not just metering that you have to do. You need to control the flow of the energy. In other words, every building needs to have some type of intelligent hub or gateway that controls the flow of energy within the home. And balances the generation [inaudible 36:04] storage of energy on the premises. And then communicates with neighboring premises through the local distribution grid and the fiber network to balance that flow within the community. And the whole community can achieve, overall, extremely high levels of penetration of solar energy by doing that.

Josh: Without smart meters though, right?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, the metering is kind of an interesting problem. Because originally the meters were for the purpose of regulating the controller and controlling the use of energy on the premises. And then, maybe once a month they would be read by a utility company. But they have the cart in front of the horse and the utility industry discovered they could make a lot of money on the smart meter network by installing a completely redundant wireless communication network. It didn't need to be wireless. It made more sense than the original prototypes of those meters that were developed back in the mid-nineties, early nineties, that were really hardwired and through the telephone network. They discovered they could make more money by selling an extra network. And it was a wireless network. And it's really about the money. Because the utility industry makes the money off of capital return on capital assets. So, the meters become a big money machine.

When in fact the meter really ought to be part of a home control system that is working entirely on the premises. And then connect. It could possibly send billing data once a month to a utility. But it doesn't make sense how it's set up now where the utility has to suck out the data on a fifteen interval basis which it doesn't have any idea what to do with. And then send you a monthly bill. And then they sell the data to somebody else, for some other entirely different purpose. It doesn't make any sense.

So, what I'm trying to do is get this back to what the original concept of the smart meter was. As part of a system that is for premises control of energy. Premises based controlled went to somehow the illusion was used to sell the smart meter idea that there wasn't going to be some giant computer in the sky that could monitor everybody's toaster. And somehow control the flow of energy. Which it cannot do. And they have no interest in doing that.

Josh: So, in the solutions that you have mapped out. Is a digital meter still required to do that home level of control? Or can it be an analog meter with the appropriate technology that doesn't suck data out as you put it?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, people want the analog meters because they don't have radios in them. They're not radiating microwaves. You don't have to have a microwave transmitter on your house. In fact, the modern equipment has meters built into it. Like a solar inverter is measuring the amount of power that's being produced, that's coming off the solar panels, and the amount of power that's going into the house. There is nothing wrong with doing that if you are using that information locally to control the flow of energy. A digital meter is just fine because it's not a radio. The issue here is the radio transmitter, turning it into a microwave transmitter, a radar transmitter. Why do we need that? We don't. It's completely useless, redundant, and counterproductive.

Josh: So, we know that smart meters were installed to surveil people and collect data. And they don't even know how to really use it. But in most cases, although some it's being monetized. And you don't know who it's going to. We know that, you know, you said earlier, we talked about 5G basically very, very similar thing. Data harvesting, control, profit, in the name of convenience.

So, my question is this. What is your understanding of how smart utility meters and 5G infrastructure are planned to work together? Or are they not planned to work together?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I don't know. I mean, I would assume that they'll try to milk that cash cow too. The utility industry, they need to make money. So, if they can money off of it, they will do it. They have to get the regulators to let them get a way with it. The data doesn't need to leave the premises. The data is needed on the premises. In fact, the premises need data from the network, from the power companies. Not vice versa. The power company doesn't need data from the premises. The premises need the data from the power company about the price of energy at any particular time. Or what they call demand charges, demand response issues. The flow of data, they have it backwards right now. If you need any data, that's what it would be needed for.

And I think that the idea behind using fiber network to control the flow of energy is actually one of the cutting edge areas right now. There is a technology called transactive energy which is the idea of basically real time, local trading of energy. You know, like short five minute interval basis between homes and buildings in a distribution grid. That could be done. And it could make that distribution grid very efficient. And nobody needs to collect that data and sell it. It's data that is just held on the premises and minimized. There is no need to send data off into the electric company or into the larger grid. It's something for local grid management.

Josh: Yeah. So, in your wise grid solution. Help us get an understanding for the level of effectiveness of solar energy production and energy storage? You know, where is it at right now? And where is it developing too? Like is it viable in terms of large scale transition technology?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, we've seen huge changes in the last year or last two years. In terms of the price of solar panels and the price of solar energy. And also, we have seen not quite as far along yet but it's getting there too. It is changing at the same rate, is the battery storage and the technology behind that. Well, the solar panels are already competitive with any other kind of electricity. Wind and solar are probably, we are seeing proposals around here for just buying solar power from large wind farms and larger solar installations down in the one or two cent per kilowatt hour range which is unbelievable. When, you know, coal and other conventional sources are up to eight or ten cents in some places or more per kilowatt hour.

So, solar is already competitive with any other source of energy. The issue around solar of course, is storage. And so, if you pair solar storage with solar, then you've got the perfect solution. The storage is still very expensive and that the performance improves dramatically in the last couple of years. And it will continue to improve because they use the same kind of battery technology in electric vehicles. And there's a huge effort going on there all over the world to improve that. So, the economies of vehicle battery storage will also accrue to the users of stationary batteries in homes, buildings, and even in local grid operations. So, it's competitive at this point. Solar and storage are competitive with natural gas and are far better than coal at the present time.

Josh: I live close to Seattle. And so, what would you say about this? You know, we don't get three hundred days of sun like you do in Boulder. So, how viable would that be in cloudier climates?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, one thing about Seattle you do have a lot of hydro. And that's one other aspect of it too. Because it can be made to work together with the same electric power grid. Although that hydro is larger scale. I tend to feel that the smaller distributed technologies are going to be better than highly centralized ones. But you already have all that hydro, so there it is. And there's a lot of wind available to in that part of the country.

But to answer your question about the solar, it just takes more of it, if it's not so sunny. Here in Denver area, we have average of three hundred sunny days a year. You don't have that many in Seattle. So, you need more solar. But Germany has gotten a reputation for being one of the most solarized countries in the world already. And they're certainly not any sunnier than Seattle. So, it can be done, just takes more of it.

Josh: So, with wind production and to a lesser extent with solar as well. The technology by default seems to be basically as such that it produces

either magnetic fields and/or dirty electricity, voltage transients, and so forth. Have you had a chance to look into any technologies to mitigate or to make safer solar, especially wind I would suppose, in terms of that concern that people have?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, the technology is available to do that. It's just that, it costs a certain amount. And people that build that equipment, if they don't care about it, they are not going to build it. The new inverters that we have, the new inverters for homes, some of them can be extremely clean. They don't generate any dirty electricity. They actually clean-up the electricity. Some of the older equipment, is pretty noisy. Basically, what you call dirty electricity is the electrical noise that is created by sloppy, cheap electronics. If you take care to design the electronics properly, like some of the manufacturers have done. It's very nice. It's very clean. And you know, the same thing can be said about LED lamps and compact fluorescent lamps. They tend to have real cheap sloppy power supplies, badly designed. Because the people designing them didn't care. If people care. Then they can get this stuff that is properly designed.

The big windmills same story. The electrical problems around those are significant but can be mitigated with the proper designs. I don't tend to be a fan of big wind farms because they required transmission. That means building transmission systems and those create all kinds of radiation and noise. And they cost a lot of money. It is capital intensive. We are seeing an opportunity here to morph the electric system from a hundred year old centralized capital intensive structure to a new decentralized distributed consumer electronic mass market structure. And those kinds of products can be designed to be user friendly.

Josh: And so, by communities, local governments, and individuals getting behind this kind of technology. Not only are we literally bringing our power back into our own hands. And out of the hands of multinational corporate interests. But we're preserving this, like you said, this surveillance economy, right? Sorry, we are preserving our rights from being kind taken over by let's say a surveillance company on the back of a smart grid, 5G network, Internet of Things.

Dr. Schoechle: Yeah. Here again, I agree completely with that. And my philosophy is basically around smaller sometimes is better. They are usually better because it doesn't entail these institutional structures and capital structures that are so politically uncontrollable. If we can favor localized governance and localized distributed technologies, then we'll be much better able to shape our environment in a desirable way. When stuff is controlled by big corporations, you don't get any say over what they do or what they design. And smaller markets work better. When any market gets too big, it becomes out of control. And dominated by corporate interest.

Josh: I'm going to maybe put you on the spot a little bit and ask your specific preferences around some technologies in just a moment. But

you were talking about it is possible, if there is a motivation to do so, to clean up dirty power or voltage transients from wind production, from solar production, that technology is available. It just needs to be an awareness brought to that market and the producers. And then it can be cleaned up. We actually have someone in the Summit, Terry Stoughton. Our audience will be very interested in a specific technology that he has developed. He has in place for quite a long time that are getting specific very positive results with reducing dirty power and also reducing people's utility bills.

So, my question is with regard to storage or energy production. A year or two ago we were hearing a lot about Tesla's power wall as being the new market. The cream of the crop for the commonly known and available product for storage energy. Is that a product that you would recommend? Are there more advanced products out there now? What are you most excited about in terms of energy storage and perhaps if you want to talk about specific energy production? Specific brands? And feel free to name specific brands or companies.

Dr. Schoechle: Okay. Well, that's an interesting question. And relating back to the issue of clean power and dirty power, there is a real opportunity with this kind of distributed architecture storage and small inverters, you know like home level equipment to go to DC power. Or to create a market would be developed for transitioning to more DC appliances which is the cleanest kind of power. So, you know, people don't realize it but if you buy a new dishwasher or some kind of major appliance, it already has a DC motor in. It is DC powered inside. They just run it off an AC power system because that is what is available. But if the market were to develop for DC and it was commonly available, then they would cut a lot of costs out of major appliances by not having to do that conversion. The cost would go way down.

The other aspect, the solar system is inherently a DC coupled system. The solar plus storage that I'm talking about. There is kind of a debate going on in this battery industry and inverter industry over whether we are going to use high voltage batteries or low voltage batteries. I tend to favor the low voltage. A forty-eight volt battery system is a standard that has been around for many years. That was pioneered by Thomas Edison, the idea of not going over fifty volts in a power grid. He really developed a lot of the battery technology that's even now finally coming to market.

But the power wall, from my understanding, for efficiency reasons. And it's running at a much higher voltage because the solar system is cheaper to wire them up so that they produce high voltage DC. But the problem is that is extremely dangerous, and it creates a system that is not consumer friendly. You are not going to go messing around inside a power wall because it's extremely dangerous to work in those voltages, particularly with DC. But with forty-eight volts you could go buy forty-eight volt batteries anywhere and put them in. Consumers can do that.

That is something that is quite accessible to consumers and the new inverters that serve those, companies like Outback, Snyder Electric, and Magnum. Those are basically low voltage DC systems that still work with solar panels, fine. But they convert the high voltage DC into low voltage battery power. And then they work with that in the premises.

So, then you have a DC power bus that's available. There are new products coming out for lighting for instance. Lighting systems that are low voltage DC. All of the appliances you are using, your phones, your computers, everything is running on low voltage DC. That is what they work on. So, if you put a power supply in the wall, it's a 110-volt power supply. It's converting everything to low voltage DC. So, the new standards that I talk about in my paper for building wiring, using ethernet where you can transmit data around the building at the same speed as the fiber coming in. A gigabyte per second if you want to. Copper is able to do that. And not only that, the new versions of ethernet that are coming out now. And the standards committees that I work in, we are working on that right now. The technical standards to support that are new versions of USB that include ethernet and will deliver DC power over the same wire.

So, you can have wires in your house that deliver not only gigabyte data but also power. So, instead of data over power, it's power over data and power lines. So, plug your smart phone into a charger in the wall and it would get both data and power to charge the battery out of the same plug. A new version of USB.

Josh: So, if it's power over data, rather than data over power. Such as the, what is it called? Not power wall. But you know those technologies where you run Internet through the electricity lines in your house. I've tested that and that creates terrible dirty electricity. Terrible voltage transients.

Dr. Schoechle: Yeah, different versions of that for years and years. I've worked with it a lot. And that's not the solution. But the new one is the way to go. It's the power over data.

Josh: So, there is no dirty electricity problems or voltage transients in that solution, right?

Dr. Schoechle: No, it's completely shielded and works fine. It is delivering DC.

Josh: Okay. I also want to say is a transition technology, I don't know if you've heard of MOCHA. A multi-media over coaxial alliance? People watching this can go on Amazon and look this up. MOCHA 2. Tim, I've actually set this up in about four homes. Have you heard of it, first of all?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I've heard the name. But I can confess. That I'm not up to speed on MOCHA.

Josh: Well, what you're doing is the real solution. And so, this is a transition technology that actually has an adapter between your wired

router and the TV cable system throughout your house. It actually allows the internet to be transmitted and be available in every room that has a TV cable outlet. So, that is actually in this house. And I've set up a number of houses. That is a very viable transition technology that I would definitely recommend.

So, I want to get back to the 5G problem and your wired solutions. So, the question is this, it appears to be, Tim, that this is a battle between local governments and the people needing to actually team up with their local governments to preserve local rights. To preserve even individual rights like we are talking about with these locally controlled, home controlled technologies. And against, you could say, the FCC or big corporate interest that are controlling the FCC.

So, when this was first announced yearly this year, I think, it was reported that more than three hundred local governments across the United States were threatening legal action against the FCC. Because we are going to have people sharing this with local government reps. And there's going to be elected officials watching. What would you say to local governments that are really at that place of, of saying, "I see the value in this? I see the importance of this conversation. But really, I'm not sure about this legal battle. I'm not sure about going against big corporate interests or the FCC." What would you say to maybe encourage local government officials that are in that process of figuring out the best way forward?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I'd say you have to stand up to them. They have to get some courage. And realize that they are there to represent their constituents. They are there to represent the people that live in their community. That is their job. And if they can't do that, they need to step aside and let someone else do it. Rather than say, "Oh, our hands are tied by the Federal Laws, the FCC, or even state laws." Get them changed. You have to fight to change this because as you might use the phrase, "Take back your power." You know you have to take it back and that may not be easy.

People may have to do a lot of work to make that happen. At the end of the day, all political power is local. It starts out being local. It's the city council level, it's at the county level, and if democracy doesn't work at that level then it's not going to work anywhere. It has to start there. You have to fight with every tool that you can find. All of these cities and towns have bound together. There are statewide organizations of cities and towns that could represent the interest of those. And their charge is the public right of way. Local governments control the right of way and it's their responsibility to protect the health, safety, and environment of people that live there that they represent. That is where you have to start.

It requires a lot of lobbying to change state laws back to where they were, undo these ALEC laws that got done while we were all sleeping or looking the other way. We fight the FCC. The Natural Resources Defense

Council I think filed one of the suits there. And I know that many municipalities joined that suit. There are organizations in Colorado, it is Colorado Communication and Utilities Alliance. It represents many, many towns and cities in Colorado. They joined the lawsuit with the NRDC. So, that is going forward. I don't know the status of it right now. But it's basically to undo what the FCC has done. And there are also laws being brought forward in Congress. People make a racist issue with their representatives and we will see if democracy really works. But what else have we got?

Josh: It's on trial right now. Democracy's on trial, right?

Dr. Schoechle: Absolutely. This is a test. The corporation as an institution, that is the root of all this. The way we have allowed the corporation to become, what I call the Frankenstein invention of humanity is the corporate ration. It is the machine that's out of control. It's very efficient and effective technology. That form of organizing human activity. But it's completely out of control. And it was allowed to go out of control. And there are things being proposed now to bring it back under control. Everything from anti-trust enforcement, a great book now by Tim Wu. I don't know if you have heard of that, but he talks about revitalizing the enforcement of the anti-trust law.

There is a big editorial in the New York Times just last week by the co-founder of Facebook saying that they should break it up. And that is exactly what Wu was talking about. So, we need to get the people elected that will make that happen. There are many other aspects of corporate governance. Corporations, I think they can be salvaged but it needs some work. There is a thing called a B Corp that we could move to. It's a nascent movement, mostly breweries that I know of. But it's an efficient way of making a more benign corporation with things that can be done. It just takes local action to start with.

Josh: Local action and political will, right? In this context, how important is it that the people communicate and educate their elected officials in this?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, it's vitally important. Because the elected officials they are really swamped with issues all the time. I know some of the members of the city council here and they have hundreds of pages of stuff they have to read. They don't get paid very much, if any. They don't have any staff. And they have to make the decisions. What ends up happening is that the counties, state, and city governments end up being controlled by the bureaucrats, the managers, and not the election officials are so strapped for time. So, anything you can do to make it easier for your legislators, for your elected officials to get up to speed on things and help them. Anything you can do they appreciate. And then of course, they are swamped. The old saying, "The squeaky wheel gets the grease." So, you have to be the squeaky wheel if you want to get their attention.

Josh: Yeah. So, we're advocating for people to do a simple action along with thousands of others wherever they live and educate in a grounded scientific way, in a solutions way to their elected officials. So, what are your thoughts on this general strategy, Tim? People teaming up with our elected officials to pass an ordinance against FCCs power grab. So, retaining light of citing in local government.

And whatever legal process emerges as the most effective that cities are using, in addition to cities actually taking steps to control, develop, and build out the local infrastructure? The local wired fiber infrastructure to the building level? And let me just ask for that building out, I guess, a part B to that question is. And how would you recommend cities allocate funding to do that? So, what do you think of the strategy first? Fighting legally big brother and at the same time creating a roadmap for building out wired and safe solutions?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, the first issue, I think, as they say, it just takes getting to know your local officials, your elected officials, first of all. And getting to know them. Being able to go meet with them. Have a cup of coffee with them. And don't assume they are in the pocket of your opposition. Just be upfront with them and tell them how you feel. And make sure your friends do the same thing. Actually, I think they'll appreciate it. Don't assume that there is a conspiracy. Don't assume that that everything is wired against you. Just assume that you need to say it enough times so that they get the message. Keep in mind that they are very busy.

Now on the other issue, what was that?

Josh: Like at the same time, you know, taking a stand against the corporate ties, centralized control, and for local, they are actually building out the solution. So, laying the groundwork for the wired solutions to the home and so forth.

Dr. Schoechle: Right. And one of the things is that it's well established that cities and towns put in sewer systems for their people, and the water systems. In fact, in some parts of the country that's been ironically that's been a problem. Why can't we have clean drinking water for everybody. That's the most basic function of a town, of a government. The next step somewhere along there is going to be getting internet access for everybody there.

Unfortunately, while we were sleeping, I guess, back in 2005, ALEC went around and got at least twenty states to pass laws that prohibited municipalities from building fiber networks or any kind of communication stuff. So, in preference to corporations, private corporations. They got their agenda. Well, we have to undo that stuff. We have to go back and get those laws abolished. They did the same thing recently with the small cells. But this was just about fiber, getting fiber networks. In Colorado, fortunately, there was an opt out that cities could go if they went to the ballot box. They could opt out of the damn

thing. But these corporations will try to cement their monopolies if they can. And that's what they have done.

Now some of the states, as I said twenty states or so have that problem. The FCC actually overruled that. The old FCC overruled that but then it got stopped in Court. So, there was a court battle. But the FCC was on the correct side of that issue in trying to enable broadband fiber in Chattanooga, Tennessee. I mentioned this in my paper. I described the whole battle. But that stuff has to be undone.

And then particularly companies that own their electric power system already, can do this very quickly. Chattanooga, Tennessee was an example of a municipal power system that then put in optical fiber network. A few years ago, it was state of the art. The new state of the art is Longmont, Colorado, which is a city of about a hundred thousand people that has probably 50,000 customers that have electricity and now potentially optical fiber. They can now move that system to an advanced distributed power grid if they want it. You know, the solar is catching on all over Colorado. So, we realized what the crisis is with the climate change issues, fossil fuels, and pollution. I think it's just amazing what has happened just in the last year in terms of cities in Colorado adopting a hundred percent renewable energy goal for their community.

Josh: And laying the groundwork with these integrated fiber solutions like Longmont, was it?

Dr. Schoechle: Right.

Josh: And basically, laying the groundwork for them to take back their control, take back their rights, and actually protect their people at the same time in the long term of these big corporate interests.

So, my next question is, have you identified a funding plan or roadmap that financially local governments can do this? They can assume the responsibility for building out. Like how is it being done? What do you recommend to local officials?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, the cases that I just cited. I think Chattanooga was able to do it because they got a large federal grant that helped them. They still had to provide a lot of the money, but it really got the thing going. And likewise, Longmont got some federal money to initiate that. And some of the rural electric associations that I know of in this region, in Colorado, New Mexico, got some funding to put in optical fiber with their electric power systems. But bottom line is the municipalities have the power of taxation. And they can do bonding.

An example is our neighboring town of Fort Collins. Which decided that they have owned their own electric power system for some time. The problem is it is mostly based on coal. But they are trying to figure out how to transition that into solar. They made the decision last year to do a bond authorization for about \$150 million to build out optical fiber along with the electric power grid. So, that they could then do the same thing Longmont did. That is a bundle of money, but it's not beyond their

means. And the payback it's been shown, it has been in place a number of years in Chattanooga. And then, and it's too new in Longmont to have any statistics yet.

But in Chattanooga, they were able to show that the return was a billion dollars in the first of few years in terms of local business. How to revitalize the entire economy of the city. You can see how having that kind of infrastructure could revitalize the local economy particularly in this era that we are going to conventional ways of doing business and conventional work patterns. Work and employment are changing to where there is more and more responsibility on individuals to fend for themselves or work at home. They call the giga economy or whatever. Communications becomes even more important than it ever was before. And, that even then the businesses work better if they have good communications. I think that kind of investment by communities in doing bonding to support a fiber construction would be paid off. Each one has to take the courage to do that.

Josh: Yeah. And local governments also have the power to do, on the other hand, to make it more difficult for large, the triopoly, to take their zoning rights away, to take their deployment rights away. In other words, they can do things like recertification fees. I know that on the Environment Health Trust website, Americans for Responsible Technology, Telecom Power Grab, and a couple of other websites, they are actually laying out. Have you seen this, Tim, where they are actually laying out sample legislations, sample ordinances, that issue recertification fees to the wireless providers to make it unprofitable or highly less profitable for them to deploy small cells everywhere. And secondly, they are passing ordinances to set minimum distances. I think it was fifteen hundred feet if I remember correctly. As an example, minimum distance from cell sites, residential, or school areas. Any thoughts on those sets of powers that local governments do have?

Dr. Schoechele: Well, I think that's right. I heard other people mention that. And I have to say, I don't know. I'm not completely up to speed on what those options are specifically. But I think that is their responsibility to do things like that. The local government can and should do that to basically represent the interests of their citizens and controlling the rights of way. The environmental issues around that, they are a tremendous responsibility.

Josh: Yeah. And then recently the California Supreme Court upheld its opinion. Either an opinion or a ruling. That basically affirming that, in this case San Francisco, or any local government has more power than we've been told that it has. In context of the 1996 Telecommunications Act. They are different ways to interpret that. And what seems to be emerging is that it's not entirely accurate to basically be under the opinion that local governments have no power because of Section 704 of that Act. So, that was actually upheld on the local government side, just fairly recently in 2019 in California.

Okay, that being said. Just moving towards wrapping up this really fascinating conversation, which we have kind of covered the gamut here. And I'm really just interested in how you can powerfully bring solutions in several different areas at the same time, Tim. Thank you for that.

I just want to kind of get your closing thoughts on what we're seeing here is the need that we've identified for local interests, local people, communities together with their local governments. To basically come together and take a stand, individually and collectively, at the local level to create something new, right? Because if they don't, then the big power is just going to continue that narrative. Just in closing, would you have any other suggestions that would help the viewer to kind of encapsulate or frame the heart of the message here?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I think the things you're pointing out are excellent things. And one of the things that can be done to take advantage of that, of those things you mentioned, is better communication between cities and towns. We have some experience here in Boulder and in Colorado of cities learning to work together and collaborate. And to trade the knowledge that they've gained. Because they all share a lot of the common problems. A lot of their problems are unique to their community. But then a lot of them are not. They have a lot of common solutions. And some of the stuff you just mentioned a few minutes ago, is in the category of sharing information, experience, and even sometimes legal costs will make it easier to do. And actually, give them the courage. When they see that they are just not off by themselves having to fend for themselves. But they have colleagues next door that they can work together with in other communities.

I think there are a number of those organizations forming around that are focused on different topics. That is a way to go for local activists to learn what the landscape is and make sure that their public officials are aware of it.

Josh: My last question. Are you optimistic about the future? And if so, what are there any other keys in order for the people to unlock a positive future?

Dr. Schoechle: Well, I don't know. I have to be optimistic. Because I don't know what else to do. I guess it is part of my nature anyway. But I think there is always a way. One thing is, look at every situation. One thing that I learned early on as an entrepreneur is that look for the opportunity at every catastrophe. There is usually some other way to take advantage of it.

Josh: Well, Tim, thank you so much for joining us today on the Summit. We encourage everyone out there to check out those two seminal works of Tim's. "Getting Smarter About the Smart Grid" and "Reinventing Landlines and Wire Technologies". So, Tim thank you so much for joining us today.

Dr. Schoechle: Okay. Well thank you very much, Josh.

