

5G CRISIS

AWARENESS & ACCOUNTABILITY



5G: The Agenda for Total Control

Guest: Patrick Wood

The contents of this presentation are for informational purposes only and are not intended to be a substitute for professional medical advice, diagnosis, or treatment. This presentation does 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.

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 type, 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 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 send 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 mine. 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 [inaudible]. 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 its 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 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.