Protecting Our Children

Guest: CeCe Doucette

Josh: With us today on the Summit is CeCe Doucette. And I'm just going to say it, CeCe is a communications ninja. She has a masters in technical and professional writing and a bachelor's in communication studies. She's a technical and professional writer by trade. She helped the first public school district in the United States adopt best practices for mobile devices. CeCe has also worked with her public library to become the first in the nation to host a film series on electromagnetic radiation and health. And to put a loan on microwave radiation detection meters for residents to borrow. She further collaborated with legislators in Massachusetts to introduce a number of bills addressing wireless radiation and public health and worked with her Department of Public Health to draft EMF fact sheets.

So, CeCe, welcome to the 5G and Beyond Summit today.

CeCe: Thanks so much, Josh. It's a real pleasure to be joining you today.

Josh: So, you are a leader in communications and electromagnetic radiation. You have a website that helps people to learn about it. And you are out there creating change in the world. You also, have a very interesting story about how you came to be in this role. Why don't you tell our viewers about that?

CeCe: Yeah. So, when my kids were in school, we kept hearing about this twenty-first century classroom and how we were going to need all this new equipment for our kids to succeed in life. So, a bunch of us jumped in. And I used to help run our local Education Foundation. And we ran

seven campaigns to get things like wireless infrastructure, and iPads, and Chrome books, and smart boards, and minis, and all this equipment that we thought we really had to have for our children. And then I went to work directly for our schools as our Grant Coordinator. And in that role, I found out about Donors Choose, which is crowdfunding for teachers. I thought, "Well, wow, our budgets have been but to the bone. Let's see what we can do to help get some additional money in here for this." So, I promoted that program and we got over a hundred projects set up, and funded, which was amazing our community was so supportive. But we got more things like the iPads, and the Chrome books, and you know all this wireless technology.

Then one night at book group, a girlfriend of mine, who is an electrical engineer was reading a book call *Zapped*. And she mentioned that it looks like there could be biological harm from wireless. You know, it was book group, so I just made a mental note of it. Then not long after, I read something along the same lines about that. And I went, "Oh, if there is anything to this, I want to know because I've literally brought this stuff into our schools."

So, if you do a cursory search and say is Wi-Fi safe or is wireless technology harmful. You will find studies that were done under conditions that showed no harm. And I didn't know it at the time. This was back in 2012, 2013. But being a tech writer, part of my skill set is research. So, I started doing the deep dive. I was just astounded at how many studies are out there, peer reviewed, published, scientific literature showing great harm from wireless technology. So, I was finding the science. But then I was finding that other countries were already protecting their citizens and especially the children. Because the science shows that children are not just little people, biologically they are still growing. Their DNA is still growing, their immune system is still developing, their central nervous system is still under development, and here we are pulsing them with what turns out to be two way microwave radiation.

And some people will say, "Yeah, but it's at such a low level. It really doesn't matter because it doesn't cause any heating." Well that's the dilemma we are in. Back in the 90s I discovered, we set our public radiation exposure limits only on how much heat it would take from one antenna from one cell phone to cause the temperature to raise inside this mannequin's head.

And if I can show you, Sam, I have him here somewhere. Sam is a specific anthropomorphic mannequin, who is in the ninetieth percentile of military fitness. He's adult male, 220 pounds, 6 foot 2. And most of us aren't built like that, right? So, all they did is they took one cell phone and put it near Sam's head. Not even right up against his head. They put a probe inside his head, in this water based gel, and said, "How much

heat from this one device in a half an hour does it take to raise that temperature?" So, that's what they did. They took that heat limit and set our public radiation exposure levels. Did they even safety test that? No. So, we have no safety testing on anything wireless.

It all came to market through the FCC approval of these thermal based limits. And now we have literally thousands of studies all over the world. And I had the privilege of being asked to co-chair a technology panel down at the National Institutes of Health for the Health and Buildings Round Table Conference. Dr. Martin Paul joined our panel. And he's gone in and gathered up all of the science that's been done on this. And he's organized it by scientific reviews.

And what each group of studies is telling us. And he put out a document called, 5G Great Risk for the European Union, the U.S., and International Health Compelling Evidence for Eight Distinct Types of Great Harm Caused by Electromagnetic Field or EMF Exposures. And really importantly, the mechanisms that cause them. Because for years the industry's been able to spin it like, "Well, there's no mechanism of harm identified." And Dr. Paul, pulled all the research together recently to tell us what that is. So, at the point that I began my journey, I was finding studies that were saying, "This is really harmful and especially to our children."

So, the set of studies that actually got me on my feet, were the reproductive studies. Because they have taken male human sperm, exposed it to a laptop with the antennas on, and it changed the DNA, it slowed the motility of the sperm, and it caused far fewer sperm to become viable in just four hours of exposure. And I went, "You've got to be kidding me." And one of my daughters was fifteen and we had just given her a laptop for Christmas. And of course, where is she using it? But right on top of her reproductive organs. So, that's what gave me the courage to step up and say, "I think we've got a problem here."

So, I start sending my school committee, our school nurse, our science teachers, our superintendent, all of our leaders in our school district. I start sending them this stuff. And you know how the French National Library removed wireless in 2008 because of the harm they knew about already a decade ago.

There were pockets in Italy, and Belgium, and Israel, that were taking wireless out of the schools. So, I'm thinking this looks to be really serious. So, Ashland Public Schools, first didn't even acknowledge that I was sending this information to them. Like, literally, I got back crickets. Then ultimately our school committee chairwoman started doing the deep dive too. And she actually picked up the phone and called an EMF expert, who at the time was on the East Coast here.

And she wanted to talk to him. She's a lawyer. She has four children. She runs hospice programs in our hospital and at the women's prison. She's just the right kind of caring soul, right? So, she did her due diligence and she called this EMF expert, Ray Pealer. And he said, "You know, you are the first school person who has ever picked up the phone and called in all the years," he's been doing it. She was the first caring school person to actually reach out for a connection with somebody who's an expert on this.

Josh: Wow, and that was four years ago? Is that right?

CeCe: Yeah, yeah, five now. So, she did the deep dive. I was doing the deep dive. We're sharing information. But she was only one voice on our school committee. And I met one of them at the gas pump one night and he's like, "Wow, CeCe, really you turn your router off at night?" And I said, "Yeah." And that was the point at which I was still circling my tail figuring this out. The first thing I wanted to do was protect our sleep. And he said, "You know, I'm a technologist, I've been in technology for thirty years. And I had no idea that this was even going on." And I said, "I know. Who would even know, right?"

And so, another one of our school committee members, her husband is an engineer. And our engineers, and our physicists, and our technologists, have only been taught the thermal effects. So, they go into this thinking that you have to have a ton of heat before you're going to have harm. They have no idea of these thousands of studies showing biological effects at the non-thermal level.

So, then there was another woman who had been our former chairwoman. And she understood due diligence. So, she went out and looked at the top lobbyists at the federal level. She came back saying, "Wow, look at that. That top 100 of all time lobbyists is just riddled with Telecom, with cable, with energy, with technology. So, she was piecing together that we really could have a conflict of interest here.

And then the fifth school committee member was new that year. So, she just kind of recused herself because she didn't never feel under her enough yet. So, ultimately, I think what happened, is our school committee members are educators, their parents, they come from other backgrounds. So, they didn't feel empowered in the scientific and medical realm to really make a determination. But when they read the fine print that comes with all of our devices. I think that's when they had a legal ut-oh moment.

And for anybody listening today, who has perhaps an iPhone. If you pick up your phone, log in, go into settings, and then remember the acronym GAL. So, once you're in settings, scroll down just a little way and hit general. That's the G. Right at the top, hit about. That's the A. And then

scroll all the way down, and second from the bottom, you'll see legal. That's the L. So, from settings, it's general, about, legal. And right there at the bottom of legal is RF exposure. Which is what we're talking about here. It's radio frequency radiation that the industry in there politely calls energy. Well it's two way microwave radiation. That's the bottom line.

And even in the manufacturers fine print it says, "Keep this device, X amount of distance from your body, or you may exceed the FCC limits for public radiation exposure. And most people look at that and, "Oh my gosh! I've been sticking this thing in my bra. I've been putting it in my pocket, in my suit pocket, in my front pocket, in my waistband. I've been putting it in my back pocket." And it's no wonder that the American Cancer Society is reporting a doubling and quadrupling of colon and rectal cancers right now, including among our young adults. That fine print also says, not only keep it off your body but to use the hands free option.

And Josh, as you and I are doing, we're using a headset, right? But we're hooked up to our hard wired computers. But even if you have to use your cell phone in active mode. You should know that that one cell phone has five or six separate antennas. That are constantly pulsing microwave radiation at us to make or maintain a handshake with that nearest cell tower or router.

And why would we knowingly sit there with six microwave antennas pulsing at us, right? So, you can choose, once you know, to only use the one antenna that you need at the moment. Put everything else in airplane mode or turn it off. There's a cell antenna, a data antenna, a Bluetooth antenna, a Wi-Fi antenna, a locator antenna, and by now a hot spot. Because the industry is using us as their network., right? And we don't need that. So, I think when our school committee read that legal fine print. They realized they had a legal exposure. Because they've given those kids and the teachers all this technology with no safety education.

So, you know, I went into it hoping that we would see what the harm is and then fix it, right? But we had people take the podium when this came up for community discussion at our school committee meetings. We had a PhD Physicist. We had a veterinarian. We had technologists. We had engineers. Who got up as much to say, "Our kids deserve to have the best that we can afford to give them. So, we shouldn't be thinking about going backwards on technology." And I think what happened is in their college educations, they were only told that you had to adhere to the FCC limits, right? And now, we know those were never safety tested. And they are not protective of biological health.

So, they apparently haven't done the deep dive. So, it became a very difficult conversation in our town. And I respect that. Who wants to

know, that this wonderful technology, that we've all become reliant on is harming us. And that we're really hurting our kids on this. So, to Ashland's credit, what they did is they put together a committee and it included a school committee member. She was the former chairwoman who had a lot of seasoned experience. It was our IT Director and our Director of Curriculum. And because they didn't want this to be a divisional issue in our town, what they did is they came up with best practices for mobile devices, right? And on this little sign it says turn off the devices when not in use. So, don't just have things sitting around just pulsing radiation all the time for a handshake with the nearest cell tower router. Turn it off when you're not using it, as a first step. Only turn the Wi-Fi on when needed. So, now we've got all these routers and wireless access points mounted all over our schools, and our homes, that are constantly pulsing this toxic microwave radiation. So, turn off the Wi-Fi.

And as even the manufacturers themselves tell us, always place the mobile device on a solid surface. Because you don't want to put it on your body. And if you have one that's in active mode, you don't want to put it on a metal surface. Because metal amplifies radiation. So, you think about kids with pierced ears, braces, or other piercings, or metal in the underwire of their bras, or on their glasses. All of this is drawing the radiation to us. So, we don't want to have it on a metal surface.

And so, we trained our schools on this on the first day back to school the next fall when all of our teachers and staff come back on that first day before the kids show up. They get trained on anti-bullying, and physical restraint, mandated reporter, and so they threw up a few slides on best practices for mobile devices. And as I was sitting there. I noticed that what the committee had showed me early on said best practices for Wi-Fi safety. And when they rolled this out, they never talked about safety. They never told our school community that this is two way microwave radiation. That the scientific literature is showing to be extraordinarily harmful. And so, I was puzzled.

I set up a meeting with our superintendent the next day. First, I said, "Thank you." Because I've seen meeting video from all around the country, where parents figure this out or figure out that this is why their child is sick. They bring it to their school committees, who are by now so deep in bed with industry. That they don't want to hear it, right? So, I went in with gratitude. And I said you know, "Thank you so much, Mr. Adams. I'm very grateful that we at least have this sign hanging. But I'm deeply concerned that we didn't tell the teachers exactly what this toxin is."

And he said, "Honestly, all I can do is what our school committee commissioned me to do. And that's to train the staff and to hang this sign up." And I said, "Well, can we tell them that it's microwave radiation?" And he had just stepped in as our superintendent, he was

the sixth one, we had had in five years. So, we are going through a lot of changes in our district. And he had never been a superintendent before. So, he had come out of our high school, as our principal. But he still needed to get to know all of our administrators in the other schools better, all the teachers.

So, I thought, "Okay, well if we can't take it any further inside the schools. Can we please tell the parents?" Because even if the parents knew to turn everything off at home and especially during the sleeping hours where our bodies are supposed to be taking care of cell repair and regeneration. This wireless disables that capability in our body. And he just held up his hands and he said, "I'm sorry this is as far as I can take it right now." So, I'm thinking, "Okay, how can we give people the right to know?"

So, next I went to our Board of Health. And I learned that they had no idea that wireless was harmless.

Josh: Harmful. Go ahead, sorry to interrupt.

CeCe: So, I met with our health agent and he was around in the 90s, when the cell towers started coming in. And he said, "Back then, at the municipal level, we were told that if anybody claims for the environment, then we're just out of luck. There's no recourse." I was like, "How could that be?" And he said, "At the municipal level, we have to follow the State. The State has to follow the Federal. And the Federal rolls up to the 1996 Telecom Act, that has a Section 704. That says, if anybody claims environmental harm and they've since sort of interpreted that to include health, that there's no recourse. And I just walked away scratching my head going, "What are we doing, right?" So, I knew our health board and our health agent were in the dark on this.

And so, I asked for a meeting with my Senator Karen Spilka. She's my rep here in Ashland. And during her district office hours, we met at the local coffee shop. And I was teaching her the science. Then I had a device that I could measure. And so, I measured Senator Spilka's cell phone and I measured her district director's laptop. And both devices were inactive mode and they went right off the charts. And they're looking at me, "Like really?" And I'm like, "Yes. And nobody knows." I said, "Is there something from where you sit, where we could at least give the public the right to know? And then they can make their choices? Just like they do with drugs, or alcohol, or tobacco, or pornography, or gambling all these addictive things. Some people will choose, and some people choose not to. If they know how toxic it is, right?"

But beyond that, we are morally obliged to protect our children. So, Senator Spilka put me with a lawyer in her office and we crafted a very simple bill that would simply give the public the right to know, right?

Put a commission together, get the Department of Health, get the Department of Education, get our legislative leaders, get everybody to the table. And let's bring in the experts, the non-industry funded scientific experts.

So, she put the bill in under my name in 2015. Here in Massachusetts we have a two year cycle. And I was told by other people, "Don't get your hopes up." One because when a bill goes in under a constituent's name, that can be a red flag to the legislators. They literally have thousands of bills to get through in two years. And if it's not directly sponsored by a Senator or a State Rep, maybe they're not going to spend time examining it. And I thought, "Okay. But you know it's better than what we started with, right?" And they said, "And a bill almost never ever goes anywhere the first session that it's introduced." And that's just how our system here in Massachusetts works.

And Senator Spilka actually cautioned me too. She said, "I've had some child protective bills that took many, many, sessions before we finally enacted it." So, I said, "Okay, but it's better than what we started with, right?" So, my bill was introduced. And I didn't know anything about how our legislative process works. So, it was a total learning curve for me too. They introduced the bill, the Senate brought it in, the House gave it the nod, and then it got assigned to the Joint Committee on Public Health. And I said, "Okay, so now what happens?"

And they said, "Sometime over the next eighteen months, your bill will come up for public hearing and you will have three minutes to testify." And I went, "Okay, three minutes it's a lot. But it's better than what we started with, right?" So, I'm doing everything I can think of to educate my town, to educate my public servants, to try and get this to the public. Because really, it's a no brainer. The message is not no technology. It's safe technology. So, all you need is a good hour's worth of education to know there's peer reviewed published independent science shouting great harm.

But how can we even get that one hour with people, right? So, I thought, "Okay, I've done everything I can think of from my classrooms, to my home, to my town, to my state." So, I'm like, "Okay now, I can catch my breath. Sometime my bill is going to come up for hearing, right?" So, around July of that summer, I get a call from somebody referencing the bill. And I'm thinking it's Senator Spilka's office and maybe the bill is coming up for hearing.

But it was actually a brilliant woman here in Massachusetts by the name of Patricia Burke. And she figured out how toxic the utility smart meters are. And she found out that I had this bill. She called me up to say, "We actually had a bill in Massachusetts, to give people the right to opt out of these utility smart meters because they beacon microwave radiation

all around the clock.” And you never know who’s on the other side of the wall, it could be a child, or a pregnant woman, or an elderly, and we know this does a number on the cognitive abilities. So, the elderly are particularly vulnerable. And anybody else who has any kind of a health condition is especially vulnerable too. And that’s not to say that it’s healthy for any of us, right?

So, she was calling to tell me there was a smart meter bill in Massachusetts. And I’m like, “Wow.” I was actually like double wow. I actually have somebody that I can talk to about this because I was just going on my own intellect and instinct for the first two years in digging all this stuff up. So, I finally had somebody to talk to. And she said, “There was a panel of experts coming to the Massachusetts legislature to address wireless radiation and to ask our legislators for the right to know.” And I hung up the phone that day feeling like a kid in a candy store because oh my gosh, not only have I found somebody that I can talk to, now I get to go to the State House and actually listen to some of the world’s leading experts on this.

So, when I show up at the State House, there’s a standing room only room full of other parents and citizens of Massachusetts who’ve been on this path for ages. And I thought I was the only one, right? And now I get to connect with people all over the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

But we were there to listen to Dr. Devra Davis, who is a Nobel Peace Prize Laureate on Climate Change. And when she figured out what this technology is doing, she’s been all over it. And she has amazing resources at the Environmental Health Trust. And she has produced a whole bunch of terrific learning tools for doctors, for the public. She’s got a great one on 5G and the internet. So, she came to tell us about the science. She got Dr. Sharma, from India, to fly in on his vacation time, to teach us what India’s been doing.

And Dr. Sharma and his team has done some of those fertility studies and other scientific endeavors. And their radiation exposures were up, where ours still are here in the United States. And he has brought them down through his recommendations, ninety percent. They’re still in the throes of figuring out how to do that, but at least on paper they’ve got it down that we should not be exposing our public like this.

Josh: Excellent model, you know, that it can be done. And it is happening in other countries. And it is even happening in the United States and Canada. It needs more, we don’t hear about it, it needs more attention. It needs more people and more focus. So, you’re doing an amazing job, and kind of pioneering all this.

So, you’re involved in legislation. Now at this point, several years ago, with the smart meter bill. And bring us up to speed. What’s going

on from that point on now? And what's going on with a Department of Public Health and the Departments of Education there in Massachusetts? And if you have insight on a federal level?

CeCe: So, to speed is that from 2015 to 2019. My bill was actually reported out favorably that first session by the Joint Committee on Public Health. And the reason why is I've been so blessed to connect with so many of the experts out there, the scientists, the doctors, the public health experts, and so many people who have become either sick or lost a loved one from radio frequency radiation exposure. So, as each bill would come up for public hearing, I would create a template. And put it out there and say, "Folks if you can take a few minutes, please send in testimony." So, we were able to educate the Department of Public Health. We were able to educate others that I put on that template, like every committee that had one of these bills assigned to it and all of its members of our Attorney General Office's. Because folks may not know but it was our Attorney's General banding together that finally got tobacco outed as the toxin, that it is. They sued big tobacco. So, I wanted them to be learning along with us. And so, people were so generous with their time to send in testimony. And so, my bill passed the first big hurdle. But then it got bundled with a bunch of other bills that really weren't even related. And it got sent to study with that lot of bills.

So, the next session in 2017-18, Senator Spilka brought my bill back. But this time she directly sponsored it. And that was really huge because I understand that she doesn't sponsor very many bills directly. Because she had a very prominent position as the chairwoman of the Senate Ways and Means Committee. So, she has to be very judicious about what she supports. So, I was I was just so honored that she did that. Once again, the bill came out favorably and it didn't get sent to study. It got sent over to Senate Rules Committee where it timed out on December 30 first of this past year. So, I checked in to see if she'd be bringing it back this year, and kind of at the eleventh hour, I found out that because she's now been voted in as our Senate President, in that role, she cannot introduce legislation.

So, I went, "Oh no, what about my bill, right?" So, thank goodness for Representative Jack Patrick Lewis. He's my State Rep and he brought the bill back and he actually polished it up to meet this point in time we're now facing 5G or fifth generation technology. And the harm that that's going to bring to our community.

So, Jack Lewis brought my bill back and it is now been assigned to a committee. And hopefully over the next few months it will come up for public hearing. And once again, I will reach out to folks and ask that people please, please, send in testimony. So, that we cannot ignore this issue because one of the hardest lessons I've learned. I walked into this expecting that our public servants would react to something like

this as we as parents are reacting to it. Saying, problem, gap analysis, solution, right? If there's something hurting our kids, let's learn about it, let's figure out what needs to be done, and how to get there. But unfortunately, there are so many issues that our public servants need to address today. That unless the public is speaking up about an issue in volume, like many people. They've got to put their limited resources and time, into what's getting the loudest outcry.

So, that was heartbreaking because we should all be protecting our kids. So, that's the way the system works. But a really cool thing has happened in Massachusetts. We started out with my bill with Senator Spilka and Senator Moore's bill on the smart meter opt out. And then all these other bills that popped up from all over the state. Massachusetts now leads the nation with nineteen bills addressing everything from schools, to the utility companies, to public health. And we've got a whole lot of good information out there that other states, other citizens, can look at and say, "Hey, why don't we do this?"

And then a really amazing thing happened in New Hampshire. So, there's an excellent film called, *Generation Zapped*. We have held a screening at our State House. We held a screening down at the National Institutes of Health, when we did that symposium down there this summer. And a lot of people have asked me to come co-host in their public library.

And one of the schools here, charter school called River Valley Charter School up in Massachusetts. Their principal thought there was enough merit to this and agreed to have this screening there. So, that's a huge lesson for all of our schools. What a beautiful example. Somebody from New Hampshire drove down and she has electrical sensitivities. And she wanted to see the film. Then she had me go to Stratham, New Hampshire and do a screening with her there. And then after that, she introduced her State Rep to it, but he couldn't make it that night. He had another commitment. But then he went campaigning door to door for the vote last fall. And she invited him in, she really brought him up to speed on what this is, and he had a huge wow moment when he started looking at the science. And he didn't take it face value. He did the deep dive and he's an engineer by trade.

So, this goes counter to everything he knew about engineering, right? And these devices that are emitting wireless. But when he looked at the science he was like wow. So, he wrote a bill. And he asked me to take a quick look at it and I did. And he polished it up. And then they both hopped in his car and drove down from New Hampshire, we sat at my kitchen table, we talked about electromagnetic radiation. He got his bill introduced. It was assigned to their House Committee on technology science and energy, I think it is. And nobody on that House Committee had any idea either.

But they actually set up an hour and a half so that we could really educate. And Frank Clegg, who's the retired President of Microsoft Canada is trying to get the word out now. He's retired. He investigated. He knew enough never to have wireless at home. But he didn't really understand it because he was with Microsoft when they were just on the software end of things.

So, he investigated, did the deep dive, and came back and said, "Our FCC guidelines and Canada's Safety Code 6 are not safe." So, he's devoted his retirement years. You know, he should be able to just be hanging out with his grandchildren and being a good grandpa and stuff. Which he is doing. But he also set up Canadians for Safe Technology. And he's up in Parliament trying to do, what we are trying to do here and get the word out for safe technology. So, he was so gracious. He flew into this hearing in New Hampshire in February.

And then Dr. Paul Heroux from McGill University, who I believe is also part of your forum here, he came down. He came down. He is not only a scientist but he's a professor in the medical school at McGill, which as I understand is like the Harvard of Canada. And he came down and passionately told our legislators exactly what he's seeing in his petri dishes when he's putting cancer agents against EMF. And what it's doing to ourselves biologically.

So, it was so wonderful that these legislators in New Hampshire really listened. Then they took it to a floor vote, and it passed. So, now it has gone to the Senate in New Hampshire. And instead of putting it back in with technology, they put it in with Health and Human Services. Which is where it belongs because we have to address the biological effects. And Representative Abrami's bill which is House Bill 522 is to address the impact of 5G and wireless technology on both health and the environment.

So, we're hopeful that by the time your symposium goes live, maybe that Bill will already be passed. Because there's only six committee members on Health and Human Services and as luck would have it, we didn't know where that Bill was going to go when it got reported out of the house. But one of the co-sponsors of the bill is Senator Tom Sherman, who is the chair of Health and Human Services. And he's a physician. He's a gastroenterologist. I had the privilege of meeting him. He's given up a lot of his practice time to help with legislation. And in New Hampshire after these hearings took place. this woman, Deb Hodgson, who got the ball rolling in New Hampshire. Set up a screening of, Generation Zapped, just a couple of weeks ago and it was held at their middle school.

So again, bravo to another school who had the courage to bring this in and start this important conversation in the community. So, once again, we have courageous leadership in New Hampshire. The State Rep and

the Senator both came out in the community to talk about this at this screening of Generation Zapped. A

And so, I was talking about what we learned in this report out of Harvard called Captured Agency. How our federal communications commission is dominated by the industries it presumably regulates. And that was a big missing piece for me because I thought surely somebody has got our back. And that's where I lost my innocence when I found out that the FCC is run by industry people. Literally. Head of the Cellular Telephone Industry Association that rebranded itself to call itself CTA The Wireless Association. Grew up to be the head of the FCC, Tom Wheeler. He just stepped down when Trump came in. Ajit Pai is at the head of the FCC and he's a former, I think, senior lawyer from Verizon. So, we don't have anybody protecting us.

They defunded all of our EPA and FDA programs that were supposed to be investigating the non-thermal effects. So, when we were at the Generations Zapped screening in New Hampshire and I started talking about the corruption we have at the federal level. I could just see the Senator really wanted the microphone. So, I handed it over to him and he turned around to the audience and he said, "We have seen this time and again with the chemical corporations, with these other toxic things that they've just dumped into our environment." He said, "It is no surprise to me that this is what's happening with big Wi-Fi just as it happened with big tobacco. And Monsanto with the glyphosate. And the GMOs and all of that." So, refreshing that we have champions in New Hampshire who are taken this by the horns.

So, maybe, by the time this goes out to the public, we will actually have a commission formed in New Hampshire that's going to try and get ahead of 5G. But it's already rolled out all over Massachusetts. I had a woman who met with me and with Senator Spilka here in Massachusetts and a number of other citizens, we got together. And this woman has been coming into Boston for years doing business.

And she said, this past fall she was walking down School Street, which is one of the main streets in downtown Boston. And all of a sudden, her skull platelet started shifting and something was squeezing in on her brain. And her heart started going like this really erratic. And she just started feeling like very, very anxious. And she looked up and there was one of those small cell antennas right above her head. And then she was down by Northeastern University and she started feeling the same thing. And she looked up and there was another small cell antenna.

And since that meeting, I met with a professor in the medical school, she's a chemistry professor. And she came to a screening of Generation Zapped. And she said, "Could this be causing migraines?" And I said, "That's a classic first symptom of microwave radiation toxicity." And she

said, "And my doctor just put me on anti-nausea medication. And I said, "That's another classic symptom." Headaches, nose bleeds, nausea, dizziness, anxiety, depression, suicidal ideation, because we know it hits that central nervous system especially hard. Cognitive impairment, memory issues, skin problems because we have little antennas all over our skin. And when this radiation and especially during these five millimeter waves that are going to be used for 5G. They have a huge impact on skin which is our largest organ. And the eyes, we have no shielding for our eyes, right?

And by the way, 5G is not going to operate independently. It's not like we're going to get rid of all those cell tower antennas, the big macro ones. They're going to go away and we're just going to have 5G, no. Because these little dinky millimeter waves for 5G, will not penetrate buildings, or leaves, or rain, like the bigger waves are right now for 3G and 4G. So, their solution to give us a faster download, a smart city, or an autonomous car, is they're going to put cell towers in our neighborhoods every two to twelve houses right at street level. So, we will never ever get a break from microwave radiation.

Josh: So, that's why it's so important for everyone to get involved. And you are a pioneer in this. There's been people that have come before and have been speaking out and the science. But you have really helped to bring this movement and this process in terms of communicating especially with our elected officials to the next level. As pioneers' sort of open it up, it becomes easier for people to follow. So, there's resources. There's Generation Zapped, you'd mentioned.

I have a Cornet meter here. Which is super helpful for showing people visually and auditory, they can actually see and hear the microwave radiation.

CeCe: Yeah, that makes a difference. Yeah, that makes a huge impact. And I appreciate you bringing up your meter because when I fell down the rabbit hole. I'm thinking again, problem, solution, right? And I figured out that there are meters out there that do radio frequency detection. So, I thought, okay, I'm a Grant Coordinator. I know we have a pot of money in our town through a fund that our selectmen are in charge of and you can put in an application for these small grants. And I thought let's get a meter for our library. Everybody in town can check it out and start understanding what this is.

Let's get one for our schools, right? Measure and remediate. So, I put in an application for two meters and it was rejected. They're like, "Oh, we really don't know what this issue is. So, come back next time." So, I come back the next time. And they're like, "Oh gee, this is probably more of a Board of Health issue." But I knew our Board of Health was not up to speed on this. So, I went, okay. But then when my bill came up for

public hearing and I got to testify. I got my three minutes. So, I'm holding up the science. I'm holding up Ashland's best practices and I'm holding up my meter. And I could tell that not one single person on that Joint Committee on Public Health knew that this issue existed.

I could just tell by the expressions in their eyes. So, I thought, "Okay, this isn't going to cut it." So, I made it a priority to take time to set up a meeting with every single representative and Senator on each of the committees that were now assigned all these bills. And from that I learned, you really have to educate people. You can't just send them an e-mail because their inboxes are too full. And they've never heard it's harmful so, why would they even listen, right? So, I thought, "Okay, I better double back to my town." And so, I actually bought myself an Acoustic Meter. And I went back to our selectmen and asked for an individual meeting with every one of them.

I met one in his home and he invited a second selectman over. And we walked around his house and showed him what their exposures were. I met another in a coffee shop. One came to my home. I met another one for lunch. And one by one, I showed them what this really is. And then I resubmitted my application. And they were still nervous because this was a contentious issue in our community. But they said, "Well for starters, we will grant you funding for one acoustic meter conditionally." And that was that our library would agree to take it into circulation.

And the reason why I even got the idea to put one in our library, is back when those CFL light bulbs were being promoted for our homes, they are the swirly ones. Which by the way, throw off a lot of harmful dirty electricity. But part of their marketing campaign was to put a kilowatt meter on loan in all of our libraries. So, they donated this device that you can take home, plug into the wall, and measure how much energy you're using from our cleaner incandescent bulbs versus these toxic dirty electricity CFL's that do save energy. But at the cost of our health. That's not a very good.

Josh: And they're loaded with mercury. Like what happens so all of these bulbs after their life. They are filled with mercury and that's going to go in the environment. It's crazy.

CeCe: Right, then you drop one. I dropped probably two dozen light bulbs in my lifetime. And now I've got mercury toxicity in my home, so. So, yeah good reasons for that. But we already had that kilowatt meter bar coded on loan in our library. So, in order to get an acoustic meter on loan, I had to present to our library trustees. And again, it's a hard sell for some people because they may have had an entire career thinking that this was safe.

So, one gentleman sat there with his arms folded and thought the whole

thing was hogwash. Another woman wanted to get that acoustic meter and take it home as soon as she could see what she was living in. And then a third one said, "You know, regardless of how we feel personally, our role is to be a conduit of information in the community. And if this is a resource that would help our community, then we should take a vote, and see if we'll bring it into circulation." So, they did. They voted, 4 to 1 to put this acoustic meter into circulation. So, I bought it and I donated it. And we did up a little set of instructions.

So, anybody out there who wants to do something like that for your community. My grant was for about four hundred dollars for this acoustic meter. And I'll do a quick demonstration. So, if there was no radio frequency in the area, it would just crackle to confirm it's working. If the LCD glows green, that's the level of radiation at which the scientific community is still identifying what the biological effects are.

When it goes into yellow, that's where people may not be sleeping well anymore because this does a number on our sleep cycle. It may be where they're getting headaches that their doctors can't figure out, nose bleeds, nausea, dizziness, they can't focus, they have chronic fatigue, or their memory is going. All of that is the electrical sensitivity. And then when we go into red, we literally have thousands of studies proving all of this. Along with cancers, DNA damage, sperm infertility, Alzheimer's at earlier and earlier ages, ADD, ADHD, autism is tying into this now.

So, a meter like this can show you what your exposures are. And so, when I turn this on in my meeting with Senator Spilka, it went off the charts. But right now, in my home we see it flickering down here at the green. And that's because I'm working with you today with a hard wired PC. I went into my PC and I put whatever antenna was in there in airplane mode. I replaced my mouse with my corded mouse. I got rid of the wireless one because it turns out that was emitting too. My wireless keyboards gone. I went and got my old hardwired one. My printer has always been hard wired. My CPU has always been hard wired.

But I was sitting here one day and all of a sudden, I started feeling like the Earth was sucking me down again. And I had slept great. I had eaten a clean organic diet. But something, I could tell. Something was going on. And I turned on my acoustic meter and it turned out my printer was hot. It was beckoning off the charts. And I'm like, "How could that be? The little light on the front of my printer wasn't glowing on the Wi-Fi logo." So, I just looked online and pulled up the manual. And it turns out there were two antennas in that printer. Even though it's hard wired. My daughter had been home from college and needed to print something from her laptop. So, she just turned the wireless on. And forgot to totally disable it. But we didn't know there were two antennas in there. So, I just went into settings and went off, off, apply. And then it was done.

So, we became the first in the United States to have an acoustic meter on loan and it's only available to the people in Ashland Massachusetts because it came out of a pot of money that was from our town. But other communities could do that. And as you mentioned in the introduction, Josh. We became the first in the United States also to do a six part documentary film and discussion series. And this woman, Patricia Burke, who had been learning about this stuff way ahead of me. She and I consulted with our library, Friends of the Library because they hosted this along with our Farmer's Market. And we chose your film, Take Back Your Power. We chose to show some of the talks that were given by other experts in the field. We did Microwave Science and Lies Today. We would do Generation Zapped. And there are a few other really good films. So, we did this six part documentary film and discussion series over a span of several months.

And that's something that every community can do as well. So, there are some good examples from the grassroots up. And that's really what it's going to take to effect large scale change. You have to get people educated and my advice is don't go it alone.

That was my first mistake. As having been a volunteer in my community for twenty years, having worked directly for our schools, and having the kid's best interests at heart. I thought I would raise my hand and say we have an issue here. Let's fix it. And if we had a gas leak, they would have evacuated that school immediately.

Well, the World Health Organization in 2011, classified this radio frequency, all radio frequency radiation. So, we're talking cell phones, cell towers, microwave ovens, baby monitors, Bluetooth, Chrome books, iPads, everything, wearables, all of it emit this toxic radiation. We should be getting that away from our kids especially. But no. It came so far out of left field, that I got back crickets. So, don't go it alone.

If I had a do over. I would get Generation Zapped. I would license that. And I would invite twenty-five of my closest friends and family into my living room or into my library. And then you get to sit there. So, you don't have to sell it. You get to listen to the world's leading scientists, and doctors, and public health experts, and people who have suffered from this technology. And finally connecting the dots that this is what's keeping them up at night. This is what's hurting their children. This is why their kids are jumping out of their skin. You know the anxiety, depression, suicidal ideation in our kids. We have never in the course of humanity seen it at this level. And it's no coincidence. Scientifically, we know, this hits that central nervous system really hard.

So, anybody can do this, but you have to come out of your comfort zone. And that was a big thing for me. But I'm sorry, when I read those fertility studies and I had given my daughter a laptop. It's like you got to

be kidding me. And I didn't like speaking up about this. You know I am a good doobie. I want to be everybody's friend. And I hope to be. But you have to go in and start this conversation. And if you come in with fire and brimstone. Everybody's looking for an exit. They don't want to talk about this.

So, if you come in on the attack, like it's your fault, you brought all this stuff in. Who's going to want to listen to that. It's legal. They don't have to listen to it. So, let's go in collaboratively and say, "Hey, the US National Toxicology Program, our own government had been doing a twenty year study. Thirty million dollars expecting to prove that cell phones are safe because that was the technology the day when they got started. Instead they held an unprecedented three day review at the US National Toxicology Program. And they are the world's leader in toxicology research. So, what agents make people ill, what harms our planet. And they found statistically significant DNA damage, clear evidence of heart tumors, with additional findings of brain tumors, thyroid tumors, adrenal, and on, and on. Clear evidence is the highest public warning that they can issue. And on November 1st of 2018, they put out their final report. The FDA is supposed to take that and take it out to the public and they have failed to do that.

Josh: They're not doing their job.

CeCe: They're not doing their job. And it's highly unusual, that they wouldn't take this immediately and take it to the next steps to get it out to the public. So again, just like captured agency with the FCC. We likely have conflicts of interest with industry in the FDA and the EPA. But the public deserves the right to know. And you know sometimes the industrial will spin it saying, "Well, you have to have more than one study showing the same thing." Well right on the heels of this National Toxicology Program study, the Rama Zina Institute in Italy put out another large scale publicly funded study. That found the same thing. So, this Rama Zina Institute study is out there.

So, we don't need more science. What we need is to educate the public. And for the public to say, "This is bad enough, that I am not going to sit still and wait for public policy to catch up." Because public policy can take decades and we're already decades into this. So, we need courageous people from the grassroots up, to sit down calmly to have a conversation, and use these amazing tools that we have. Host a screening of Generation Zapped. You can go right out on their website. You can get it on DVD. There are legal responsibilities around that. You can share it with your own loved ones. But if you're going to do it for a crowd of fifteen or more...

This amazing film producer Sabine El-Gamal gave four years of her life to this project. And she had to do some crowdfunding just to pay

the experts who did the film, and the music, and everything else, the promotion, and everything. So, she needs to earn back her time. So, please don't go against the licensing. And let's honor her by legally licensing it through our libraries, through our schools, and through public screenings. So, hold a screening of Generation Zapped.

And on this journey, I've had the privilege of meeting Brett and Lynne West out of the UK. And Brett in his earlier years was an EMT in South Africa. And then he grew up to be a technologist in the UK. And his job at the time was to put in Wi-Fi systems in these massive construction projects in the UK. And then somehow it crossed his desk that the American Academy of Environmental Medicine, this is the group of doctors here in the US that get the conundrum cases. That other doctors have no idea how to address. So, they're by and large environmental specialists. They put out a position statement in 2013, to our school superintendent saying, "Please hard wire and do not let the wireless exposures in for our children." And so, Brett sees this and says, "Well, what is this?"

So, he did the deep dive. He's really smart. He did the deep dive and quickly put it together that we should not have wireless as a choice. We should have hard wired technology and use wireless minimally. So, he said, "I'm a technologist. I'll start a remediation company. I'll get out there and help people and show them how to fix this." And then he quickly realized, you can't fix it if people don't even know there's a problem. So, you have to educate first.

So, he reached out to Dr. Devra Davis at the Environmental Health Trust and said, "Thank you for everything you have done. Can I please have your permission? I'm building these courses online that we can quickly train the public. Can I please reference the Environmental Health Trust?" And she said, "Absolutely. And there's this woman CeCe Doucette in Massachusetts, who has made some inroads with her schools and the legislature. So, you might want to talk to her." So, Dr. Davis put me in touch with Brett. And I said, "Absolutely, I'm a tech writer by trade. If there's anything in my skill set that I can volunteer with."

So, me, and Brett, and his wife Lynne, who does graphics and public relations. And then Dr. Davis introduced us to Dr. Miko Honan, who's another world leading expert. He's done research programs with Dr. Leonard Hardell and others in Europe. And Miko Honan was in between contracts with universities. So, we had this little bubble, this little miraculous three month period, where me, and Brett, and Lynne, and Miko, all hit it hard.

And our goal was to distill these volumes of scientific literature on this into a way that we can quickly teach the public what the science says, the peer reviewed non-industry funded scientific studies. What the risks

are? What the international community is doing because we are way behind the eight ball in the U.S. France already has a national law to protect little ones in nursery schools, preschools, and kindergartens. And at the upper grades the default is all wireless is off and you only turn it on when you need it. And here in the U.S., it's all Wi-Fi all the time, everywhere.

So, we distilled it all down into a half hour course for schools and families. For less than the cost of a movie ticket. We'd like to give it away, but we have overhead costs to keep our systems up and running. And to hire our programmers and developers and stuff, and our accountants and all that. So, please it's less than the cost of a movie ticket. But we have, you know, wireless education is up and running. It's built. And we have the schools and family's course.

Josh: Which I took yesterday. It's excellent. It's excellent. It's less than a half an hour. You go through the whole course. And like, I have been studying this for a long time. I found that to be one of the best, most concise, you know, ways to spend about twenty minutes for me. And it was so well communicated. And I learned a lot just by doing that course. So, I highly recommend everyone, WirelessEducation.org, correct?

CeCe: Yes, thank you. So, you took the schools and family's course. And we realize that people are still getting massive doses at work too. And so, we also did another one for corporate safety. Corporate Induction Safety Awareness. And we priced that one, here in the U.S., it's like around the twenty-five dollar mark. Which is really short money for doing corporate training. But we wanted to also offer a Robin Hood program. So, if you are with a company that is already a socially responsible member of the community. If you license the courses to teach everybody at work how to use technology safely. So, you don't want to be sitting underneath a wireless access point, right? You don't want to be made to use a wireless headset because now you're putting radiation on your head all day long at work. You don't want to be using a company issued laptop or cell phone without knowing how to use it safely, right?

So, in our corporate course, we say, "If you license to train your people at work, you can then appoint a local school and we as wireless education, we're a nonprofit. We will donate the licensing to train your local school."

Josh: Excellent.

CeCe: Yeah. So, we want to create some momentum and give the impetus to create a win, win, win, for our kids, for our community, for our workforces.

Josh: Good. Thank you so much. What a great array of resources and

information you're providing to the world CeCe. This is incredible. Really, really good.

And in closing, I want to just echo something that you said. I think you mentioned it when you were getting their acoustic meter in the library. And the library said, "We are here to be conduits of information." And so, for those watching this many, many, many, are going to be feeling, "Okay, I want to be. I feel compelled to be part of the solution. Part of this conversation and it's part of the solution." Because we know that it is going to come to solution. We also feel compressed in the timing with the push of 5G especially.

What would you say, just in closing, to those who are, you know, inspired at this moment just to hear your experience, and knowledge, and wisdom, and story. But maybe who are still feeling a little bit of fear, like what if? Give us some encouragement to end on here.

CeCe: Sure, you are definitely not alone. And so, it makes us feel good to know there are others around us. I cannot even convey how accessible everybody is. People want to help you. So, start a Facebook page. Have a community conversation in your living room. Get those around you educated and you wouldn't believe the power that comes out of that. Here in Cape Cod, Massachusetts, there is a little community. It's a protected district. And they thought there was just some maintenance going on in the church steeple. Well, it turns out T-Mobile was up there, putting up cell tower antennas. In a very condensed little neighborhood where there's a library right next door. The generally penny candy store is right next door. There is a school right across the street. There are houses right there. And the church is being offered revenue to put the steeple in the cell tower. The town's people, one or two figured this out. And they told a friend, and they told a friend. They now have a Facebook page with like two hundred people who are now coming out in force to say, "We do not want this in our community." And that's what we need to do to 5G as well. I know it makes you uncomfortable. Nobody ever thought we'd have to be addressing this. But just, you know, muster up a little bit of courage, get a few people near you educated, and ripple it out from there.

So, they started a Facebook page at the Centreville Concerned Citizens from Cape Cod. They've gotten a local artist to come out of retirement, who has done this amazing painting that they're going to auction off to raise the money if they need to take this to court. They're going to fight that hard. So, there's lots of ways people will join you. But don't go it alone because you will be swept under the rug.

But you guys are really lucky joining the conversation right now. Because when I started, I had nobody I could talk to. Now you've got Generation Zapped an award winning film that took Best Documentary at the D.C.

Independent Film Festival, at the Women's Independent Film Festival. It was selected for the United Nations Film Festival. So, you can't go wrong by educating with Generation Zapped. And then in your family, if everybody can't get together for that, just say, "Hey, go take that little course with wireless education. You will see the facts. And then when you level set with the facts, you can sit down." Sit down at your table and say, "Okay, what is the first thing we might want to do." Maybe we'll agree to turn everything off at night, right? At least let our sleep do what it needs to do to help us be healthy.

Then maybe you'll actually hard wire everything at home. And that's easy enough to figure out. We can help you with that. And then start at the community. Because if you are not careful and autonomous car can't get very far unless there's a small cell antenna everywhere. So, these are coming. They're already slipping them into communities. They're being very clever. Usually they'll start with a cell antenna on a pole. But sometimes they don't want to have to go to the pole and conduit committee for an application. So, now maybe they're going to hang them on the wires.

I just read an article that they're sticking them under the manhole covers in England. So, don't wait. Go right to your town. And say, "We are concerned. Here's resources to teach us that this is toxic. It may not be something you've ever known about. We don't hold you to blame. But we all need to start this conversation." And there's an excellent resource to use with your town. The National Institute for Science, Law, and Public Policy out of Washington D.C. Has put together a document for our communities called Reinventing Wires, The Future of Landlines and Networks.

You know, if we're honest with ourselves, we will admit that wireless technology, although it's convenient, it's very unreliable. The signal is slow. It falls apart. Your data is out there flying through the air. Yet, you know, these cell towers lower your property value. There are at least eleven reasons outlined in this document Reinventing Wires. And it's free and it's online. So that is a good one to share with our communities. And then we just had the privilege of hosting an amazing forum here in Massachusetts, called Questioning the Safety of Our Children's Exposure to Wireless Radiation in Schools.

So, we need to protect our kids. And we had, Dr. Ron Melnick, who designed that thirty million dollar government study. That showed clear evidence of cancer and DNA damage. We had the retired president of Microsoft Canada, Frank Clegg who is a whistleblower. He Skyped in with us. We had Dr. Martha Herbert, who's a Harvard Pediatric Neurologist and she founded the autism lab at Mass General Hospital. She came to tell us exactly what this radiation is doing to our brains and our children's brains. We had Theodore Scrodo from the Environmental

Health Trust. They have an amazing database. Everybody should go pound around in there and you will quickly see what all this adds up to. And she talked us through what all the European countries are doing. What Italy is doing. And what Russia is doing. That we are not doing here to protect our citizens.

And we also had Dr. David Carpenter from the University of Albany, who is on a panel that consults to the World Health Organization. And the message is the same. There's never been a safe level of Microsoft radiation. And once you've identified something as a carcinogen, every dose of that is carcinogenic. So, there is no safe way to use microwave radiation. And that's the message.

But start the conversation with your schools. Use that forum. It's current. Start the conversation with your town. Go seek out that Reinventing Wires. Being a tech writer, I got way in over my head when I started investigating. So, I couldn't find things that I wanted to share. So, I just started categorizing them. I built myself a very simple research repository. There's no bells or whistles. But you can go out on to the Internet and type in my name, CeCe Doucette, and then just typing understanding EMFs, electromagnetic fields. So, CeCe Doucette understanding EMFs. I just categorized it all, the impact on children, Wi-Fi in schools, cancers, the science, DNA, what the industry will say.

I've also tried to look at it from the perspective of when you open this conversation with an engineer or a physicist or a technologist. What does it look like from their shoes? So, I cobbled together a bunch of resources that might make sense from their perspective. You know listen to Jeremy Johnson, who's an engineer, who gave a TED talk on this. Really good. And then, listen to Dr. Ron Melnick, who was one of our government scientists and physicists. Who is now trying to get the word out that we've done a really disservice by bringing this into the commercial space. But I've lined up all those for the physicists, for the engineers.

Then I did a page for municipal leaders because all they know is, they're getting a nice revenue stream by giving out our public access way rights to the industry. And if you let one application in, the way our law is written, you now have to let every vendor come in. So, you might start with one antenna on one pole. Now everybody has a right.

So, now you're getting an extraordinary dose of radiation. And all they know is that it's a great revenue stream that helps to cover our tight budget. So, I put together what the industry will tell you. What you also need to know and what solutions are. So, feel free to go out to understanding EMFs. If you'd like to do the deep dive or you want resources to share, go to Reinventing Wires, go to Questioning the Safety of Our Children's Exposure to Wireless Radiation in Schools, go to

Generation Zapped, go to WirelessEducation.org.

We can literally train your entire community, your entire school, your entire workforce, in a half an hour. And each course kicks out a tip sheet, so you can walk around. We have bulk rates. We'll work with our schools on a sliding scale. We just want to start protecting the public and especially our children.

Keys in the Fight for Justice

Guest: Patrick Colbeck

Josh: With us today on the Summit, is former Senator Patrick Colbeck. Patrick, thanks so much for being with us.

Patrick: Great to be with you, Josh.

Josh: You and I were talking just before we started rolling about your career in politics. And now, I'm looking forward to asking you about what you're going to do next. But just in context of using your position as a platform for a voice of truth. And so, thank you so much for all that you've done for the awareness around 5G, around dangerous technology, and other matters as well. So, looking forward to dive in with you.

Before we do so, I'm just going to share with our viewers a little bit about your background. So, former Senator Patrick Colbeck served two terms in Michigan Seventh State Senate District and quickly earned his reputation for being a principled statesman and truly representing the people of Michigan. He was a consistent advocate of policies and solutions that benefit all Michigan citizens.

Rather than the special interest groups that too often influence government policies with their pocketbooks. And although it doesn't take a rocket scientist to be a disciplined leader, Patrick Colbeck, is you could say, exactly that. He is a graduate of the University of Michigan with a master's degrees in Aerospace Engineering. As well as a graduate of the International Space University in Strasbourg, France.

So, that's really impressive and again, you know, thank you for bringing your voice, and your wisdom, and your background, and your position in society to this conversation.

Patrick: I appreciate that Josh. It's a calling and frankly, we wouldn't have been down this path of identifying some of the risks with 5G and other wireless technology. If it wasn't for the fact that there were some other trailblazers before us that did the research, that found out what the issues were. It just took me a little while to go off and find out what those risks and what those issues were. But I really appreciate all the work that came before us, for sure.

Josh: Excellent. So, let's talk about that. What got you into this whole conversation of wireless, 5G, and health?

Patrick: Well first, let me be clear, I'm not an advocate of going back to the days where we bang rocks together and make fire. I think there's a way to go off and get access to this connected technology. This Internet of Things, without some of the risks that we see before us. My background as you'd mentioned is aerospace engineer. I actually did design work on the International Space Station around cabling design of all things. So, we're worrying about electromagnetic interference and compatibility. I also worked on virtual reality training system for the Department of Defense. So, I like technology. That's not the issue.

I've been an early adopter ever since I was knee-high to a grasshopper. So, I came to this issue kind of kicking and screaming. And it really started with my engagement as a senator. Where a lot of my constituents are coming up to me and expressing concerns around smart meters. And originally, I approached the issue from a constitutional Fourth Amendment perspective. I mean, this is personal data privacy and it was a clear violation of our rights to personal privacy when they were collecting data from these smart meters. They had a full consumer profile of our household on the data that was being transmitted out to the power companies. I thought that was an issue.

Especially it was an issue when they were telling them, that you couldn't keep your old analog meters. Which we're working great for decades and didn't have this issue. So, there is this issue of control. Spidey senses were tingling saying, "Something is wrong. There is more to this." And we were talking earlier. It wasn't until one of the advocates in Michigan, with a group called Michigan for Safe Technology. And that's what we're talking about. We're not talking about going back to the credo of the luddites. We are talking about safe technology.

One of the advocates that approached my office came over to my home. His name is Bill Bathgate. He is an electrical engineer. Sharp as a tack. And even though I'm an engineer. As an aerospace engineer,

I pretty much just know the questions around electronics. He has all the answers. And he came into our home and provided a detailed breakdown of smart meter technology. And then he also brought his RF meter. And did a little bit of an RF survey on our home. And he provided a series of recommendations for us to actually go off and decrease the wireless radiation signature inside our home.

And just to just to point out, in parallel with my engagement in the Senate, my concern around smart meters, we were having some health issues at home. My wife who is a pediatrician, was having serious tinnitus. Which is ringing in the ears. And we went to every specialist in the book to try to identify what is causing this tinnitus. Nobody had an idea. And my wife's is a pediatrician. She knows what questions to ask.

Well I'll tell you, as soon as we took the remediation steps that Bill recommended regarding wireless radiation sources in our home. Which involved going from a cordless phone to a corded phone. Which involved turning off the Wi-Fi router and hardwiring the ethernet cable to all my internet connections. Which also involved opting out of the smart meter. As soon as we took all those measures, guess what? My wife's tinnitus disappeared.

So, it started waking me up saying, "Whoa, I think there's a little bit more to this than just the Fourth Amendment concerns." And I started doing some digging. It turns out that there are thousands of studies talking about the adverse health impacts. And this went on further. We tested this out. We went over to friends and family's houses. We went over to her folk's house. And they had serious atrial fibrillation issues, you know palpitation of the heart. And so, we went off and safeguarded their home. We did the same thing we did in our home to their home. And her dad prior to putting these safeguards into place, was getting fit for a pacemaker. After we took the safeguards, implemented, and got them a clean home from a wireless radiation perspective. He no longer needed a pacemaker. I mean this is serious stuff.

So, this is anecdotal. But it's backed up by thousands of studies. And this is a case where, we finally and I'm curious by nature as an engineer, I started digging into this. And found out that there is a lot of substance to the concern around adverse health impacts and this wireless technology.

Josh: Wow. Thank you. So, you had two terms in the Michigan Senate.

Patrick: Yeah.

Josh: You basically challenged the prevailing or the industry perspective on not only 5G, but other matters as well. So, and you recently in early 2019, you ran for governor, right?

Patrick: Well actually it was 2018 and the end of 2017. It was about two years we were on the road making our case.

Josh: Okay. So, what are you doing next? Before we dive in further to the wireless and 5G. I want to learn more about you and some of your experience and what your plans are now?

Patrick: Well I'm keeping with my progression in public service. I had a very nice job nice. I ran my own consulting business before going into the Senate. Going to the Senate took a little bit of a cut in compensation. Now, I'm continuing that trend towards less and less money because I found another cause that I'm focused on right now. And that's taking care of our veterans and military personnel. So, I'm actually working on a hospitality organization for veterans traveling through Detroit Metro Airport and military entrance processing stations throughout Michigan.

So, still focus on public service. Just that we're taking care of military personnel and their families right now.

Josh: Thank you. You put together a website? Where people can get their questions answered?

Patrick: Yeah, one of the things that I found out was nobody was taking on the issues that I was taking on when I was in the legislature. So, I would constantly get these emails saying, "Hey, can you tell me what you were focused on here? What was the legislation you were pursuing? Hey, can give me more information on things like wireless radiation." Or other issues that I was taking on. So, I put together a website called MorninginMichigan.com. Anyway, you can get more information there including discussion around this wireless radiation issue. I linked to the EH Trust website on that site. Because I think they've got one of the more comprehensive bodies of information on this topic.

Josh: And your book, you've written a book, *Wrestling Gators*. Is that right?

Patrick: Yeah, if you want to find out how government really works on the inside. And why it can be so frustrating at times to go off and push different policy and issues. When you think it's just common sense that they should be taking option A, instead they choose option B. If you want to know why that is, I tried to explain how government really works. And it's a book called *Wrestling Gators, An Outsiders Guide to Draining the Swamp*. And it's available on Amazon.com.

Josh: Excellent, thank you. So, diving back in. You mentioned about your experience and your wife's experience and your family's experience with Bill Bathgate who actually is working closely with a gentleman by the name of Terry Stoughton. Who is a dirty power expert interviewed in this

Summit? I highly recommend that. But do you want to talk more about what are the risks associated with wireless technology and the untested deployment of 5G?

Patrick: Yeah, I put the risk in three different categories. One is we mentioned earlier, the adverse health impacts. Number two is privacy risk, as we mentioned earlier. Actually, believe it or not, on both sides of the wireless technology debate, they recognize it is a National Security risk. So, there's three basic risk. The adverse health impacts are pretty serious. We experienced an issue with tinnitus and with cardiovascular issues. But it's been linked to cancer, infertility, DNA damage. I mean it acts at the cellular level. So, it essentially, that's basic building block in our human body. When you are messing with some basic biological functions at the cellular level, it leads to all kinds of permutations of adverse health impacts.

And the sad part, from a legislative perspective. In the Michigan Constitution we have an Article 4, Section 51, that states that health concerns are supposed to be the primary concern whenever we propose policy. Whenever we put forward legislation. And I think unfortunately a lot of people are ignoring that for the sake of convenience instead. Which is not supposed to be the primary concern.

On the privacy risk, you know, we got our fourth amendment. It is supposed to protect individuals from unreasonable searches and seizures. And unfortunately, we had a recent ruling on smart meter data by the Seventh Circuit Court. And it was a kind of good news, bad news story. The end game was not very good. On the good news front, they did recognize that the data being collected by smart meters, which by the way will apply to the data being collected by sensors on a 5G grid as well. They ruled that the data was subject to protections under the Fourth Amendment.

But unfortunately, they went on to rule that because of the public good. It's okay to go off and collect that information. So essentially, we've set up this conflict between what they deemed and this court decision as a public good versus our own personal privacy. And that's a very slippery slope.

Josh: That's not what the Constitution intended. And to have this balance between the public good, whatever that's defined as and whoever decides that. And individual basic fundamental rights, right?

Patrick: Right. With this decision, with this ruling, they essentially said, "Forget about the individual rights. We are going to go with the public good." Or what they perceive to be the public good.

And then the last one is National Security risks. I mean all these grids

that were talking about, whether it's a smart meter grid or 5G network. They all depend on little devices, and network servers, and network devices that have motherboards inside of them. And Bloomberg News highlighted recently that the Chinese government actually influenced all the specs on motherboards manufactured in China. Which is about 87% of the market. And actually, put in a chip that provided back door access to any network that motherboard was installed upon.

This means that they've got back to our access to things like our power grid. And even some of our defense systems. And if somebody who used to work with the Department of Defense, that's a concern. I'd take the defense of our nation pretty seriously. The good news on National Security risks is I think a lot of the folks in the federal government now, in particularly in the U.S., recognize that there is security risk. Unfortunately, they're saying, "Well, that's why we need to be the ones leading the charge on 5G, instead of the bad guys." What we've got to start looking at is, why do these risks exist in the first place?

Josh: Well, we'll dive into that a little bit later. But first I want to now get the other side. Because it's important to talk about what are the stated benefits. To evaluate the benefits of 5G, the stated reasons why they are doing it. Maybe kind of get in underneath of those. But could you summarize the benefits of 5G and what we are being told why it's so necessary?

Patrick: I'm glad you brought that up. Because too often, people concerned with the deployment of 5G, we just simply dismiss the benefits and zero in on the risk. I'll tell you it's a legislator, if you've got somebody running into the office in Chicken Little mode. It's something that's typically easily dismissed. And so, it's important that you need to go in with your eyes wide open that there are some potential benefits associated with this technology. I mean now there's convenience and a lot of autonomous vehicle technology. I come from Michigan and about thirty minutes outside of the Motor City, Detroit. Autonomous vehicles are all the rage. Right now, the way they are developing these autonomous vehicles is that they are basing it on this 5G technology. And it doesn't have to be that way. But that's what they're doing right now.

If you actually talk to people in the industry, that thick thing that they're pushing is faster download speeds. So, all those risks we talked about before. It's all for the sake of faster download speeds. I think people need to be able to start doing that balancing act of benefits versus risks on their own.

And so, there's also discussions around enabling things like the smart grid for power. Also enabling, per health concerns, I mean better routing of ambulances and identification of health issues in the community. So,

there are some perceived benefits around that. But you always got to balance that discussion of the benefits though with the risks.

Josh: Yeah, good. It's a good perspective. So, when you and other advocates bring this information to other elected officials, to other people in positions of power. Often times, they are still tone deaf, you could say. They are still deaf to anything that is critical to this program that is moving forward. Why is that? And do you have suggestions for how they can be overcome? I mean, is it just being subject to lobbying? Is it that they are not hearing from enough people? Is it that they are being communicated to in a way that hasn't been effective? Help us to understand from an insider's perspective of this.

Patrick: Well first, the good news is this is not a Democrat versus Republican thing. I think both parties approach this issue kind of in a pretty similar fashion. And so, the usual pitfalls, where you're being an advocate, going into a certain environment where I have to worry about positioning this from a Democratic perspective to a Republican perspective. That doesn't really apply in this case. At least, I don't believe.

So, the reason a lot of officials are tone deaf. So, it's not because of their political background or political persuasion. It's because I think at first and foremost it's a complexity of the issue. It's human nature that when you hear something that is kind of mind-boggling. That it's tough to get your head around. You immediately kind of go into power-down mode. You don't want to address it. You just want to put your head in the sand and wait until it goes away. And I think there's just a very human response in that regard for a lot of these elected officials. And ironically, they are the same elected officials that will try to defend them putting their head in the sand by saying that, "You should be fit with the tinfoil hat."

So, it means you've got to approach us with a spirit of understanding that you're dealing with human beings with these elected officials. They got fancy titles, but a lot of them don't have a background in electrical engineering to go off and tackle some of these issues. They don't have a background in medicine in many cases. And very few have a background that combines medicine with electrical engineering. So, this is a difficult topic to get their head around. And ask people to kind of be sympathetic to that understanding.

Another thing is, especially when you're dealing at the state level, is that they the state elected officials will simply say, "Hey, this is a federal issue. I'm going to play in my sandbox. They can play in their sandbox. This is an issue that the federal government should be taking care of this." What they don't realize or what they don't want to realize in many cases, is that the government agency responsible for regulating wireless emissions and in our country, is the FCC. The Federal Communications

Commission. It's not the EPA. It's not the FDA. It's not the CDC. It's the FCC. Which has nobody that I'm aware of that has any health background serving on the FCC. And people need to realize, Yes, FCC is actually what they call a captive agency. Which means that it's ran by the same people that they're attempting to regulate.

In other words, telecommunication industry officials are the ones who are typically heading up the FCC. And in this case right now, we have Ajit Pai who is running the FCC chair. He is actually a former Verizon Wireless lawyer. He's somebody that I actually handed a paper that my wife and I had put together on wireless radiation concerns. I physically met with him, handed them this paper talking about both the benefits and the risks associated with wireless technology and 5G in particular.

And provided some suggested policy guidelines that he could pursue. And it was one that within a day or two of me handing that, that he went out and did the equivalent of an executive order stating that the states have no authority in blocking any of the deployment of this 5G technology in the states. So, he had choice of which way to go on this and I think he chose the wrong door.

The other kind of a reason why a lot of officials frankly are tone deaf is getting into the seeder side of politics. And it deals with money. When it's a lot easier for legislators who are focused on their next re-election to give deference to the people that are writing them big checks. And constituents, even though they're the ones who vote for them or against them as the case may be, they tend to take a back seat to the people that write big checks. I hate to say it that way but that's the way it works. And it's very rare that you get somebody who's willing to go off and listen to the constituents and what their concerns are over the concerns of the lobbyists.

There are officials at do act that way. I don't want to disparage all of them. But unfortunately, there are few and far between.

Josh: Can you tell us did you have any experience ever with companies or lobbyists attempting to sway you against your will? Is there anything you can share about what it is like on the inside as a Senator? You know, as an elected officer. To be in the mix to be pulled like that.

Patrick: Well, I developed a reputation pretty early on that said that, "I wasn't one of those guys that could be swayed that way." So, they typically went around me as opposed through me. To the point where eventually they helped influence the Senate majority leader in my second term to make sure I had no chairmanships of committees. And that I was actually removed from all committees later in my term.

So, there's different ways. They saw me more as a barrier. We were

talking earlier I never threw dirt at my individual colleagues or anything. But I would attack bad policies with both barrels. They didn't want somebody being out smoking and sharing facts that were inconvenient to the citizens at large.

And making a case where it actually influenced legislator. I think on the 5G issue in particular, I think Michigan had one of the best votes against 5G deployment, I think in the nation. Usually it just passes with a landslide. We made it close in the State House because we were able to make our case to a lot of the State Reps in the Michigan House. And they don't like that. So, if they can't tackle you personally. And they can't influence you individually. They will do their best to marginalize you and go around you. And that's what they did with me.

Josh: And the Michigan State hearings on 5G, you spoke, Dr. Sharon Goldberg spoke, Dr. Paul Haru spoke, who are also on the Summit here. And many others very eloquently, very effectively, you know, some of those videos really went viral. What was the outcome of that? What's happened since there?

Patrick: Well, they did pass a bill that essentially prohibits local units of government from interfering with the deployment of 5G system. But we did better than most other states in that regard. So, we did get some awareness going. I was really appreciative of a lot of the names that you just mentioned. Not only came out to testify in opposition to these bills, but they also came out to a forum that I hosted in Lansing where we specifically talked about the benefits and risks associated with wireless technology. You can see it on my YouTube channel. There's a list of therefore wireless technology forum in the December of 2018. And all these experts that you talk about are brilliant in shaping a specific aspect of this overall policy debate. I think while legislatively, we lost. I think we did move the needle on this. And that's really what we're trying to do is improve awareness around these issues.

That's why what you're doing, Josh, is so important. Because there's a lot of people that just want to throw this under the carpet and ignore it. They took that same approach with tobacco. With a lot of these environmental concerns if you will. And they are trying to follow that same playbook with this wireless radiation and it ain't going to work. Eventually they're going to get found out and efforts like what you're doing, and what Dr. Sharon Goldberg, and Ron Melnick, and Dr. Devra Davis, and crew. And Frank Clegg, former President of Microsoft Canada.

I mean, these trailblazers are getting the word about this issue and it's developing a whole bunch of citizen-based advocacy groups now that are armed with information that they are providing. And I'm excited to see what is germinating out of this. It's started get traction. I can just feel it right now. We got folks with quite a bit of passion on this topic. When

those messages get out to the general public. I think people are going to be pretty upset about the folks who've been trying to hide this and suppress this information for so long.

Josh: So, as far as strategies to help hasten that turning point, to help be effective, and one of those obviously is reaching our elected officials to you know, team up with them. To get them aware of this issue and to be synergizing on this. What's an effective strategy, in terms of spreading awareness both to citizens and to elected officials?

Patrick: Well in social media lingo, you find the influencers that are out there, and you get to those people and get that information out. My wife who also testified against some of the 5G legislation here in the state of Michigan. Has been working behind the scenes to get two key media personalities and let them know about this awareness. And because she's an MD, this actually has some serious impacts.

And she's making progress along those lines. Also, because she's a pediatrician and the most vulnerable population to a lot of these wireless radiation effects are actually kids. They are students in school. It also lends a lot of credence to that message. So, education is first and foremost the key. But getting to these influencers in society the people that can be a good sounding box for this issue are is very important.

There is a concept called Overton Window. I don't know if you have ever heard of it at all. But this concept of an Overton Window is that the only positions on a given policy issue that will be entertained by the society at large fit within this narrow little window called the Overton Window. And what we're dealing with the big challenge we have right now on this wireless radiation issue, is that pop culture or popular philosophy on this topic is outside of that window. And so, we've either got an enlarged that window to include what we're talking about or move the window over where the issues that were talking about which are the evidence is pretty clear. Where it becomes mainstream and that's the challenge we have.

Obviously using elected officials to go off and communicate that is a powerful mechanism to influence the shifting of that window as well. And that's one of the reasons I was emboldened to go off and speak out on this particular issue. And it's been pretty effective in getting the word out in certain circles. A matter of fact, the position paper my wife and I put together, we got contacted from people all over the world on this particular topic. Because we are one of the few legislators that was willing to go off and talk about this. More legislators willing to go off and talk about this. And when we do that, then there's some specific policies that we can start advocating for.

Number one is start safeguarding the most vulnerable populations

among us. If you look at what's going on in Israel and France, they actually prohibit Wi-Fi in the schools. Now that doesn't mean the kids can't get access to the internet. They can still get an access to the internet. It just means you should be hardwiring those devices via ethernet cables and you can do that. It's not challenging. I did that to my own home. I've hardwired businesses before and routed ethernet cables. Not only is it faster to go off and hardwire, it's actually more secure as well. So, there are some other reasons to go off and pursue this.

The other thing we can do and which kind of gets at the heart of this whole policy debate. Is to adjust these FCC guidelines in regard to acceptable wireless radiation profiles. And right now, they're focused on thermal. All the settings that they have are based on thermal effects of this wireless technology. What we need to do is expand that into non-thermal effects.

Josh: How do we get leverage? How do we get leverage though on the FCC to actually make that change? Because scientists have been screaming this at them for decades, right?

Patrick: Yeah. Well, it starts with inconvenient questions. Like what Senator Blumenthal asked the other day to industry when they were testifying before a Senate Committee. He said, "Please, you keep saying that 5G is safe. So, help me out. Show me the evidence that says that we are safe." And the fact of the matter is, right now, they are incentivized to go off and worry about it being safe. Because are indemnified against any lawsuits because these FCC guidelines are at such a level where you could drive a Mack truck through it from wireless emission profile. It's orders of magnitude above what you'll see in most civilized nations cross the world. So, they are not incentivized to go off and change things.

That's why I zero in on changing those standards. One way of influencing that is through that education process. Highlight that there are adverse health impacts that are well below. Orders of magnitude that are below the threshold that are currently being specified. And also, highlight the facts that it's not just about the power density levels, which is specified in the FCC. It's actually about the modulation around these signals that happens as well. And that's part of the education process, unfortunately. It is not easy.

But here's why this is such a linchpin though. If you change those standards, the laws that they are passing in the states and in communities, all point to those FCC standards. And they say, "As long as you deploy technology in accordance with these standards provided by the FCC. Then we have no say in blocking any your deployments." But if those standards get down to the point where more and more of these deployments are going to be bumping into the threshold specified in

these SEC standards. Now all of a sudden, it's one heck of a little domino effect on making sure that the telecom companies are held accountable for the safety of their systems.

So, that's why I zero on that. But it's a long haul. Ultimately that FCC commission is appointed by the President. And so, this is a case where it's important for us to go off and people that help get the President into office are the ones that are more influential in helping him wake up to what is actually going on in this particular issue. And you know, a President is just like everybody else. You only take the information that you get from your advisors. You can't be expert on everything that is going on.

Josh: And so, you're a supporter President Trump, right?

Patrick: Absolutely, yeah.

Josh: You are also an advocate for safe technology. Why is it, do you think, that he has gone on record, on Twitter, and his administration is so staunchly behind 5G? Winning the 5G battle against China, it's like a new Cold War it seems. Why is that him and his administration are so supportive of 5G? And how do you reconcile that? What do you think is going on there in terms of what's happening behind the scenes?

Patrick: I think he's getting bad advice. And I think he's getting an incomplete picture of what's actually happening with the 5G deployment. I think he's been advised of the National Security risks associated with the 5G deployment. In particular, due to the issues around Huawei and ZTE being involved in the deployment of these networks here in the U.S. Because of the aforementioned issue with the motherboards and backdoor access to our networks. He sees that as a security issue. Our whole power grid for example would be dependent upon equipment that is connected to these devices. That's a big issue. There is also an economic competitive advantage. Because with this 5G deployment, they're talking about new efficiencies that can be leveraged into getting more bang for the buck for our economy.

So, it uses our resources more effectively. That's where he's been focused on and I think you can tell that the President is pretty competitive by nature. So, he wants to be first at anything. And it's been positioned as a race between us and Russia and China. Due to his competitive nature, he wants to win that. So, all I ask is that gets a few more advisers in there that identify the other risks around personal privacy and adverse health impacts. And also, take a step back. And ask the question, "Okay, we are in a race. What does that finish line really look like? Where are we headed?"

And this 5G stuff works great for totalitarian governments like China and

for Russia. But for a country with the Fourth Amendment, for example, that's founded on an appreciation for freedom. Maybe this finish line isn't exactly where we want to head.

And so, I think if we actually started acknowledging some of the risks associated with this wireless technology. I think there's an opportunity for the President to get off the 5G bandwagon. And instead get on a bandwagon that says, "Guys we can get connected as a society. We can get all these economic efficiencies. But we can lead the world in being the folks who deploy it in a safe manner. That actually protects our privacy rights. That actually protects us from these adverse health impacts." I'm an engineer. And if you give us the right specifications. And the right requirements. And the right objectives. And the right boundaries. We can come up with some pretty innovated solutions to different problems that we face in society. But in this case, the first step is understanding what those real risks are. And I don't think the President has been given the full picture.

Josh: So, in March of 2019, there was a conference that was particularly on 5G called the CPAC Conference on 5G. Can you tell us about that and what are the key takeaways from that?

Patrick: Well, the whole conference was Conservative Political Action Conference. So, there's a lot of topics besides 5G at that conference. But one of the panel discussions, I found very interesting because it was specifically talking about the topic of 5G. And they had some experts on there, that knew about the 5G roll out. And I found it interesting that they acknowledged that there are serious risks around the deployment of 5G. So, here are people within the inner circle, the administration, and halls of Congress, that actually have quite a bit of connections with the folks who are making decision their own policies. They acknowledge that there is a national security risk associated with 5G.

Unfortunately, they took the approach of said, "Well, that's why we need to control the deployment." They took it upon themselves saying, "I know we're playing with fire on this. But we need to be the ones controlling the matchsticks." Rather than taking a step back and saying, "Hey, do we really need this fire in the first place?" I mean, what are we actually doing here? Is there another way of going off and heating things up for a warm meal? Besides going off and taking this approach on a massive wireless system. That is by the way operating the same frequency spectrum as the active denial system, which was used for crowd control by the military.

Anyway, the good news is they recognize it as there are risks associated with it. The bad news, they said, "Well, that's why we need to control it."

Josh: Do you have any perspective on the QAnon meme or that whole

stream? Which is basically giving its followers the message to trust the plan and not really be involved as a change agent, per se.

Patrick: Well, somebody who's got my own [inaudible 37:46] tie clip on. I appreciate what has been happening in that area. There are a lot of moving pieces with what's going on inside of the D.C. I think this concept of a deep state, that is separated from the best interests of the people were supposed to be serving. Is very real. And I do realize that there might be some compromises along the way as we go off and try to address that. But I think in this particular issue around wireless radiation and some of the concerns around that. It ties into, how did they tap the President? How did they go off and tap his conversations? Well they used technology similar to what we're talking about right here. With 5G. The NSA database that has information on everybody, all their phone calls, everything else transcribed, and available for people to go off and query. This is Big Brother Phase 1.

And so, from that perspective, I think they believe overall, they're attempting to dismantle it. Because the people that were using this frankly were the ones trying to keep our current President out of office with that technology. That was pretty clear. The thing that makes me a little nervous is that when I hear things like at the CPAC Conference, where they say, "Well the key is, we need to be in one thing control this technology." And so, it gets into this spy versus spy discussion. As long as I'm the one in control of the detonator, I'm okay.

The fact that they may have to be in control of it, before they can go off and dismantle it. That might be true, frankly. That might be a viable approach associated with it and something we need to be talking about. But I would rather dismantle it first. And we'll see what happens on this. This is not a straightforward decision at all on it. And I'm always in the President Reagan mode, where it's trust but verify. But I am very curious about it. I don't know if it's just political opera this point in time. Or whether or not it is has a lot of substance to it. But I'm certainly seen events play out the way they were predicted to be played out.

Josh: Just to ask a side question here. Do you encourage people to run for political office? To attempt to change the system from within or not?

Patrick: Yes. I think it's very important. And matter of fact, I've created an organization in Michigan called The Mission Grassroots Alliance to help provide them with the resources they need to be successful. As I think I mentioned, I ran for Governor back in 2017, 2018 timeframe. And our message resonated with a lot of people. I'm an engineer. People are looking for solutions. I provide a lot of solutions. The issue is we didn't have the money to reach a broad enough audience. At Election Day, I had 15% name recognition across the state. That's enough to win. Now, we got 13% of the vote, which means that 87% of people who heard

what I had to say, were supporting me. But you have to reach that other 85%. That's why I'm putting together a Grassroots Advocacy Group, called Michigan Grassroots Alliance. To help provide them with the cover that they need to reach that other 85% that only seemed to tune in on Election Day.

Josh: Do you see it as a viable approach that we the people could take to inform but go beyond inform. And actually litigate. Actually, you know, do criminal, legal action, in addition to commercial liability based actions? Just these different approaches upon the FCC? Upon even President Trump and his administration to come from a stronger position to indicate our commitment. To say, "Look we are taking this seriously. We are not just going to keep asking, and asking, and asking." How do you see an effective strategy for the people to ramp up the matter here to get an actual result?

Patrick: Yeah. What you're framing is, sometimes referred to as lawfare. And it's one strategy, go off and approach it. In this case we are hampered by the provisions of the 1996 Telecom Act that was passed by the Federal government. In that, they essentially indemnify the Telecommunications Industry from any lawsuits particularly around the adverse health impacts. I referenced earlier, the court case between a citizen advocacy group in the City of Naperville versus City of Naperville as ruled on by the Seventh Circuit Court. And when they issued their ruling, they recognized that there was a Fourth Amendment interest associated with it. But they ruled the wrong way in regard to whether or not they should protect the individual rights versus what they saw as the public good.

So, we've got that as a hurdle to go through. There is a court decision that is already out. So, the deck is kind of stacked against us. So, I think from a lawfare strategy perspective at this point, I think we just need to really ramp up the education and the advocacy. And essentially tackle this with knowledge. Much the same way, that we finally couldn't deny what the impacts were when it comes to the harms of tobacco. I mean when you start seeing the incidents and lung cancer going up. Well, that was a big deal. Now with cell phones, you can sit there and see for example, that we just had Senator McCain pass away with cancer. Well, if you see where he held his phone on a regular basis and where he had his cancer. Guess what? They are in the same spot. If you go off and look at MRIs of women with breast cancer who put cell phones in their bra. You will notice that the pattern on that MRI maps one to one with all the antennas that are found in that cell phone.

If we got that information out. I think what we'd start seeing is more of a clamor from citizens at large to hold their elected officials accountable for protecting against these adverse health impacts. And also, frankly, there is a bigger picture with the constitutional issue. I think today,

unfortunately we are relatively constitutionally illiterate as a society. And that's a topic for another day here that I've been pushing on and around our social studies standards in Michigan.

But ultimately, our constitution is out there to protect this on it. We just need to assert the rights. And the only way we can assert those rights if we know they actually exist.

Josh: Yeah, well said. Let's get into maybe some deeper social aspects. And we talked before our interview again about the pursuit of convenience. And how 5G is being sold is convenience. What are some maybe deeper issues that we can look at in ourselves and in society at large. And how values seem to be being expressed or being steered? And what do you think are some of those solutions on that deeper level?

Patrick: Wow. Yeah, I think as a society we've lost a little bit of our moral compass. Which means we've lost an appreciation for the pursuit of the truth. So, when an issue like this comes up and it's such a complex issue. That people kind of give up on even seeking the truth. Which is a shame. I think we are more willing to listen to what somebody else tells us. Then to go off and investigate it on our own to see whether or not it's true or not.

And I think this plays into a lot of different aspects of society. It plays into faith in general, I believe. And you know, we're kind of talking about faith in government. But I think it applies to faith in general. And if you're like me, I believe that a lot of our freedoms that were put in place in the United States in particular. Are based on very biblical principles. I mean, I can track back to specific passage in the Bible, for example, how our system of government got created with the foundation was and the structure of it.

And if you look back in the history of the pilgrims, you understand that appreciation. And when we start talking about the common good and the public good. It was taken in a different context frankly. It was looking at how to protect these individual liberties and our individual access to some of these larger issues, if you will. Instead, we've kind of replaced that with this group think, if you will. That is harmful.

So, if you're on the wrong side of the group think. We get into some serious issues. That's why simple things like are we a republic or democracy? Are important to me because a democracy is a turning of the majority. In a republic, based on a system of laws where we actually benefit from the wisdom of our ancestors and we dig into the truth of the matter. There is safety for the minorities.

You have minority views, like us frankly on the wireless radiation topic. Those are protected and they are listened to. I think we've lost an

appreciation for that perspective and that pursuit of individual rights in pursuit of the truth.

Josh: Let's take a further look into that because part of this Summit is, we're looking at understanding, you know ourselves more. Our motivations. Our reason. Our why. Getting more deeper into what's important. Our properties. Looking at what 5G is about and kind of how it's being sold to us. And gratification and instant downloads. And just connecting in a way that is artificial versus the real essence of life and values. I'm interested in what you say about faith. And your reasons? And your why?

Tell us a little bit more about that. Like how can we tap into our deeper why? Or what is your why? Your reason for taking on these battles that you've taken on through your political career and now into your new venture. And with this 5G, what's your why? And how can we tap into that at a deeper level?

Patrick: Well first, I think I want to approach that from the perspective of some wise words from Benjamin Franklin. And he said a long time ago that those willing to give up their liberty for a little bit of security deserves neither. And that's the choice we have before us. I mean when we talk about how 5G is being pitched to us. It's being pitched to us from a matter of convenience. It's a security, comfort. That's what's being pitched to us.

I tell you I serve those that serve us in the military right now. And that's my passion. And a lot of people died to protect those freedoms. They weren't very comfortable when that was happening. Their families were not comfortable to hear the news of their loved ones dying to protect those freedoms. A lot of people sacrifice to give us the society we live in today. And I think a lot of people are taking that for granted.

From a faith perspective, I take that a step further. I highlight that is for freedom, that Christ set us free. That is under Galatians, Chapter 5. And then for me, I'm passionate about making sure that we have the option to pursue that freedom. We could have lived in a world where God told us everything that we need to go off and do on a regular basis. We had no free will, no discussion, about a given topic. We'd be little robots going through life. But that's not the way God created us. I believe. And he's got this passion for us to make these choices in life.

And on this particular issue, it seems like a lot of people are seeking to just bury their heads in the sand and not even question what they're being told on either side of the issue frankly. And I think it's important instead that we take a step back. And actually, start questioning some of these topics. And for me, what motivates me to get involved on this. Frankly, I was one of those folks that was not engaged in politics at all

for the first 44 years of my life. I mean, we never talked about politics in the household. We never talked about any issues of consequence. I was focused on playing sports and having fun. And what time's the game on type of discussion.

But I got woken up after I started waking up in my faith to understand that there's more to life than just satisfying my own needs and my own interest. And when I started doing that I started looking out for the best interests of others. Life started getting a little bit more complex, right? And we start addressing issues like this. Matter of fact, that's what got me motivated to run for politics. I did not want to run for public office. I'm an engineer. Engineers are not known for being extroverts on any topic. But I felt so called to go run for office. I felt a little bit like Jonah going to Nineveh. And frankly, I didn't want to get swallowed by a big fish. So, I decided to go out to Nineveh. Which for those of you in Michigan, that Nineveh is Lansing.

It's a change the perspective and gives you the ability when you know why are doing it and when you know who you are serving. And you're not serving the lobbyists up there. You are serving the people of Michigan. And you take an oath to support the Michigan Constitution, the U.S. Constitution. And the whole concept of an oath I think is kind of been diluted or appreciation for that oath has been diluted over the years. For me, I took it very seriously. I want my yes to be yes and my no to be no. And when I serve, I want to make sure that it's serving in a way that when this political career is long over, I can sit there and say, "I ran the race and I do so with integrity." I'm thankful saying that I think I did that in the eight years that I was in service there. But it is a very tempting environment.

John Adams once said, "That the difference being a politician and a Statesman is that a politician fears man and Statesman fears God." A lot of folks are in the fears man category. They're afraid of what people are going to say about them. They're afraid of people on topics like this. That are saying, "Hey, I'm going to fit you for a tinfoil hat." They are afraid, "Maybe, I'm not going to get enough people to support me or vote for me in the next election. Or I'm afraid I'm going to lose certain committee chairmanships. Or I'm not going to get my bill passed." They are fearing man. Ultimately, though what let me sleep well at night, was that I believe I was in the fear God category. And I think that makes all the difference.

Josh: Yeah. So, a lot of people watching this might have a religious perspective or background. And a lot of people might, you know, have a perspective that that institution, or the church or religion in general, has caused so much harm on the planet. We talked before the call, like for me, I resonate with kind of the original teachings and not so much the church.

What would you say to people kind of struggling with this this idea? It seems like we're going through this freaking existential crisis on the planet right now Patrick. Like really whether it's 5G or you know, these other agendas. I believe 5G is maybe the most pressing right now in terms of corporate agenda and the amount of harm that is said to become. But you know, what would you say to people about that? On that topic, how do we process this sort of inner fear of is there going to be an "apocalypse". Is it really going to hit the fan? Will be around five years from now? Will we become like this sort of AI bog? You know, this transhumanist sort of organism. How do we process that in terms of these the deeper essence of who we are? Not from a religious perspective, but maybe from like your soul's perspective? Or each of our soul's perspective? Do you have any wisdom as we kind of wrap up here how we can best navigate this?

Patrick: I think ultimately it comes down to the pursuit of truth. We are just dealing with a technical issue when it comes to this 5G deployment, right? But as you point out, there is some connections into this broader metaphysical question about what is true. What is the truth of our existence? And when you start talking about technology like 5G, it really presses the limits of that a little bit, right? Because now we're getting to the point, where it theoretically is pursued all the way down to its logical extension. Now, we're getting to the point where there's an artificial intelligence that could potentially be managing our steps as we go forward. And to a certain extent via bots. That's kind of already happening in social media. As to what information gets portrayed and what information doesn't get portrayed.

Josh: I know, I'm being blacklisted on YouTube. My stuff doesn't go anywhere. Please go ahead.

Patrick: I've seen on in Twitter, I'm regularly losing people off my Twitter following every single day whether I post, or I don't post. It's like an algorithm that says a you lose two to three a day. So, we know this stuff is happening. So, the bottom line comes down to what kind of people are we and as individuals. And everybody has a different approach to take this on. I often say there's four gospels for a reason. They're hitting for different audiences and ways of thinking. You got John who is a little bit more metaphorical with a lot of his explanations. And they have you have Mark, which is like the Ernest Hemingway of the gospels. And it is, See Jesus run, type of approach on it.

Everybody approaches their search for faith a little bit differently. I've gotten the opportunity to meet and talk with a former atheist by name a Lee Strobel. And Lee approached this as a journalist and he actually went off and because his wife gave her life to Christ. He went out to go off and disprove Christianity. And in the process actually found out that Christ is real. And then he believed the truth ever found in a gospel.

For other people, they take a step back and look at the beauty of God's creation. And actually, recognize the fact that there has to be a creator in there somewhere. And they know that whenever you see a painting that somebody painted it, right?

Well, if you're sitting up at Yosemite Park and you're looking over the beauty of that park. And you're sitting there going, you know, and you say, "Oh, nobody created this. This is just a bunch of random events that kind of pulled themselves together." It forces you to recognize that maybe it's not so random after all. There are some people that just do it by experience. And unfortunately, a lot of people will experience the negative aspect of people that profess something in their faith.

But see something exactly the opposite in practice. And that's probably one of the biggest detractors that we have in society is somebody who says that they're one thing but does something completely different. And Jesus talks about this. He says, "Do everything that they say. Just don't do what they do." And we have a lot of folks that do that here in society today. And you can use faith, the Bible, and God's word as one measure of your ability to go off and stick with what you testify to as the truth.

Another one, frankly, we will get back in the world if you will. It's Constitution. Why is it that other legislators are not going off and highlighting the issue with issues like 5G? Haven't they read Article 4 Section 51 of the Michigan Constitution like I have? Which says that health of our citizens supposed to be a primary concern. Why aren't they taking that to heart?

It's the same issue with us in a lot of people's walk for faith. It's like we say something, we read something, but we don't take it to heart. And unfortunately, our hearts can be kind of vulnerable to being led astray at times. The encouraging part is, I believe that if you just stick to your pursuit of the truth. You will find yourself on ground that is rocky and solid. And that cannot be shaken.

If you just listen to what the world has to say and the chatter in there. You are going to find yourself building a house on shifting sand and being blown wherever the wind blows. So, I just encourage people to take advantage of documentaries, like what you're doing right here. And getting the truth out. Let people not take what we're saying at face value. But go off and do their own research. I heard all the stuff around wireless radiation concerns before I went off and dived into the studies on my own. I've heard all that stuff. But I was a victim of the Isaac, eyes that see but can't see. Ears that hear but can't hear. I was in that mode.

What we've got to do is go off and show mercy first of all because there's a lot of people in that mode. But be persistent on conveying these truths

and getting them out to as many people as possible, all your friends and family. Let them investigate on their own. And I think in the final analysis, the truth will be pretty clear.

Josh: Thank you, Patrick. So, your position paper on 5G and your videos, they are linked from your website, right?

Patrick: Yeah, if you go to MorningInMichigan.com. If you go to YouTube channel. I'm creating playlists around different topics. And one of the topics is wireless technology risk. And you can get access to that which includes a lot of the floor speeches I've had on this issue. And how we try to bring it to people's attention

Josh: Okay, good. Well, thank you for that and for spending time with us today. I really appreciate your time, and energy, and dedication, and for sharing us your insights and wisdom. Thank you so much for being with us today.

Patrick: Hey, thank you Josh. And thanks for pulling this project together. This is essential to everything we have been talking about. It's about giving people information so that they can make a good informed, rational decision.

Unlocking Hidden Potential of the 5G Crisis

Guest: Claire Edwards

Josh: Joining us today on the summit is, Claire Edwards. Claire, welcome.

Claire: Thank you.

Josh: So, you worked at the UN for 18 years. And you never desired to be a leader and very outspoken, doing talks all over Europe, and an activist, essentially, for this 5G focus. I mean, this is something that just fell on your lap.

Claire: Absolutely. The accidental activist, Josh.

Josh: That's right. I can relate to that. It happened to me about seven years ago. And for our viewing audience, I'm just going to read your bio and introduce them to you, or you to them, rather. So, Claire Edwards worked for the United Nations as editor and trainer in intercultural writing, from 1999 to 2017. Since May 2018, she has collaborated with Arthur Firstenberg to publish the international appeal to stop 5G on earth and in space. Over 100,000 people, including hundreds of doctors and organizations, for more than 170 countries, have signed the appeal.

Claire warned the UN Secretary General, in person, during a meeting about the dangers of 5G, also in May 2018. Where she called for a halt to its rollout at UN duty stations; and that was in a video that's gone pretty viral. So yeah, thank you for initiating that appeal, Claire. That's reached many, many people, more than 100,000 now; you and Arthur Firstenberg. So you have really gone from working at the UN for a vast portion of your career, to stepping up in a position of leadership, in a big way. What's that transition been like?

Claire: Well, it's been a big learning curve. Over the last year, in terms of

experience, I think I've lived about 13 years because it's been incredibly challenging, with amazing ups and downs and challenges. And it really brings you to yourself, and it brings out the best in you. So I've met a lot of very nice people. It's brought people together and it's been an opportunity actually to use all of my skills from the past. So it's been quite a ride, let's say.

Josh: That video that we put out that I helped to release, of you speaking to the UN Secretary General, it's been translated into five or six different languages now. And you yourself, speak many languages. How many?

Claire: Well, I speak four but I only speak two properly. So, I find myself now having to speak German because I live in Austria. So I'm having to talk about electromagnetic radiation and electricity, in German, so I'm acquiring some new vocabulary.

Josh: Very good. So, what happened after that talk or that comment period in which you noticed verbally, the UN Secretary General, of the problems of these high powered Wi-Fi systems, of the problems and 5G, and he kind of laughed it off a little bit? What happened since then, with the UN, with the Secretary General, and bring us up to speed?

Claire: Well, after that, he did nothing about it. I didn't hear from him at all. I wrote a whole series of follow up emails to the medical service at Vienna, to the staff union. Again, I had already written to them. I wrote to the head of office, so the chief of administration, everybody involved, and I never even received a reply. I was at the UN on a Friday evening quite late, about three or four weeks ago, with my EMF meter, and I thought I would check what the situation was. And again, I found that my meter was permanently in the red, in the corridors; exactly as it had been in December 2015. So I found it pretty shocking.

So as far as I know, people are still being heavily irradiated, so it's not good. And I have notified also, my colleagues there and my colleagues also don't seem to be doing anything. Now, the issue is, that in fact, the computers at the UN are connected by cable. So there is justification for having this Wi-Fi and these devices on the ceiling, these Wi-Fi boosters and cell phone boosters. There's justification for having these things in the conference areas because of course, the delegates would want these connections. But when you use your EMF meter in the conference areas, of course, the ceilings are extremely high. So the radiation is not so bad.

But where I was concerned, and I remain concerned, is that the staff work along these corridors with metal walls and these are public access points. So by definition, they are designed to serve large public areas. And I don't believe they should be installed on very narrow, low ceilinged corridors, with metal walls. Plus, I checked the installation instructions for such public access points, I found that for safety reasons, they are not supposed to be within 20 centimeters of the human body. Well, a slightly taller man would definitely be within 20 centimeters of these things as he walked underneath. So to my mind, they are extremely

dangerous.

Josh: And so with the international appeal to stop 5G website, you've gotten tons of response, it's gone viral as well, you could say. What's been the response from that? Or has there been any acknowledgement of that appeal, even by the UN or other governing organizations?

Claire: We haven't yet sent it to the UN or to the WHO or to governments. We have spent some time trying to automate the website, which has taken a great deal of time. I think now it is automated. So, now I think would be a good time to send it, especially in view of Elon Musk's 60 satellites, which went up just a few days ago. So I think we will send it quite shortly.

Josh: Isn't that frustrating? I mean, we hear about Elon Musk's 60 satellites, the first 60 or whatever, of that program, being covered on by the media, as being this beautiful thing that you can see in the night sky or whatever. How frustrated are you, Claire, having basically dived in here and these couple of different initiatives that we've talked about so far, and we're not seeing the traction happening? We're seeing things happen in some countries, like Belgium, Switzerland, cities throughout the US, some in Australia, some small cells getting removed. But what is your perspective, in terms of how confident and optimistic you are or frustration on the other hand? Where are you at?

Claire: I have always been extremely positive, and I sometimes wonder why. But there are moments, of course, the situation changes very rapidly, and there are moments when one's confidence is dented. And one of them would be a few days ago, when Elon Musk's 60 satellites went up. But on the whole, I remain extremely optimistic because I don't even like to talk about 5G because it's not just mad, it's completely off the scale mad. And as soon as you start talking about 5G in rational terms, you are normalizing it. There is nothing normal about 5G, it should not be happening, and as we know, it's all based on a lie anyway.

So I have always been confident that it is so mad that we will succeed in stopping it but I think that there are various phases involved here. We worked for four months on drafting the appeal and we published it on the 19th of September last year, and then it went viral. So the information spread and in December, there was a bit of a hiatus; where I thought by that time, something would be happening, there would be some kind of reaction. But in fact, what happened was, it was picked up by the David Icke website on the 1st of January. And then on the 3rd of January, it was published in a tabloid newspaper in the UK.

So that was picked up from the David Icke website. And because it was only covered by a tabloid newspaper, we thought that wouldn't go anywhere but in actual fact, it's extremely interesting that that was picked up around the world. We saw that pop up in South America, we saw it pop up in Morocco, and then we saw that there were questions about what my writing partner, Arthur Firstenberg, had said, in

the Libération; a very, very mainstream, quality newspaper in France. So in fact, even though that was a tabloid newspaper, it really went wide.

Then RT America, which has recently been attacked by the New York Times for covering the 5G issue, picked up that tabloid article, quoting Arthur Firstenberg, and they started covering 5G. I know that their first two pieces that they did, were actually based on our appeal. Then since then, they've gone on and they've done various other pieces, also on 5G. But the mainstream media does not cover the dangers of 5G at all. I mean, you will see nothing, other than positive reports in the mainstream media. So, you have to rely on other means for this message to come through to people.

So, through the appeal, through the RT America coverage, through various other main social media, YouTube videos, etc., the message has come through to people. So I would say that I started seeing action about, let's say, three months after that. People started getting into gear and you started seeing people coming together and starting to talk about what action they could take. And I see that movement really accelerating. And I always knew that it would take time for the information to come through to people and for people to get into gear. Now, in my position, I see myself very much in an international position, by virtue of my background and where I live; and so I tend to cover what's happening in the neighboring countries in Europe. And I really see a lot of action.

Josh: Well, tell us about that. Let's dive into what is happening within because you're in Central Europe, you're in Austria, right? And we know that there's things happening, like as mentioned, in Switzerland and Belgium, Russia, Italy. Bring us up to speed, if you've could, about Europe and about other countries, if you like. And I will just quickly mention that. Raphael Mahaim, who's the Green Party statesman, in the Canton of Vaud, Switzerland; he's part of this summit, and I had a great conversation with him.

I would highly recommend everyone to watch that because he spells out what's how happening behind the scenes and what's happening. He says that within Switzerland, the 5G focus, the health related focus on 5G, the fact that industry is pushing it; ramming it through, even though they're passing these moratoriums. That was actually front page news in Geneva. And that's actually on par with the whole environmental discussion around climate change and the different perspectives. That's a very hot topic in some parts of Europe. So from your perspective, what are you seeing and what do you anticipate to see?

Claire: Well, I think that Switzerland is really significant because the Swiss people are very educated, and they're very well informed; and they seem to have more of an open media. And of course, they have several languages. So we're talking Italian, French, and German. So of course, whatever is happening in Switzerland will also go into the neighboring countries that also speak those languages. So I think it is crucial. You say

that you you've already interviewed somebody from Switzerland, so no doubt he has more up to date information than me.

But from my point of view, I thought it was really significant that you had three cantons that adopted moratoria, and they needed a fourth canton, Neuchâtel; that posed questions to the government. And you also had a petition signed by 56,000 people, who wanted to request the government to actually debate this in parliament. And in the face of all that opposition, Swisscom, which is majority owned by the Swiss government, then went ahead the very same week, and made a big fanfare of rolling out 5G in 102 locations.

So, this was really an affront to the Swiss people. Now, it's interesting to note, I've since found out Swisscom filed a patent in 2004, in which they acknowledged that electromagnetic radiation causes DNA damage and chromosome mutations. So there you have it, black and white. Swisscom has rolled out 5G which is a much more powerful technology and potentially much more damaging technology. They have rolled out 5G on the Swiss population, in full knowledge that it will kill. I consider that a crime.

Josh: It is, it's obviously beyond criminal negligence, you could say. And meanwhile, Swiss Re, the insurance giant, has voiced its clear concerns about the safety of 5G. So, it's obviously heating up on both sides. It feels like it's like this showdown of corporate agenda, for profit, for control; diminishment of rights, diminishment of health and safety of the people. Corporate agenda versus the will of the people, the will of local governments.

Claire: This is what is clearly being demonstrated in Switzerland and that's why I think what's happening in Switzerland is extremely important. And I think it will be picked up elsewhere. You asked me what's going on in the various countries. I don't know everything, but I know that there's been a lot of activity in Spain. We know they had activities around Segovia. We know that there's a lot of activity in Italy. In France, you have the Gilet Jaune movement and one of their demands is actually that appeal should be taken note of and action should be taken on it. They're very supportive of the appeal. I also know that there's a lot of activity around smart meters. There's a lot of opposition in France to smart meters. So, France is extremely active. And again, you have a very, very informed population.

Josh: What about Russia?

Claire: Well, Russia, as far as I know, the defense ministry has refused to hand over the frequencies that are required for 5G. So it looks as if Russia will not have 5G until at least 2024. Now, as I understand it, President Putin has talked about 5G going ahead, but it could be that Russia is cautious and they want to see what happens in other countries before they move on 5G. Germany, I think there's a certain amount of opposition. In Austria, I have to say that I was quite concerned until

recently because Austria really pushed ahead with the 5G agenda. And the Austrian government claimed to be the first government in Europe to roll out... in Western Europe, sorry... to roll up full 5G across the country.

And I'm very well aware of how people here have been affected. But until very recently, I really didn't see any organized opposition. There was one gentleman, who for a long time has been complaining about smart meters, but in your case, you moved on from smart meters to looking at 5G because you realized that smart meters are a part of the 5G agenda. And this gentleman actually refuses to discuss 5G. So I think that this is quite damaging to the Stop 5G Campaign, because people need to understand how this is connected. So this could be one reason why the opposition in Austria has been quite delayed. But I do very much see it happening now. People are organizing and behind the scenes, things are happening.

Josh: What's your thoughts on the minister in Belgium, the minister, I believe, environment and housing for Brussels, her comments and what's happening in Brussels? First of all, can we just summarize what she said, if you remember the details?

Claire: That she was not going to get permission for 5G to be trialed in Brussels because she did not want the people of Brussels to be guinea pigs. Now, this is obviously very encouraging but people in Belgium are skeptical about, really whether this is just rhetoric, and actually behind the scenes, it's going to happen anyway. Now, I don't know if I should divulge this, but I will anyway, you can cut this out if you wish. But yesterday I talked to somebody whose friend is actually friends with Norbert Hofer, who was the minister here in Australia, who was responsible for rolling out 5G. And he said that he could not stop 5G, and if he tried to stop it, he would fear for his life. So this gives some indication of the power behind the 5G agenda, which clearly comes from the top.

We see it feeding through the UN, we see that it is clearly a global agenda. And the people who are doing this are quite determined to do it, come what may. Now in my view, it's quite clear that when people take back their power, this will be impossible. The only barrier to that happening is information. The powers that be or the powers that were thought that they could roll out 5G without anybody understanding what 5G was. And they were so wrong because our appeal has reached millions of people at this stage. And I know that millions of people are informed. So it's just a question of time because everybody is telling everybody else now. So, this will be stopped.

Josh: With your experience in the UN, you and I were talking before this conversation about how the UN is actually... not only are they not stopping or slowing down or considering health, before rolling out 5G, before supporting it, but they're actually integrating it into their various programs. From your perspective, can you summarize what they are doing?

Claire: When I spoke to the Secretary General, in fact, he trained as an electrical engineer and as a physicist, so he of all people should really understand the dangers of this technology. Whereas, in fact, in that video, he laughed when I brought my concerns to him. And I find it quite interesting that he laughed. He had several minutes to think about what his reaction to my question might be and he chose to laugh. So I think it's quite significant that he did not reassure me that this technology is safe. And as we know, from Senator Richard Blumenthal, speaking to representatives of the telecommunications industry, nobody can provide an assurance that this is safe.

Now, despite that, the UN is gung ho moving ahead to push this through all its programs. So at the time that I spoke to the Secretary General, the UN must have been planning the appointment of a panel on digital cooperation, because that panel was appointed just a couple of months later. And this panel on digital cooperation is stuffed with industry insiders. There is no doctor on this panel. There's no environmentalist on this panel. It's all pro this technology. The Secretary General brought out his strategy on new technologies.

And this shows you that this agenda is being pushed through every program of the UN. And when I look at these documents, I do not find a single mention anywhere of health issues. So there is no consideration of this at all. I guess we know this is based on a lie, which I'm sure you've discussed with the other people that you've interviewed. This is based on the lie of the thermal hypothesis, which tells us that there are only heating effects and there are no biological effects to this 5G technology.

So it's been quite interesting to find that in fact, the World Health Organization held a symposium in 1973. It was Barrie Trower, the weapons expert and campaigner against 5G, who drew my attention to this. It is called, The Biologic Effects and Health Hazards of Microwave Radiation: Proceedings of an International Symposium held in Warsaw in 1973. Now, I don't have the whole document but the title alone tells you that the UN, the World Health Organization, which is part of the UN, was aware of the biological effects of microwave radiation, way back in 1973.

And I have here the index to that document, there are two pages of this index, which shows you all the biological effects that they were discussing in 1973. And you even have one entry which talks about the non-thermal effects and all the pages on which the long term effects are discussed. So there can be no question that not only the World Health Organization, but also the governments that would have attended that international symposium, knew in 1973 about the biological effects. So again, we're talking about a crime against humanity because we have been lied to for over 40 years, and now they're rolling out 5G on us, which as we know, is a killer technology.

Josh: Yeah, wow. Thank you for that. Do you have any perspective on... we hear a lot of talk online and a lot of researchers are doing very credible research, I feel, with trying to get behind and comprehend

what's happening with the UN. Specifically with, we hear, Agenda 21, Agenda 2030, sustainable development, and we can see how smart meters, smart grids, smart cities are part of that. That attempt, you could say or skewing of a solution to an environmental problem, by implementing technocracy; by implementing greater control. By taking away people's rights. We see a very similar thing happening, a very similar feeling to 5G, do you have any thoughts about UN Agenda 21 or 2030, or any of that side of the conversation?

Claire: When I worked for the UN, I worked for the conference management service. So, we are linguists and conference management people, we're not substantive staff. So I was not dealing with the substantive issues at the UN, so I can't comment on that. But I would refer people to some very interesting reports from James Corbett, the Corbett Report, he talks about this sort of thing. And I find those extremely informative.

Josh: Okay, good. Switching gears a little bit, in spring of 2019, the Notre Dame Cathedral burned down in France. You have a unique perspective on that. You and I have dialogued about that previously. I'd like to ask you to share how you see that event and the surrounding details and significance from your perspective of that.

Claire: Well, Notre Dame is a symbol for France. It's very much associated with Joan of Arc. It's associated with all the history of France. The monarchs were crowned at Notre Dame. And it has enormous significance because it is the point zero of France, from which all the distances in France are calculated. And even before it was a cathedral, it was actually a lighthouse. And people could orient themselves on the basis of the location of this lighthouse. So it has enormous symbolism for France. And it was a major national tragedy and I would say, an international tragedy, for Notre Dame to be burnt down.

Now, what I found quite interesting is that I have a photograph that was posted on Facebook, of the President Macron and Prime Minister Philippe, that very same evening, who were chuckling. As they watched Notre Dame burn, they were sharing a joke; at a time when everybody else was struck by this tragedy and in mourning. So really, one wonders what was in their minds at the time. You have the Gilet Jaune movement in France, which is struggling to have their economic difficulties recognized. The Gilet Jaune is not just about fuel tax. It started on the basis of a fuel tax but actually, it's turned into a movement for democracy and better living conditions and a more equal society.

So it was very insulting to the Gilet Jaune, when within hours of Notre Dame burning down, the oligarchs in France came forward and were vying with each other for how many hundreds of millions they could donate for the reconstruction of Notre Dame. Then various people came forward, architects and people connected with Notre Dame, and they said, actually, it would have been impossible for this fire to happen. Because it seems that oak, after 800 years, it becomes sort of fossilized

and we're told that even if you put a match to it, it would not burn. So, people said that there are always two people at the cathedral, watching out for fires.

So there was a great mystery about how this fire could have happened. And as I understood it, we were told that renovation work was already proceeding. But in fact, the scaffolding had been erected, but no renovation work had actually started at that point. So it is a mystery as to how this fire could have happened. And then the mystery deepens when we discover that, in fact, the French, which is the front area of the cathedral, had already been privatized at some earlier point in time. And in fact, plans had been drawn up a couple of years earlier, for the sort of privatization and modernization of this area to take place, with shops and underground, whatever.

So it would seem that Notre Dame was sort of designated somewhere; that certainly people wanted to make money out of. Then the law was changed so that it did not have to be renovated and reconstructed as it was, according to UNESCO and National Heritage rules. So they propose to rebuild in some... the Prime Minister described it that it should be rebuilt to conform to the modern era and modern techniques of the modern era; something along these lines. Now, you have to note that in England, there's an agreement between the telecommunications companies and 10,000 churches, for the spires of these churches to be used for tenants. So, the architect, the former architect of Notre Dame, has been silenced. He's been told that he's not allowed to talk about the fire and the causes of it and speculate about any suspicions.

And proposals have been requested from architects for rebuilding. So, one sees various proposals for sort of modernizing the roof of Notre Dame, which the French people are quite outraged about, because they would like to see it renovated exactly as it was. But one has to pose the question, at least one of the oligarchs who donated money for the rebuilding of the cathedral, is actually the owner of a telecommunications company. So one has to wonder whether, in fact, they want to put antennas. Which would not only be potentially dangerous for the cathedral, but also, the French people are quite outraged about this. As a desecration of a national monument and a national treasure.

Josh: Yeah, wow. So, ground zero; it's symbolic for being the center of France, and perhaps Europe, or perhaps the ancient world. Perhaps it's the space holder, or a symbol of spirituality of these religious traditions. Notre Dame, our mother, you know, Mother Earth, right? What you're suggesting is that maybe there's something else going on behind the mainstream story. And like we've seen time, and again, there's agendas, and that there are false flags, for lack of a better word. I think most of our viewers are aware of this. Then the piece about how all of these churches and these supposedly sacred sites, dedicated to our Creator, are converting their symbol, their top sort of antenna, if you will; the

symbol of the peak, the apex of that structure, to basically serve the radiating and control agenda, now morphing into 5G.

Just how that's being done. I mean, when you when you think about it, so many churches around the world are putting in the cross or the spire, like you say, microwave, irradiating technology that is originally military weaponry, really. It's originally a military weapon. So, just seeing that on a deeper level. I appreciate your... it might sound, to some of our viewers, like it's off topic, but just having a brief look into how some of these world events could be connected, is very, very intriguing. I think.

Claire: I think it's useful to connect the dots. When one sees certain actions taken, I think it indicates a certain picture. I can't really speculate beyond that. You'd have to have the facts, otherwise you go off into pure speculation.

Josh: Yeah, thank you.

Claire: We have to join the dots. I mean, this is a desecration. Notre Dame is a desecration of this national monument. And a further desecration, I would suggest, is the cutting down of the trees, which we see taking place everywhere. You talk about antennas and this is the association in my mind, because the trees are also a form of antenna, a natural antenna, of course, for the earth energies. And now we see that these trees are being cut down by the thousands. We see a study at the University of Sussex in the UK, which actually states that tree leaves block these millimeter waves to the tune of 70%, which clearly indicates that this is the main reason why these trees have to be cut down.

In addition, if you want self-driving vehicles, such as trains, cars, and so forth, you're going to have to cut down the trees. And in fact, this is what we saw suggested or proposed, in Britain. The national rail network announced that they were going to cut down millions of trees all along the rail network last year, and there was a public outcry. So, they said that they were suspending this plan. But we see this everywhere. We see pictures from Romania, from France; certainly the trees have been cut down in Austria, we know the UK, and many other countries. This is also a desecration. The trees are essential to our survival.

Josh: Before the call, we were talking about the importance of shifting to a perspective, let's say, Claire, of acting without attachment to the outcome. You do what's right because it's right, because it gives us almost like an inner liberation. It connects our heart and mind or it frees our conscience, it lightens our load. And then we can do what we feel is right, without needing a certain specific result. And sometimes even, without knowing the how. Can you talk a little bit about that and this shift that perhaps we're being asked to make? Because we can't guarantee a specific success or a specific result in this movement or in any of the tremendous intensity, I guess, that's happening on the planet right now. We're kind of in uncharted waters here. Talk to us about that.

Claire: I think we're totally in uncharted waters. I think we've seen the

collapse of the rule of law, which I know that you referred to recently. We've seen the... what can we call it? In every area of life, we have seen our trust in our institutions, exploded. We heard that Monsanto had a black ops department where they were killing journalists and others who opposed their plans. We've seen massive accusations of pedophilia against the Catholic Church, right across the world. We've seen Julian Assange attacked.

Now, the WikiLeaks documents, none of those documents was proved to have been false. So, Julian Assange has done a tremendous job in bringing forth the truth, and now he's being crucified for it. So there are many areas in which we see that the rule of law has collapsed. I mean, 5G in itself goes against the rule of law. It's against the precautionary principle, it's against EU law; it's against international law. It's against human rights. It's immoral, apart from anything else.

Josh: Experimentation without consent.

Claire: Absolutely. It's against the Nuremberg Code, which forbids experimentation on humans, without consent and information. I think people, for a long time, have known that something was terribly, terribly wrong with our system, and now the evidence is black and white. So people really have to wake up now and realize that we cannot go to leaders anymore. We cannot look to authorities anymore because who is doing this? It's actually the politicians, the leaders, the authorities, that we have looked to in the past. So, we cannot expect them to stop this 5G agenda.

So we have to look to our own resources. And that's why I'm very much in sympathy with you and your Take Back Your Power movement, because 5G is a wonderful opportunity to be who you really should be, as a human being. 5G is an annihilation event, potentially. So you are faced with your own death, and what are you going to do? When you have that realization, of course, it's absolutely terrifying. But when you move beyond it, you realize that it's an opportunity. Now I find it very interesting personally, that the people who recognize this fully are the spiritual people. It's very much the spiritual people who are stepping forward on this, and the people who are very much trapped in our current paradigm don't seem to be able to see it.

But the spiritual people, this is a challenge to be the best of yourself because you cannot look to anybody else to solve this and nor should you. I think it's very much a personal responsibility. And these challenges force you to look inside and fall back on your own resources and they force you to grow. I think in normal circumstances, with something less dire than 5G, you hope that somebody else more qualified, will perhaps step forth to deal with this. Or, "Somebody who's better educated than me. Somebody who is more experienced than me. Somebody who has more knowledge to me." But in these circumstances, frankly, you have to go with what you've got.

They're rolling out 5G now. So whoever you are, whatever you can do, you've got to look to your own resources and do that. So it doesn't matter if you don't have any qualifications; well, just go and tell other people about it. That's fine, if you lack the skills. But whatever it is that you can do, you should now be stepping up to do it. So, I really see this as very much a spiritual opportunity because we are effectively raising our consciousness with this. We're coming together. 5G, I see as anti-life, anti-love, anti-compassion, anti-family, anti-connection, anti-God, anti-sacred; anti-everything. So what is the solution to 5G?

Krishnamurti said that the solution to a problem is always contained within the problem. So, what is the solution to 5G? It is then love, compassion, empathy, family, connection, creativity, freedom; all the things that 5G is not. So, who are the experts on all of these things? Human beings. So we don't need to go anywhere, we don't need to be anything else; all we need to do is to come back to our humanity. And for me, that means getting rid of your mobile phone. People have to understand that if they want to stop 5G, they're going to have to get rid of their mobile phone.

This is something that my writing partner, Arthur Firstenberg, really helped me to understand; that you cannot expect to stop 5G, if you want to keep your smartphone, because it's not a question of reducing your use of it. The very existence of that smartphone or any mobile phone is destroying you. It's destroying your children, it's destroying nature. And now we are at very great risk of damaging the ionosphere and destroying the entire planet. So, at what cost? Your phone. I think people have to take responsibility and stop using this technology. That's not to say we won't find a better technology shortly.

But right now, if you want to stop 5G, you're going to have to get rid of your phone. And you're going to have to start being responsible and step up to the plate and do something about this. This requires everybody to take action. This is one of the things, coming back to what you asked me about, the UN. I have talked to my colleagues at the UN, extensively about this, and frankly, I don't see them taking action to do something about it; which I have to say is quite disappointing.

Josh: Well, in our human adolescence of our species, let's say, we're resisting stepping into responsibility. We want the rights but we're resisting this sort of self-responsibility. Sometimes we need a good talking to by our mother. So I think that you've really embodied that in a beautiful way, in a very impactful way. That, just bring that reality check; that kind of a parent figure who cares, can give you.

So thank you for challenging us on that, on the level of commitment and where we draw the line, and what we truly stand for. What builds the life within us and around us? What's important? Like you said, the antithesis of what 5G is about, like focusing on that. And then, it's from that place that our actions can have deeper impact and meaning, isn't it?

Claire: Absolutely. I see 5G as the opportunity for bringing in the new paradigm.

Josh: What is the new paradigm?

Claire: Oh, the new paradigm is not the old paradigm. The old paradigm is where we are now. The old paradigm is the materialist, reductionist paradigm that we've had for just about 2,000 years. And it's based on a false reality. It's based on a mistake. Now, this is one of my themes. I used to teach intercultural competence. And I've lived in a lot of countries, and I've worked with international people. So if you like, I've been quite deprogrammed when it comes to cultural things because when you realize that in one culture, they do it this way, but in another culture, they do it that way; and then in my case, I've been to many cultures where I know that they do in very different ways. So, logic is not necessarily logic when you move to another culture.

So, people who buy into the materialist, reductionist paradigm, tend to believe that it's universal. It's so obvious, like logic; it's universal and it applies everywhere. But not so, I would say that probably most of the cultures of this world do not buy into this paradigm. And, in fact, because I have quite an open mind, certain people have shared certain things with me. And they've told me that they wouldn't normally share that with a white European person because that person probably would ridicule them for sharing those things. But I really see that the collapse of everything; that people are very frightened by what is happening. And it is very frightening to see everything you believed in, everything you've trusted, collapsing in front of your eyes. And this is really what is happening.

But I think that that is a natural evolution. We have come to the end of that materialist, reductionist paradigm, and it has run its course. And for me, 5G is the ultimate expression of a set of wrong thinking. You can only reach the point where you believe that this is a solid reality. You can only reach the point where you have to have a complete destruction and a control system. I think it's also an expression of the culmination of the 40 years we've had of the neoliberal economics, which has brought us to this; because basically, Neo liberal economics is actually a kleptocracy. And everything that could be stolen has now been stolen. So the only remaining thing is the consumption of the consumer, him or herself, which is what we have with 5G and big data.

So, we've had the commodification of everything, with this paradigm. Everything that can be measured, has a price tag on it. All that cannot be measured, is considered of no value. And what cannot be measured, of course, is the list that I've just given you. Life, love, empathy, compassion, connection, family, community; none of these things can be commodified and sold. So they are regarded as having no value. But in fact, we know, as human beings, that these are the only things that have value. And in fact, everything that has a price tag has pretty much no value. So I think we've reached a point where 5G is a culmination. So it's

also a control systems, so it's a mind control system, and also a physical control system.

And in that respect, I think it's about the kleptocrats being able to keep the money that they've stacked up in their tax havens. So it's about them protecting themselves. So, people have to understand what 5G is. 5G is a very ugly and terrifying thing. And what it is, is one thing, but its function is something else. So its function is to raise awareness, bring people together, bring back our human values and our humanity, and reestablish a new paradigm. And bring in a new paradigm where we can rethink everything. And I would hope that people would not turn to any template that they might find in the current paradigm.

So I don't want to talk about new systems or new structure or new organizations because I think what we're actually doing now, coming together to combat 5G, is, the process of coming together to combat 5G is actually the solution to 5G. So I will put it like this, in the West, we tend to look at the objective of what we're trying to do, and we tend to disregard the process. This would be the opposite in China and Japan, where they would very much value and pay attention to the process. So hence, because you have this thinking in the West, where you're concentrated on the objective, the objective, in terms of getting rid of 5G, then seems to be absolutely overwhelming.

"It's a global agenda. Wow, there are some fabulous powers behind it. That must be impossible, we cannot do that." But I would say that the process of combating 5G, which is what we are all experiencing now, is a coming together, a feeling of community, a feeling of love; a manifestation of the new paradigm. We're actually already building the new paradigm as we combat 5G, which I find absolutely fascinating. So for me, I think, even the process of combating 5G should not be about structures, organization, or systems.

It should be about each individual being faced with this potential annihilation event, coming back to him or herself, and really becoming fully who they should be, without the programming. Without any constraints. Coming to their authenticity and their full power. And when that happens, I believe that you have then changed the world. Because this is precisely what is wrong, is that people believe they have no power, because they don't really understand what they are; which is infinite consciousness.

Josh: Wow, thank you. That was so well said.

Claire: I'm a regular David Icke there but you know.

Josh: Very well said. So it's like, at the individual or the social level, even as part of this conversation, as part of this summit, we're tapping into this, you could call it a self-organizing principle, perhaps. That there's no structure, there's no template, there's no predefined outcome and the 'how'. We are the 'how'. So, it's a paradigm shift for sure.

Claire: And it's a beautiful process because I've been part of this process

for a year. And as I said at the beginning, one faces numerous and repeated challenges. And you have to face each challenge and it forces you to trust the process more and more and more. And all I can say is, as far as I'm concerned, this is unfolding beautifully.

Josh: Thank you. And as we come together and the community that's going to unfold, during and from this summit, going to evolve out of that, I want to honor you. Thank you for being part of the team, thank you for being part of the advisory team and being part of this.

Claire: Thank you so much for everything that you do. As I say, we're now a community, an unexpected and spontaneous community. And that is what's really beautiful about this. I'm now meeting people from many different countries and we're thinking along the same lines. I really see so much positivity, so much spontaneity, and so much energy and love, amongst all the people I meet. It's such a privilege actually, to be doing this.

Josh: Yeah. Very good. I totally agree. And I want to thank you for your intentional action and your time and sharing your wisdom with us today.

Claire: Thank you. It's been a pleasure.

Building Local Community to Resist 5G

Guest: Derrick Broze

Josh: With those on the Summit today is Derrick Broze. Derrick, welcome. I'm so glad you're here.

Derrick: Thanks for having me. I really appreciate it.

Josh: Derrick, you are a Houston based investigative journalist, activist, radio show host, author. You're running for mayor. You've educated the city council there in Houston very effectively on 5G. You've overcome some challenges in your life. And we can get into those and get into your conscious path as well. You're emerging a conscious intentional path with your activism in a beautiful way. So, really looking forward to this conversation, you know. You're a leader in this. Can you give us a bit of a background on who you are and what you do?

Derrick: Absolutely. So, well again thank you for having me and let me be a part of this wonderful event. Just such an important thing to be doing right now. So, I'm thirty-four years old. I've been in Houston my entire life. I've grown up around the inner city of Houston. I've been doing the things you mentioned for about the last decade. But prior to that, as you said, I did have some struggles. In 2005, I got into drugs and drug addiction and found myself locked up in 2005. I end up doing about eighteen months in Texas State Institutions behind bars.

And that was really where I started to question the path that I was on and challenge the things I was doing. Starting to do some introspection, get into meditation, and really start to uncover a lot of my own healing, and my need for healing through looking at my traumas and my familial

relationships. And so, that was a beginning of a process, that obviously is a lifelong process, and continues to this day.

But it was through those experiences that I first, when I got released from prison for the last time. And I got off parole. I really just started to look at the world with fresh eyes. I felt like I'd gotten through not only addiction but lots of depression and struggles with suicide. And things of that sort. And it felt like I was really looking at the world for the first time. Where I could just stop and enjoy a sunset or something. Things that I would have never been interested in before.

All of a sudden, you know, I was just wanting to take in the beauty of the world. And along with that I remembered and realized that I am an intelligent person that likes to read and likes to learn. And wants to understand the world. And I started to just dive down those rabbit holes as they say. And started to look at the drug war for example. And then I really definitely started to focus on health in the beginning.

It's interesting, you know, where I'm kind of making a full circle here. Because one of the first things I did was really get into health and question things like water fluoridation. Like question whether or not I wanted to microwave my house. Just as simple as those sort of things, everything just started rethinking everything. Went and placed my microwave on the edge of the street with a note for somebody that said you know, "This may or may not cause cancer. Please don't use it." It was gone within five minutes. Somebody came and took it. But it was like just starting to make those life changes.

And in that process, I also just started to look at my own city. And wanted to get involved in activism. I launched an activist blog and community called The Houston Free Thinkers in 2010. We were active for about eight years. And you know, such a wide range of things. From you know, the typical activist stuff, protests, rallies, marches, civil disobedience. But also, building community gardens, hosting skill shares, hosting documentary screenings, hosting benefit shows for different causes, and just trying to raise awareness.

And then I got into journalism along the way. I didn't go to school for journalism. I just have a natural, I think, inclination to be curious. And to enjoy putting people in positions of power on camera and asking them difficult questions that I know that they're not too comfortable with. I get a kick out of that. And so, that's just developed into a path over the last nine years I've been doing this now. And so, I've written for nearly every website out there in the independent media that exists and alternative independent media. I have my own website channel called the Conscious Resistance. Which as you said, sort of tries to merge the activist world and the awareness raising world with the spiritual path of uncovering our trauma. Because of the things I've been through, I

understand the importance of bringing those things together. Not just you know yelling at the government about 5G or yelling at Verizon about 5G. But also, kind of going inward and seeing what role we play in the grand scheme of things. And how we are contributing to some of the problems and things like that.

So, that's what I've been up to, what I'm involved in, and 5G has become increasingly important in my work in the last year.

Josh: That's outstanding. I look forward to get into those deeper consciousness and life path related questions. And that's a hugely inspiring story of having, you know, come back. And you know resurrected your life from being to that point. Where you now are such an influential and inspiring social leader.

But I'd like to first dive into what led you to specifically begin researching 5G? And how did that whole process come about? And what are some of the key things that you've learned?

Derrick: So, you know, I have been aware, like I was saying about health and you know sort of EMF generally. And over the years of my research, I've come across an article or a study or so, that was pointing at potential dangers of cell phones and things of that sort. And I also, you know, in this line of work, you notice pretty quickly what topics are going to get you called or labeled a conspiracy theorist. Or you don't understand science. Or you know these sorts of derogatory attacks.

And that was the feeling that I got every time I even mentioned or tried to bring something up about cell phones. Like, "Hey, guys have you ever heard about this cell phone this or that?" And I realized, "Okay, there is some push back." But I kind of set it aside for a little while. And in late 2018, I was coming back to Houston after being on the road for a while. And I really wanted to just dive back into local journalism. And I happened to just be, you know, the universe brought me home at the right time and I was literally coming back into the Houston the week that the mayor of Houston and the City of Houston, they had already announced a partnership with Verizon.

But they were announcing that they were going to have this press conference where they were going to have the world's first 5G customer. And it was the beginning of the 5G roll out in Houston. So, right as I was coming home and looking for a story. And like I said, somewhat aware of the issues surrounding this technology and 5G itself. I'm like, "Wow my city, the city I live in, is going to be a test site for this." So, I went down there and I was able to interview the mayor and interview Hans Vestberg who is the CEO of Verizon. And ask them both to their faces about the privacy concerns, the health concerns, just generally the concerns about 5G. And both of the men denied having any awareness or knowing

anything about this. And that was the beginning of it for me, like locally.

I started to look into the fact that the mayor here in Houston, he first announced a partnership with Verizon in the summer of 2018. A couple months later he received the 5G Wireless Champion Award from the CTIA, the Cellular Telephone Internet Association. Which I'm sure your audience is aware is the lobby for the big telecom, big wireless companies. So, they gave him the 5G Wireless Champion Award for removing all restrictions and all roadblocks to just make it as easy as possible for them to roll it out. And then a couple of months later they're announcing the world's first 5G customer.

And so, I could see these obvious conflicts of interest. And you know, I've been to city council dozens, and dozens, and dozens, of times since 2010 for a variety of issues, water fluoridation, homeless issues, police violence. You know you name it and I've gone there and tried to take that route. But what I think the average person thinks this is the way we're supposed to handle situations in our city or our town, right? You go to the council, you express your opinion, maybe they hear you, something gets done. And maybe it works that way in some other places.

But in the city of Houston, with three and a half million people, there is this sixteen member council and the mayor, who are controlling where all the taxpayer money goes. And they're signing contracts every week and budgets and this and that. And nobody pays attention. Nobody is there. Sometimes there's people come down there for their issues. But, you know, they tell you two minutes, your time's up. Three minutes, your time's up, next. You know they don't really. I've seen plenty of people over the years.

This is my point. I've seen plenty of people over the years, come there with valid concerns, taking time off of work, taking time off the school, they get all dressed up, they've got a speech written. And they go up there and they're nervous. And then they share their thoughts for two minutes, three minutes, and the City Council says next. And no feedback. No follow up. Nothing.

And I've seen so many people become disheartened from this process. But I do also know that it is a valuable tool as far as using propaganda to promote a message. And what I mean by that is, when I go down to city council. Where I live right here, I'm about a ten minute bike ride downtown. So, I get on my bike, go down there, I have all the issues in my head, planned out what I want to talk about, wait for a couple hours for my little two to three minutes to speak, spread that message and share those ideas.

And I've gone now about six times for just for 5G in the last few months.

And I've sent them e-mails. All the studies that you guys are aware of. I'm sure some of the studies we're going to be talking about in the Summit. I've sent them information on the FCC taking control of the roll out. You know, just everything. Every angle that you can think of. Privacy, health, local control, sent them e-mails, sent them studies, sent them references. I've conducted my own interviews and sent them. Not a single one has been answered. Not a single one has been even, you know, "Thank you for this. We'll get to it." Or something like that.

So, I use city council as a way to go there knowing that more than likely they're not going to respond to me. Like I said, the mayor's already in the back pocket of Verizon. I don't know how many other council members might be as well. But I use that as a way to go up there to spread these ideas. There are a couple of council members who are at least a little bit sympathetic. One of them is a chiropractor, you know, health advocate. So, he's always down to talk about health issues.

And he's always really welcoming and supportive. So, that will give me a couple extra minutes to talk, you know. It kind of extends my little two or three minutes to a five or six, seven minute video. And then I go home, and I wait for them to upload it to the city website. And I rip it off their website and I uploaded on my channel. And then it gets thousands more views, then it would ever get just sitting on the City website.

So, that's what I say as, I go there knowing full well that the city council isn't going to hear me. They are not going to, you know, just decide to listen all of a sudden one day. But it's a tool that I can use to show people, "Hey, you can go out there. You can communicate to these people. Even if they're not listening. You can go out there, you can inform them." And what I've said in one of the videos and one of the visits I made is that, in another regard I'm trying to get it on the record that they have been informed. So, in the future if there are lawsuits. If there are people who are getting sick. And, you know, hopefully nobody's, you know, I don't know. Wherever it goes, if people end up getting sick, or there's lawsuits regarding health, regarding privacy invasions, regarding eminent domain, what you have you. There is a record showing that these city council members have been made aware of that. And that's another one of the reasons I've chosen to go there.

Josh: Yeah. And I mean, my research shows that they're way more liable than I think they are, city counselors and city governments. And there is a lawyer, Harry Lehman, in California who's been doing some excellent work educating his local city officials of their liability. So, yeah that's a basis isn't it. Like notifying, getting it on the record, and then there is a basis for something like criminal negligence.

Derrick: Yeah, absolutely. I do think that's important to even, you know, because this Summit is about solutions, right? And that's my work is

always trying to take solution based approach. If I'm going to talk to somebody about an issue, I would like to be able to say, "And here's something you can do about it, right?" At the very least, what we can do, even if we have city council members, or town council members, or whatever, you have in your area, supervisors, et cetera.

And if they're not willing to listen. You can still go out there, you know, you can take it off the city's website like I'm doing. Or you can take your own camera and have a friend record. Just put it on the record that these people are being made aware of the information that you have. And bring them physical documents to the council. Make sure that there is, you know, here they are all receiving the documents. There's no claims, like maybe they can claim, "Oh, it went to the spam. We didn't see it. It went into our spam inbox, you know, when you send those e-mails." I've actually told them, "Check your spam." And I've given them physical documents too because I want to make sure that there's no excuse that this information has been passed along.

And really, I don't think there should be an excuse. As an elected member of a town council, or a city government, or anything like that, you would expect, or I believe most people would want to have members who are informed on the topics they care about. And the reality is most of them are not.

Josh: That's exactly right and thanks for mentioning that. Because you know I believe that we don't want to start out in the position that our local government officials, our adversaries, are on the other side. We need to understand that there's so much happening, you know, at this time. And they're being asked to be educated on so many different topics that most of them don't know, right? And so, we want to give them a full opportunity to be part of the solution, to be part of the discussion. And if later, if need be, if they're failing to ignore, if they are failing to recognize the reality of the situation and the risk and the harm. Then they can be held accountable. Then they can be held liable.

So, that's an important part of the message as well. They have to do the right thing or else it's going to come back to bite them. But to really come from that, maybe we can get into this intentional piece, this conscious piece, really come from that place. Where we're all in this together, right? Nobody gets like a get out of jail free card. So, maybe share with us that? So, in your organization, Conscious Resistance, and on your YouTube videos, I mean you have like thirty some thousand subscribers, right?

Derrick: Yeah, there is about thirty thousand subscribers on there. So, you know, I think I get where you're going with this. I do want people to understand that when you're trying to inform somebody, when you're trying to because I guess you know what we're focused on here

is the solutions, right? So, if you're not a doctor. If you're not a health professional. If you're not a scientist. But you are concerned individual. You live wherever you live. And you see 5G growing especially very quickly in the United States.

And you want to go to town council, you want to go to these different places, you want to write letters, you want to make phone calls. In the age of the internet and the age of social media, it is very easy, I think to fall into a us versus them mentality. As you were sort of pointing at a moment ago. Yeah, there are definitely, like I said, the mayor here in the city I live in is obviously in the back pocket of Verizon. And it's clear to me at this point, like this guy does not care, no matter what I say to him. The only thing I can get from him is, "I love 5G."

So, I understand that. And I approach the situation with that. But I also recognize that he's still a human being. Maybe there's some way to reach him. Maybe there's a different approach. You know, at the end of the day there are corrupt people. There are people who we could describe as immoral, or evil, or whatever word you would use. But there are also lots of people who truly are ignorant and just don't know. I mean we would assume that the city council would have some awareness of all the different issues we care about. But that's not always accurate in what I've found. And I can give them a little bit of leeway and say, "Okay, well they're having meetings and they're arranging city budgets, and this and that." But the goal would be to have individuals like, you know, those people watching, everybody listening is to go inform them. So, they are not going to have time to watch all the YouTube videos you've been watching. They are not going to have time to sit here and watch this Summit. They're not going to have time to, you know, just watch all the documentaries and all the things that you have become informed and look at the papers because the reality of the matter is if you're running over here, if you're in a city of Houston, this massive city. They probably got quite a bit of other things going on. And so, I'll sympathize and empathize with that. And say, "Perhaps they haven't had the time."

So, it is important I think to approach from a compassionate standpoint. Not to just come in there. You know I don't go into city council and just accuse them all being bought off, corrupt, paid for, whatever. I could take that approach and maybe that would make for an interesting YouTube video. But it really wouldn't further my goals of trying to educate them and to also educate the viewer who might be listening and who has no awareness of this like, "Wow, this guy is talking very well-spoken. He's got some points that I've never heard of. Maybe I should look further into this."

So, on one level have compassion for the people you're trying to reach. Whether that city council members, governors, the president, or your neighbors. And at the same time recognize that communicating at a

place like city council or some similar event like that, a town meeting, homeowners association, I've had people reach out to me because of these videos. The first one I did, the first city council video I did, is almost at nine hundred thousand views. For whatever reason, it just particularly took off and went really viral. So, I've had people reach out to me from all over the world asking these questions. Asking ideas on how can I get involved? How can I connect to people like yourself who are doing things like this?

So, there is a very deep need and want for people who want to get involved. And want to find a way. Sometimes, you know, we can get into the solution of that in a moment as well. But I just think it's important to definitely recognize that if you're out there on the streets trying to educate people about a topic you care about, whether it's 5G, it's EMF, whatever issue you're talking. This is a little bit more broadly. Look at them like the human being that they are, you know.

Even if they think you're crazy and they say, "You are conspiracy theorist, you think cell phones are bad for me. You think this," whatever. Just let it go. Let it go because at the end of the day, the way that I've always approached it is that when you're trying to spread awareness, you're trying to reach everyone. Even the people who might think that you're crazy. You're doing this for the benefit of them. Even if they dismiss you. They think you're a quack. They don't think you understand science. Whatever they may say.

You're trying to help them at the end of the day too. So, let that go and just come from a place of compassion to try to reach people. Whether that means council members, government officials, your friends, your neighbors. And you know come from that place of caring and understanding. Of saying like, "Look I care about you. I care about the city I live in. And I care about the town I live in. I want to live in a place that's safe for all of us. And I would really appreciate if you look at this information. If you check out this document. If you watch this video. What have you."

And everybody's going to have a different approach. Some people are very aware of their health concerns, right? So, that's why I take multiple approaches with 5G. I talked about the health, privacy, and the kind of local control, eminent domain, sort of aspect, property rights. Because some people honestly, I've heard, and I'm sure you've heard things like this. I've heard people say, "Well, everything gives us cancer. Or everything, you know, is going to get you sick." So, they sort of just dismiss, "I guess I shouldn't worry about it." Other folks will say, "Well, we don't have privacy anyway. So, why should I care if 5G is going to take away our privacy?"

But maybe they don't take one of those arguments. But one of them will

reach them. Maybe they don't care about the health. But they might care about privacy. Maybe they don't care about health or privacy, but they don't want a tower right outside their window. Or they don't want to have to deal with some weird looking device right on their street. There are multiple ways to reach people. So, I think that's important as well. When you're approaching people, come with compassion, and try to meet them where they're at.

Josh: Yeah, good. So, let's kind of dive into those three different areas. What does our audience need to be aware of? Some key problems to help, you know, crystallize for our audience, the key problems in each of those three areas. And what have you noticed as an effect of, you know, facts? Or effective strategies that really land or studies? You know, what's really working when you're communicating with people whether it's in person or on video?

Derrick: Yeah. So, as I said the main three arguments that I take. And we'll go through each of them, the health obviously, privacy, and then which you could call, local control, kind of eminent domain property rights aspect of it.

So, on the health front. You know, I have always approach this as the person who is. I'm in an investigative journalist. I'm a researcher. I'm more than capable of understanding, you know, studies and having them read to me. Read back to me and seeing the reflections of the people involved in the studies. But I also make it clear, like "Look, I'm not a scientist. I'm not a doctor." But it doesn't preclude you from being able to understand science.

So, I think that's important for people understand. There's often this this approach that some people take. I've seen this dozens of times. "Hey, I've worked in the telecom industry for a dozen years. Nothing's wrong." Or, "Hey, I have a degree in radiation this or that." You know and that's great. It is great when people have degrees. And I think if that happens, if somebody comes in and tries to play the credentials game and says look, "I've got a title or a letter next to my name. You don't know anything." You know, tell them, "Thank you. I appreciate the time that you've put into this particular area of research."

However, having those degrees does not necessarily make one an expert in 5G. Or make one an expert in how this works. Or make one an expert in the corruption that has got us to the place we are at now. Because that's a big thing to understand. Some folks will come in and say, "You know, if this was dangerous the FCC would have done something about it. The FDA would have done something about it." You know, the sort of blind trust in government or in authority generally which I think is a bigger problem that we have. Folks just assume that if it was dangerous, they would have already known about it. You know

the media would be doing their job and telling us this. So, there's a lot of assumptions that come into it.

For one the assumption that, you know, all the government officials are just good, honest people. And that there's no corruption going on. And the assumption that the media itself is doing actual journalism. And not also connected to some of the same people. So, we have to be able to approach people understand those assumptions. So, if you're coming to a situation you're talking about health.

And somebody is already coming into the conversation with their assumption that the government mandated science is fact, is based on you know accurate testing standards, and is up to date. Well then, you're going to be kind of going up facing an uphill battle. You know what I mean. Because you're going to have to not only get this person to look at the health arguments. But also, maybe have to show them that, "Look I'm not sure if you're aware. But check out this paper from Harvard that shows the FCC being captured. Or check out this war gaming memo." You know, different pieces of evidence that we have now that shows the amount of corruption that exists in the agencies that are supposed to regulate this type of technology.

And then you also, I think, it'd be important to point out the way that the media shapes the conversation. And the reason I bring these points up because I'm talking about health. But what I'm saying is that it's more than just health. It's more than just 5G. We're dealing with a bigger kind of picture here. Which is the fact that there is corruption that exists in the U.S. government. And there is corruption that exists in the corporate mainstream media. And because of that, issues like 5G get suppressed, or the science that is promoted to the average person is that government mandated often corporate funded science.

So, that's part of the battle that you're going against. I mean most recently we had the New York Times say, "That people who question 5G are like falling prey to Russian propaganda." Things like that. So, they're trying to paint any of us who are asking these questions as just, you know, useful idiots or just ignorant people. So, go into these discussions being aware of that. That you might be dealing with a person who has been heavily propagandized from the media, to the government, and industry, and the corporate industry themselves. So, if they know anything about 5G at this point, probably the average person only knows the commercial they've seen from Verizon. This commercial they seen from Sprint or from AT&T.

That's what I've seen in my experience at least. So, when you're coming into these discussions, just be aware of that. But as far as the health, I, myself as a journalist, not as a scientist. I've interviewed, Dr. Martin Paul of Washington State University. I've interviewed some of the folks from

the Environmental Health Trust. And tried to put myself in a position where I can interview other experts. Since I, myself, don't have that degree. Don't have that title or that letter next to my name. But I'm a researcher. I'm a journalist. That's what my job is to do. Is to go gather information to compare that data and then I share it with my audience. And then I let them decide.

So, I think that's a good approach to take. Is that you just find the interviews that you think fit well. And that you're trying to share with your mom. Okay, you found an hour long interview. Your mom is not going to listen to an hour long interview maybe. So, you find a fifteen minute interview that is with an expert that really breaks it down and gets those key points. And just ask Mom, "Like just give fifteen minutes your day, just sit down, and watch this. Because I need you to understand. I care about your health. I want you to be safe." Things of that sort.

Or your partner or your spouse, whatever you have. And really just be able to again meet them where they're at. And communicate the message. So, when it comes to health, I think that's what it's important to do. Is find the experts that are communicating the message in a really positive way. And I don't necessarily want to endorse any particular one individual. But there are, as the audience of this Summit knows, there are plenty of experts out there that are promoting this information. And doing lots of good work. It's important to have that information. Because somebody will come to you and say, "You're not a scientist. You're not a doctor. You're not a health professional. So, I shouldn't listen to you." But you can show them. "Well, here are the health professionals. Here are the doctors. Here are the scientists that are talking about this. And this is what I think you should look at."

My main concerns, you know, obviously there is potential cancer concerns. I think that a more immediate concern regarding health, for me personally, would be the loss of sleep and anxiety that is being shown to be connected to having the smart meter next to you. Or the Wi-Fi router running all night or the Bluetooth, you know, just pulsing through you all the time. You know, I've tried to just start unplugging the Wi-Fi every night, tried to stay connected to broadband as much possible.

Just, you know, rewire the house through ethernet cables as much as possible. And take these small steps. Like reduce my use of Bluetooth and these kinds of devices. Because with the work I do, I am on a laptop, like seventy or eighty percent of the day. And I try to put some distance to myself. I make sure I have time away from it. But at the end of the day, it's a part of my work.

So, I'm trying to take precautions. And I do think that what we're getting

into an area where people are getting anxiety. People are getting stressed. They're getting lack of sleep. That is what leads to a lot of other things. Whether the cancer is coming directly from the EMF themselves. Or because their body is breaking down from not being able to take care of itself from the constant pulsations that are taking place. So, when it comes to health, I'm particularly concerned about that and where that leads to with the other areas.

Just briefly, when it comes to privacy, I think that, you know, for those who aren't aware of the reason there are privacy concerns is because 5G is heralding the internet of things. What they call the internet of things which is the smart phones, the smart houses, the smart fridge, the driverless cars, the robot assistance, virtual reality, augmented reality, smart streetlights, sensors in the street. You know this whole futuristic world that movies have been predicting. And that all the cities want, like the mayor of Houston wants, to turn Houston into the first smart city in the country.

All of that needs 5G to operate. Because 5G, as you guys know, it's supposed to be a hundred times faster. Some people say a thousand times faster. And that low latency, that that very quick ability to send signals faster than we've ever had. Is what they say will allow for driverless vehicles and for all this to take place. But along with that, along with the installation of the cell towers, and the small cells, and all this. We are going to have hundreds of thousands, if not millions of new sensors around us.

So, it won't just be the smartphone that has a built in microphone. And that has a built in which is basically a listening device in another form. And it's not to just say, a government, you need to worry about. Or say Verizon, what are they going to do with your data when they are gathering all this information? But the day and age we're in now, there's some sixteen year old kid right now sitting in the garage, who knows how to hack your computer remotely. There's just so many brilliant young minds out there. And some who are just doing it for fun. Others who maybe have more nefarious purposes.

But the reality is whether you're talking about hackers, just individuals, or government surveillance, or corporate surveillance, the increase of sensors and the rollout of the technology of 5G and the internet of things. Is only going to dramatically increase our potential to be surveyed, to be monitored. And I believe it will truly be the end of whatever little bits of privacy that we have left. And again, some people say, "Hey, I really lost privacy. I carry my cell phone around with me everywhere I go. Google is listening to me, this and that." And that may be true. But I think that's not a reason to just give up. I think that might be a wakeup call to say, "Hey, well maybe I should actually start caring about my privacy." And the reason why I think privacy is important is

because not only on a philosophical level. I really don't think you're a free person, if you don't have the right to have your own private thoughts, you know, with your family, with your loved ones. Or you know on the activist level, if you can't get together privately with some people and say, "Hey, let's organize a march, or rally, or let's hold a meeting. And all of your conversations are being listened to." Then are you truly free?

I mean, I think that's something that we need to ask ourselves. So, privacy is still something that I personally am trying to hold on to and trying to raise awareness about. My journalism has focused extensively over the years on surveillance technology. So, I'm very aware of the capabilities of so many different types of devices.

And the other aspect of that is 5G is going to increase the use of facial recognition technology as well. Because all these technologies need 5G in order to operate correctly. So, when it comes to privacy those are, I think, the concerns there. Again, try to reach out to people in a way that they, it's not about whether you're doing something wrong. You know, you don't have to be a criminal to be concerned about having privacy. I think that's sort of a misconception that's put out there on purpose.

It's just about being a free human being who wants your health, that wants the ability to think your own thoughts, to express your own mindset. And we have to ask ourselves that question again. If you do not have privacy in your own home, are you truly free? And if not, then what the heck are we doing? I mean, I think that's where we got to try to reach out people. Get them to think about that.

And when it comes to, the more kind of, eminent domain. You know, the eminent domain is a phrase for those who may not be familiar. Sometimes it's used when it comes to land where the government wants to build the pipeline and it's going to go through somebody's farm. And they offer them some money. Eventually, whether the farmer says yes or no, they're going to take the land, and they're going to compensate them. But they're going to take the land by force.

So, that likely will happen in some cases. Once we start getting 5G to the rural areas and they start extending towers and cell sites across people's land. Because as, I'm sure the listeners are aware, these towers have to be installed every two to five hundred feet in order to operate correctly.

So, whether you're living out the country. Once it does get to the rural areas or you live in the city. We're going to have these towers and these small cells attached to either current infrastructure or building new infrastructure. There's already been examples from some cities that 5G is being rolled out. Where they're literally, I mean, I've even seen it here in Houston. There is literally a box, a 5G box. I had a friend, another activist here, send me all the locations of where the cell sites and small

cells are in the city. So, I have the addresses, the locations, the types of what each antenna does. So, I got a lot of good deals on what is related to 5G and what is other infrastructure.

There is literally a 5G, little small cell box outside of one of the warehouses downtown where people live in, attached to the window. Just right outside their window. Their new view is this box, you know. And that is something that is going to take place and it's already taking place everywhere that this rolls out. So, that is a part of the federal takeover of local control, you know. And these two issues are kind of related. In late 2018, the FCC, they passed a rule, I mean it's not a law. Nobody voted on it. They just passed a rule of their own. That says that the local governments no longer have control over the 5G roll out.

So, that means cities, states, localities, municipalities, towns, what have you, cannot study 5G for health, cannot decide how much to charge the companies, and really can't even have a say in where the towers the cell sites go. There is very limited ability that the cities have to argue. You can argue aesthetics. So, you can say, "We don't like the way it looks. So, can you make it look like a tree. Or can you make it look like a flagpole or something like that."

But those are the basic only arguments that a city can make because of this FCC ruling. And then a couple months into early 2019, Donald Trump passed an executive order, which sped it up even further. And he said, "Well these local governments, they're getting greedy. They want to charge the companies too much money. So, we're making a new rule that says they have to approve all small cell sites within ninety days." So, your local governments, wherever you are at, when they get a proposal from Verizon and it comes in like, "Hey, we are going to come in with this 5G infrastructure."

They are very limited in what they can do. They can't say no. I mean, they could technically. They would face lawsuits. But you'd have to have a local politician or a local member of council to be willing to step up and do that. So far, there's only a couple of cities. There's Danville, California where their little small town said, "You know what, we are going to stop this. We are going to go ahead and take the lawsuit." But most people aren't willing to do that.

And so, because of that it leaves the cities in a position where they have no say in where these towers go. So, I've been contacted by people here in Houston, who are trying to work with their homeowner's association. They're trying to get down to the even more local level, down to the neighborhood level. Because they're starting to roll it out in their neighborhoods. And they're putting it next to schools. They're putting it next to churches. They're putting it right next to people's homes.

And I think that's something that is so real, that people can understand. You can say, "Look even if you don't think there's health concerns here. Even if you don't care about your privacy. Do you really want this thing right outside your window? If there's even a small chance, even if you don't buy the science. If there's even a small minuscule chance that this could cause cancer in your family or your children, do you want it at their school? Do you want it next to your house? Do you want it next to your church? And then do you want it anywhere?" I guess it comes down to.

But those are, I think the key arguments here. The health, the privacy, and the fact that we have as individuals on a local level, and even those in local government, have no say in what happened with 5G because of the federal government's roll out.

So, this is another example I think, you know, you can approach some of your friends who might be a little bit more, I don't want to say right wing. But people who care about state's rights. And those sorts of issues. And show them like, "Look this is a great example of state's rights being trampled on by the federal government." You know this is the federal government partnering with a corporation passing a rule. We know that the FCC is made up of former telecom employees and that they have a revolving door relationship with them. And this is just a great example of that. And it's an unfortunate example because it's affecting us.

So, that's another way to get people to think about this. Like, look this is about your health. This is about privacy. This is about local control being taken away. This is a corporatist issue. This is the government working with the corporation to pass on something that the taxpayers have to pay for. At the end of the day, that's the other, I think, sort of slap in the face. Is that the people are paying for this one way or the other. Whether you want it or not. Whether you think it's dangerous or not. Whether you think it's going to spy on you or not. Whether you want it outside of your house or next your school, you're paying for it.

Josh: Thanks for that. My question is, is the federal government's overreach and basically saying that local government have no rights. Is that as cut and dried as they make it appear to be though? For example, in early April 2019, there was the California Supreme Court reaffirmed their opinion that local governments, and in that case the city of San Francisco, does have more rights. Versus you know, does have more rights than the traditional understanding of the 1996 Telecommunication Act would lead them to believe.

So, I just want to dive into that because it seems that some local governments are getting creative. You know, when they're made aware of this issue, both the health and or the local the power grab issue. And they're doing things like recertification fees for utilities every year

to recertify that their equipment is approved. And they're doing things like passing laws that are minimum "safer". I was going to say safe but at least it's safer distances of fifteen hundred feet or whatever it is, distance to residential or school areas. Things like that.

So, can we just dive into that because I don't want to leave the audience thinking that there's no power that local governments have to do anything, right?

Derrick: Absolutely. You're right about that Josh. You make a great point there. There's also just this past week, I saw Syracuse, New York, their local government, they passed an ordinance which would allow them to have random checks of Verizon equipment, whenever they call upon. So, they can take a random sample of any of the equipment and do their own studies. To see if it's operating correctly.

And the, I don't know if it was the mayor, but one of the council members basically said like, look, this is what we can do. They're basically saying either we pass this and 5G is going to happen one way or another. They're trying to cram it down our throats. But if we pass this ordinance, we have some level of pushback. And like you said, some people are trying to pass local rules about the distance, they're trying to pass rules about the placement in Syracuse. Like I said, they instituted a rule that said every year they could study a random sample of the cell sites.

So, there are creative ways that people can try to push back against this. The only fault I see in that, and I don't want to say fault. But the only danger in that, is the perception that well, okay so Syracuse passed this. "Yes, we didn't beat 5G but we passed this measure." But when you look at, in particular the Syracuse case, it still says in their language that they will test the random sample according to the 1996 standards. So, they're still going off the standards that we know are already flawed. And I think that's kind of just something we've got to be careful of. Is that the fight isn't over just because while the local government passed the rule saying, "This is going to take place."

But you are right that we are not completely powerless. I do think it's going to be a city by city, town by town, state by state sort of battle. And eventually if there is a local mayor, or governor, or somebody, who's willing to say, "You know what our citizens have concerns. We're going to put the brakes on this for the moment. Regardless of any contracts we've signed. Regardless of anything else. We're going to put the brakes on this until we do some further studying." That would open up the city to lawsuits from Verizon and from others. Which that's fine. If somebody is willing to take that. And then take it all the way up the Supreme Court basically. Put this issue up to Supreme Court. Like does the federal government have this right?

I think eventually that's probably what will make of it. I mean who knows how many years that could take. But at the moment, we're going to have to put pressure on them. Because as I've seen in Houston, and others I think have had similar situations. Maybe have some better luck in smaller towns. I think maybe a smaller town you might have better luck because you can be a little closer to the people. If you can get enough people, you know ten or fifteen people in a small town, can really make a difference. We've seen that in Danville, California. They just flooded all the city council meetings. They flooded all the hearings and everything until the mayor finally admitted, "Like look, we've lost local control. You know, we've lost local control but we're going to say no to this. We're going to face lawsuits. But we got to take a stand."

So, that is, I think important. There has to be leaders, politicians, and other community leaders, who are willing to say, "We might face a lawsuit. We might get called some names or whatever. But we are going to listen to what our community says. And we are going to take a stand." And I think that just brings it back to you, the individual. What steps are you willing to take to educate your community? Because I'm here in Houston. You know, the listeners are spread out maybe different parts of the world.

So, we can share information. We can watch YouTube videos. You can watch documentaries and all that. But at the end of the day, the communities that thrive and survive in the coming decades, are going to be the communities that have been able to put up some resistance to this. And that have actively got involved.

So, I do want to say that this is a situation that does need some real world action. I know a lot of us are so used to acting on social media, changing our profile pics, or just sharing links, and those things matter. Sharing content does matter. But I think this is a very pertinent example of where real world action is needed. Where you might have to go to a meeting and sit there and express your opinion. You might have to write some e-mails or make some phone calls. Might have to just get out there and let your local leaders know, that this is something that matters to you and that your community cares about. So, that they do feel the pressure. Because at the end of the day, the mayor out here he's got the 5G Wireless Champion Award.

So, I'm sort of fighting an uphill battle from the beginning. You know, he's already good friends with the company. He has shown no interest in even talking about it. Has literally ran away from me when I've asked questions. But you might be in a situation where it's not that, you know. The Verizon wants a big city like Houston to embrace this, so that other cities follow. And that's why I'm putting so much effort here in Houston because I think that if we show some amount of resistance or even getting them to slow down. Getting them to ask questions, you know,

hold it. Because they didn't even do an environmental impact study. There was no public comment period. There was nothing that gave the people of Houston a chance to speak up. And so, if I could help do something here. That might make it easier for other people in smaller towns to reference and say, "Look hey, Houston is putting the brakes on it. Maybe we should reconsider this."

But I think, yeah, that's where we're at. There are steps that can take place. Like you said, there is some hope on the local level. But the pressure is going to have to be applied in order for the leaders to really recognize that they need to do this.

Josh: Exactly. Well said. I would encourage all the viewers to also check out Ray Broomhall in this Summit. He's a lawyer in Australia that has had, actually I don't know if you've heard about this. But he's had results in getting hundreds of small cell sites either removed or prevented from going in with a novel new approach. Actually using, you know, the medical system and actually using the authority that a doctor has and having a few people in a community or neighborhood you know go that route.

In addition, I helped to cofound an organization called In Power Movement. That is doing a commercial liability action and that's in the works and currently expanding phase. And so, my question is what happens here? Where do you see all this going? What happens when awareness of the problem reaches a critical threshold? And we still have, you know, because of the money and the power involved here, we still have this 5G agenda, and internet of things thing still going forward? How do you see this actually playing out, Derrick?

In terms of, you know, because you are a pretty awake guy. You know, you are a meditator, right? You take care of yourself. And you try to bring that in. If you are just kind of project your consciousness into the future here, as things go forward. How do you see it happening? And again, like, how can we navigate to the most positive timeline possible here?

Derrick: Yeah. Well first, I want to say I really appreciate the efforts that you guys have done on the liability issue. I think that's great, great approach. I'm really interested to see how that unfolds. So, I look forward to that.

You know just like you said, kind of looking into the crystal ball of how this is going to all unfold. I do think we're going to see a patchwork of communities, and cities, and towns, who do push back against 5G. And maybe are able to either delay it or as you said get some testing implemented or change the locations and have some level of that. But it also goes back to what you were saying earlier about like, safe

versus safer. Like you know how much exposure is safer and how much is dangerous? Is putting it on the other side of the town just delaying the inevitable? That you know, they say it's going to be everywhere. I do think that there is such, I mean we have to understand. There are trillions of dollars in the making for 5G. These companies are betting everything. And there's also kind of getting into more of the geopolitics of the situation. You have the race to 5G which is creating kind of a battle between China and the U.S. Between the American telecom companies and the Chinese telecom companies.

So, they are both in a race, both nations are in a race to get their companies to embrace the technology as quick as possible. Not only because they want driverless cars and they want all the futuristic, whatever they're promising. But because there are military applications of this technology as well. And there are intelligence applications, that the governments want to use as well. So, there are trillions, and trillions, of dollars invested into making this rollout happen.

And I think that's the reality of what we're going up against now. I don't want to sort of say that, say that means it's a hopeless or anything like that. I don't think anything's hopeless. Not even when it's done. Even if, you know, a year from now, we are looking back on this conversation and I'm looking around my neighbor and there is 5G towers everywhere. The fight isn't over then.

There is still, I think, reasons to put up an active resistance and to voice your opposition to these things. Because the potential for lawsuits, like we were saying earlier, as far as holding people accountable. Well if this does happen. I mean right now for example, we're seeing juries hand out billions of dollars against Monsanto. Based on their product that people now know is associated with cancer.

Now that's still not a good thing because people have gotten cancer. People have died and the people who are getting billions of dollars, they're still likely going to die from the results of that. But it's being held accountable now. And so, in this field of research, we often talk about comparing cell phones to the way of the big tobacco industry controlled the science and controlled the government agencies. I think that's a perfect analogy because it's exactly what's taking place. And at the same time, though looking back, eventually the tobacco companies were exposed. There were lawsuits.

Of course, lots of people got lung cancer and lots of people got ill in the process. But I do think that there is a potential for whether or not the 5G rollout completely takes place. That if people start getting sick, well when people start getting sick, and they're finding different circumstances that they can directly connect. Like I'm living next to this tower and it's my whole family sick. Then lawsuits are going to start

to take place. So, this could be, you know, and this is not like the most maybe the most heartening thing to say. But this could be a decades long battle and struggle.

And I think the reality of the situation unfortunately is, that's the way the world works when it comes to government. That there are no quick fixes. You know, there's not like a, as far as I know there's no presidential candidate running on ending 5G or ending the 5G rollout. You know that's not even a topic that's being discussed. So, it's up to us as individuals to move forward going, you know, as we envision this future of healthy families and thriving communities. And if you don't see 5G as a part of that, continue to raise awareness, and continue to move forward in that direction. Also, I think it's important for us to start thinking about defense and protection, right?

So, if you can't stop it, then how can you protect your family? You know obviously the unfortunate thing about 5G is, it's going to affect us whether you like it or not. So, when you go out into the world and you're surrounded by these towers and small cells. It's going to be much more difficult to protect yourself. But inside your home, I sort of briefly mentioned unplugging the Wi-Fi at home. That, I think, is the simplest thing to ask somebody to do. Keeping the phone on airplane mode. Not bringing the phone into bed with you. Rewiring your house if possible. Which it's really not a whole lot of work to. Start plugging back into ethernet cables. And you get a faster signal, you know. It's funny that we've been moved towards a world of wireless. When it's not actually faster than being connected by cable. Of course, they're saying 5G is going to change that.

My point here, there are individual, and community, and family, decisions we can make to start actively protecting our communities. If you're a parent, reducing the amount of time that you're giving your kids access to these things. Because we're looking into the future, you don't want to see a future where your family is sick. Where your children are addicted to these devices. And that's a whole another angle on this issue. But where they are addicted to these devices that we know are going to cause detrimental health problems to them. So, being able to educate with your family and work together. I think that is going to manifest the vision that many of us want to see. Which is a world, where again, we can be thriving as individuals, thriving as healthy communities, and continuing to raise awareness on these topics. Because if we sit by and we do nothing. If we just sit here and complain on the Internet. Or just I guess except throw your hands up, "Like well, it's over and done. There's nothing I can do about it." Well then yeah, that's the world we're going to be in.

But if we actively take a role in the direction, we're taking the world and we're taking our lives. Start doing research. Not just on the problems, if

you've identified the problems. If you've come to the Summit and now, you're getting a good handle on the problem. I know that there's lots of solutions being presented in the Summit as well. Start moving in that direction. You know if you've got the problem focusing on solutions now. Continue to educate people. Continue to educate yourself.

But also present them with a solution. Like I said earlier, you know it's very difficult sometimes for people to take in a problem because they have what is known as cognitive dissonance. They don't want to accept something that not only conflicts with what they've been told. "Like no there's no way to the cell phone companies would do that. They give me great service and I have all these great gadgets. They would never lie to me about that." So, they're battling that cognitive dissonance.

But also, for them to accept the problems you're saying without a solution is very difficult for people to do. But if you present them like, "Look there's this going on. There's this corruption. There's this happening. There are these health concerns. These privacy concerns. And here are some steps I've taken to help myself and my family. Let me encourage you to do those things, right?" So, you're presenting a solution. That is going to help us as individuals and as communities move together in a way that is proactive as opposed to being reactive.

Josh: Yeah, really good. Have you ever got any pushback for reporting on 5G?

Derrick: You know, I've had some interesting experiences. So, after I started going to city council, I did reach out to. I'm pretty good at generating press releases and usually getting some coverage from some other local, you know, more mainstream media. And I had one of the Fox. There's the Fox station here in Houston. There's a journalist by the name of Isaiah Kerry. And he has a show called Uncensored. And he promotes himself as somewhat of an investigative guy. You know some of his stuff is kind of just fluffy local things. But I reached out to him, told him about what I was researching and what I was investigating. And he was like, "Yeah, let's bring you on the show. Let's talk all about it." He saw some of my city council videos and I went on the show did a little eight, ten minute segment. And I thought it went well everything was great. And I asked him when the archive was going to go up? And a couple of days passed. And he said, "Oh yeah, it should be coming up." And long story short, my archive was never posted. If you go to his website, every single episode of his show but the one that I'm on was posted.

There's even another show it came on after me promoting 5G in a positive way. So, I don't know if he just got a letter from his editor, from his boss, or from their corporate sponsors. That said, "Hey, we can't, you know don't put that video up." I've also noticed that on his Instagram. He's got quite a few pictures taken with the mayor. He seems to be

friends of the mayor. So, I don't know if that's part of it. Because like I said, I've asked the mayor about his connection with the Verizon. One way or the other though, that video never made it out there. And if it wasn't for a friend of mine who happened to DVR the video, I would have no copy of it. I literally had to go to a friend's house and just put my camera their TV and just record that. So, I could have my own copy of it. And he told me, "Oh, we are looking for it." All of a sudden, they lost it. They couldn't find it. And then I just gave up. Like this people are never going to put it up.

So, you know, I've had things like that. But also, just the general. You know when you start to try to be an independent journalist on a local level. When you go to local press conferences, you very quickly notice that there is an in group. There is an in-crowd. All the local media, they want to make sure they get invited back to the mayor's next events and all the local, they want to be a local celebrity basically. So, if you're in those rooms, with the police chief, and with the mayor, and you're asking tough questions. You might not be invited back. So, I've definitely been made to feel uncomfortable, made to feel like I'm not welcome. I have a press badge and so, I mean I think anybody should be able to question the officials though. I kind of think the badges are silly.

But either way, I'm officially allowed in there. And so, they can't do anything about it. Except for just, I guess, make me feel as uncomfortable as possible. So yeah, I've definitely been pushed back against as far as the mayor and his bodyguards. When I appeared at an event and I'm there to try to question the mayor, they are very aware of me. His bodyguards try to stand in between me and keep me from getting anywhere near him. Just silly things like that. Which to me is just so childish. It's just it's a display of the level of intelligence, I think that we're dealing with in some cases unfortunately.

Josh: But you are running for mayor of Houston, in part to raise awareness around 5G and call for a moratorium. Can you tell us more about that?

Derrick: Yeah, so I decided. You know, I'm not a, I think your audience has got to know me throughout this interview a little bit. And you can go out and find more about my work. I'm not a politician by any means. In fact, I spent a lot of my work encouraging people to just kind of stay away from politics. And to encourage community action in the way I have in this interview. So, it's a little bit of a switch for me to kind of go down this road. It's been something I've been thinking about for a couple of months. But one of the main drivers for me choosing to run for mayor of Houston was the 5G issue.

So, I've spent the last year now researching 5G and as I said I put out those city council videos. And they've collectively they've gotten over

a million views, both on Facebook and YouTube. And just generate a lot of traffic, a lot of people reaching out to me, such as yourself and others who have seen them. And that, I realize, "Well, I didn't intend to be the 5G guy in Houston, but I guess I'll take on that role." We have a Houstonian's concerned with 5G group here.

And I realize that this is an issue that people care about. So, I decided, look if I can run for mayor. I did some research. I looked into it. It doesn't take a lot of time or effort to do this. And Houston is a city with three and half million people. There is about four or five candidates running. Less than two hundred thousand people vote in the election. Because in my view because they're talking about potholes and they're talking about things that most people just like it's not anything that people really care about. There's no substance going on.

So, I have many other issues that I'm going to try to shine a light on. But 5G is definitely a central point of that. And the call is for initiating a moratorium on 5G. And to allow a public comment period, several public comment periods where we can get as many people out here. And maybe some other experts out here to the city of Houston to come testify in front of the city about what they know. On the health angles and the privacy angles. And then to order for an independent study to take place.

And I know that again, these kinds of actions. They threaten the bottom line of Verizon and the mayor and his buddies. But I think that look, if I can take the platform of being in the mayoral race. And people will listen to me just because I'm a candidate for mayor. And that gives me an opportunity to speak about these issues. Well, then I'm going to take you know. So, we just officially launched back in May. And now we have just a couple of months to go to the election in November.

So, it's been an interesting road. We've got a couple more months to really hammer down. I've already been accepted into some debates coming up. So, that's really cool to see. As soon as we launched people started reaching out. So, we're going to see how it goes. We're going to see how things flow. And come November, I hope at the very least, that 5G has become an issue in the city of Houston. You know if I can't get the mayor job. And again, it's not really a role that I think I'm fit for per say. I've got a lot of ideas. My goal is to use my leverage, my audience that I've already built, to shine a light on Houston.

So, even if you're not in Houston, you can help out with this. By just letting people know that, "Hey, there is a mayoral candidate in the fourth largest city in the country. That is talking about putting a moratorium on 5G and doing more studies and more research on this." And I think that alone, again, could make it easier for people in smaller cities. So, I'm leveraging all of my independent media contacts. And we are trying

to make this campaign go viral. And see if we can get some national, potential international coverage. And see what happens, you know. So, I'm excited to see what that will turn into.

Josh: Excellent. That's so good to hear that. And we are seeing, you know, in other parts of the world as well, like in Europe. I was interviewing Rafael Mayhem in Switzerland. And he's saying, "In Switzerland at this time, 5G has become such a hot button issue. That it's on par with climate change." You know, climate change is obviously controversial and there's evidence of false solutions being propagated there too. But he's saying that it was on the front page of the Geneva Times, I believe. That there are moratoriums passed but the telecoms are pushing anyways.

So, there's hundreds of thousands of views. Like on your videos, on Sasha Stone's videos, on others. So, this is really bubbling up. And it doesn't really take much. It doesn't really take many people, many committed people in a region, or a town, or city to come together and bring this awareness and raise this up and create change, right? So, thank you for doing that in Houston. And online, and with the Conscious Resistance network. And you're helping people connect locally as well. You're giving a platform to find people where they live, which is something that's very important to me and to our group as well. I think that connecting in person, something new happens when you connect in person, right?

Derrick: Absolutely, yeah. Definitely, you know, I encourage everybody to get out from behind the Internet. Whatever the issue is. Obviously, the internet, the social media tools have allowed so many of us to connect over the last decade. But we are also seeing an increase in censorship on those same platforms. So, I think it's important for us to make that real world connection. Like you said something special happens. You know there's some activists who I've been working with digitally for maybe a decade or so. But once we get face to face. And we finally connect in the real world. It makes it even so much easier to work together once you get back to the computers. Because now you have a real world connection. You've heard their voice. You know, you got to know them a little bit better. And it just makes the bond a little stronger and the struggle that you are facing.

Josh: Yeah. So, just as we close here Derrick. You touched on at the start of your interview, your personal journey. You were, you know, in jail ten years ago, right? And so, you turned your life around. You had an awakening. You made a decision and you followed through with it. And it seems like, you know, we're really being challenged as humanity. And really on an individual level, to really make that decision to choose life, right? To come out of the darkness, to choose to face what fears or resistances that are false beliefs that we've been hanging on to. So, if I

could ask you to just as we close here maybe. Tap into your deep soul wisdom and guide us through how we can navigate that process? And perhaps, dealing with the fears, dealing with the illusions, and really you know, having a shift in our lives where we can forward in a positive way?

Derrick: Yeah, absolutely. I appreciate that. I think that's a great way to close out the interview. And again, I thank you for just inviting me to be a part of this and I appreciate everybody who is tuned into this. It's such an important topic at this time. And it's important to be focused on solutions.

You know, this talking about tapping into that spiritual wisdom or that spiritual awareness. As I said, I was locked up just about fifteen years ago, actually. About 2005 was when I first got locked up. I was arrested the week before I turned twenty-one. And I don't know how many people have truly been in situations where we are truly deeply powerless. And what I mean by that, I mean I don't think we're ever actually powerless, right? But I mean in the physical sense, right? Where I am in a cage behind bars. There's nobody I can call, that's going to be able to save me. I can my mom and cry to her if I want. I can call my girlfriend. I can call my lawyer. I can call whoever. Nobody is getting me out. I'm looking at the calendar and realizing, "Wow, I'm not going home till next year at the earliest, right?"

And being in that space of just fear, you know, I'm in a place where it's, prison and jails are a dangerous place. There's a lot of fear. There's a lot of anxiety. There's a lot, of what I consider, low level primitive thinking. People are like well, "You're the same skin color as me. So, we're all going to hang out together. You can't talk to that person because they're this skin color." There's just a lot of tribal mentality, I think. And in that space, I had to accept that like, "Okay. I am powerless to get out here." The only thing I have control right now is my mindset. I'm sitting in this bed. I've got a journal with me, a little notepad.

And I just started writing. I started journaling just all of my thoughts. And trying to reflect on how I got from, you know, just being this depressed young kid. To getting the drugs. And being in prison. And I come from a family that has a history of prison. Like my birth father he spent my entire life in and out of prisons. He just passed away from a drug overdose in 2018. You know this is something that's been very prevalent in my life. And I've been around people who were on drugs, in and out of prison. So, it was a very big kick in the chest of like, here you are carrying on the family tradition. I was very angry at myself. I was so mad for doing that.

And I honestly think that journaling is one of the first things that started to save me because I was able to take all these thoughts out of my head and put them down on paper. Start looking at them. Kind of reflecting

back to them. And the interesting thing is over time my handwriting even started to become more precise and slower. Once I accepted like, "Okay, I can't get out here." You know, there's nothing I can do. My lawyer can't make any sort of arrangements, like I'm stuck. And then you have to let go of the outside world. You know when you're in there, people refer to this world as the free world. So, you have to let go of that. You know, you can be on the phone all day talking to your wife, your girlfriend, or your husband, or whatever. But it's just going to slow your time down.

So, you have to sort of let go. Which is a very scary thing to think like, "Alright, I can't worry about what my friends are up to. Or what my family is up to. Like I'm here." So, I need to make the most of the situation. And some people get sucked into a rabbit hole. And I definitely started to do this of connecting with other criminals, people who have no desire to change themselves. So, it has to be a conscious individual decision that I am going to change my life, for myself. Not because I'm trying to please my parents, or please my spouse, or please the society, or whatever.

But because this is the path that's going to be best for me. And I ended up getting just connected to Buddhism. I sort of had a couple of synchronicities and my grandmother started sending me books on Zen Buddhism. And that's one of the places that I really started my spiritual path is learning zazen, which is sitting meditation. And I started meditating while I was locked up. And again, in an environment with a lot of fear a lot of anger, I think it was probably the most perfect place for me to be and to do that. I'd go to bed at night. I'd meditate before bed and I could hear people whispering, you know, whatever they thought I was up to. Or, "What's up with that crazy guy? Why's he sitting there like that." You know just all this sort of stuff and just realizing like it's not about them. This is for me. This is for me because I don't want to continue down this path, you know. And it was a struggle of three or four years in and out of it. Like I did a year and got out. Went back. I didn't get it right the first time. But it came from just that individual choice, that personal choice that I wanted something different.

And I think this can be applied to any area of life. Whether we're talking about 5G or just embracing daily struggles that come along with being a human being. You have to make a commitment that you want something different. Doesn't mean that it's going to be easy. Doesn't mean that everything is going to be handed to you by any means at all. This last fifteen years of my life has not been handed to me. To get to the point where I'm at now, it's been a lot of difficult roads. And a lot of introspection. And there's still more of that to come. There's still more healing to do. There's still more trauma to uncover. There's still more forgiveness to do.

And I think all of that is a part of what I consider to be a holistic path. You know, I just want to throw this out for anybody who would like to check it out. I actually wrote a book called *The Holistic Self-Assessment*. Which goes through the entire process that I took myself through in prison. And it's just a real simple book, you can download it for free on my website. You can order if you want a physical copy.

But I wanted to be able to take the ideas and the process that I put myself through in prison. And what I've been using over the last fifteen years and just put it in a really easy to digest simple workbook. So, *The Holistic Self-Assessment*, each chapter asks you a simple question. Who am I? What are my principles? What are my habits? What are my goals? Are my relationships in line with those principles and those goals? And then different exercises, from art therapy, from meditation, from just a range of tools and exercises, journaling that can be helpful to help individuals achieve their goals.

Because I've found with working out of different activists, is that we are all struggling in different ways. Maybe you have never had a drug addiction, but you have your own struggles in different ways. That's the human connection that we have. There's a lot of good people, with good intentions, and lots of potential, who fail to accomplish the things they want. They talk about them a lot. Or they read all the spiritual books. And they have all that information. But they're not actualizing it. And so, I tried to put this in a very simple, take a lot of big psychological and spiritual concepts, and just whittle them down to the most basic and concise language that anybody could look for. And turn it into a workbook. So, that's called *The Holistic Self-Assessment*. And you guys can look that up. And I think that that can be a helpful tool for moving in that direction.

Josh: Excellent. Thank you for that Derrick. And what's your website?

Derrick: The website is TheConsciousResistance.com. And if anybody's interested in the campaign it's just my name, DerrickBroze.com.

Josh: Excellent. Derrick, thank you so much for joining us on the Summit today. It's been a pleasure chatting with you. And we look forward to staying connected with you. And just to team up in this conversation.

Derrick: Thank you so much for having me. I really appreciate it.