



Dr. Pete Peterson

Part 3 - Kerry Cassidy:

Interview transcript

Home What's New	Mission Statement	Interviews and Reports	Round Table	In Tribute	The Big Picture	Shorts
Our Goals	High Praise	About Us	Get Involved	Questions	Contact	

Dr. Pete Peterson Part 3 - Kerry Cassidy **Interior US, June 29, 2009**

[Ed note: Normally the transcripts that had any parts in them that had been difficult for the transcribers to hear were put in "audibles" in square brackets in red for Bill Ryan to attend to, fix, then he'd post the transcript; however, due to unexpected interruptions in the normal working process in Project Camelot, this normal process was not able to proceed forward, so the audibles were left in the square brackets.]

Intro:

Dr. PETE PETERSON (PP):

... I wonder. I look at Earth, and I look at the things we've done to destroy this fragile little spaceship that we live on going through space. You know, we talk about burning, we talk badly about all the burning of the rainforests in Brazil, and yet most of the oxygen's produced by plankton. Our use of nickel-cadmium batteries, and lead batteries, and putting them out into the environment has killed a good part of the plankton. Cetaceans are beaching themselves, so that there's enough food left for the others.

Start of Interview:

KERRY CASSIDY (KC): So Pete, we are very, very happy to be able to connect with you, and you have been very generous with your time, with your energy. I hope I have a little more energy left, because I'm coming after Bill, and after David, and I just have a few wrap-up questions that I want to run by you, and we'll see how this goes.

So, one of the leading things you said was that you were involved with robots.

PP: That's correct.

KC: I'm just wondering if we could kind of drill down there a little bit and talk about what your background was, and how involved you really were with robots.

PP: Well, having been involved with trying to build flying saucers, you usually found that with flying saucers, if you look at most of the movies, there always seems to be a robot involved with it, so I was very interested in robots.

In the early days, when I built a satellite tracking station before there were satellites, then tracked the Russian *Sputnik* when it was launched and called the government and told them the launch trajectory and the orbital and the frequency it was transmitting on – during the McCarthy era – they thought maybe I was a Communist *pinko*. So they came and found out that I actually had a satellite tracking station before there were satellites. I was about 17 years old at the time, so that got a lot of notoriety here in Idaho.

At that point in time in Idaho on the eastern side of the state, there was a place that was called the Atomic Energy Commission, a nuclear reactor test site. It's where the first nuclear power generation was done. Anyway, they anticipated having some nuclear problems there and decided they need some robotic-type thing that could waltz into a nuclear meltdown and pull

the reactor apart, so that they wouldn't have a *China Syndrome* taking place.

So, eventually I, and a few of my friends, got the contract to do robots that could do that. I, naturally, had great faith in myself and said: *Oh sure*. [laughs]

I found out a lot of things; that was a tremendous education. I found out that materials that were electrical conductors, inside of a heavy nuclear flux became insulators, and insulators became conductors, and...

DAVID WILCOCK (DW): Really?

PP: ...very stiff metals became like toast and very brittle and broke apart, or like ashes. Materials like ashes became very hard, and grease became like welds...

So, eventually we built a couple of different types of... I won't call them *robots*, because they were truly *manipulators*. They were devices that at one end looked exactly like we think of a robot looking. It had a pair of arms that would move and grip. Actually, we designed them so if you could grip a beaker of liquid, you could move it very rapidly and it would tilt it accordingly and not spill it. You could reach around behind you or in front of you, or out to the side.

Then on the bottom of it, we had some that had three rolling wheels, and some had little tank treads. So, this was in the 1955-6-7-8 region of time.

KC: At that point did they have AI?

PP: No, the term hadn't even been invented yet. So anyway, on the other end of this device that looked at one end like a robot, was a thing that a person got into. They had a couple of small one-inch television tubes with lenses on, and they'd put those on and they could see stereoscopically. Then they had a couple of little hands that they could move their arms and hands like it, and the robot would move accordingly – the manipulator would move accordingly.

KC: And there could be a distance, right? They could be back at...

PP: There could be any distance up to 20 or 30 miles, but it required wires at the time. Later we made some that worked on radio waves.

But for working with atomic materials, radio waves could be interfered with, a number of things. They couldn't withstand that type of lack of physical security, so all of them that we did for them had wires.

KC: So let's fast-forward to a lot more recently, or at least, may be not even recently. I don't know when it is you got really involved in AI and you started to...

PP: Well, first I got involved in computers. In 1975, '76 we built a computer that was used in Tokyo at the airport to announce the plane flights in a number of different languages. It was the first use I know of a microprocessor chip in a real product.

Then later we built a computer training device to teach people how to use microprocessors and how to use software to accomplish various tasks. We built that at a little computer company whose name was Cyberdyne, and one of the people who worked for us later worked on *Terminator* whatever-it-was.

KC: Well that was my next question. [Pete laughs] So, I'm not sure how you want to answer this, but the movie, *Terminator*, is not so far off base. Am I right?

PP: No, it's not so far off base at all. Once we got those working – and it's interesting to note that the computer chip we used in the 1970s, there are more of those produced monthly than all the Intel chips produced in a year, even today. Because it's a chip that was actually designed like a computer, whereas the Intel chips are not designed like computers.

Intel is paying a lot of royalties to various people who worked in and on various chips that evolved over the *proper* evolution of computer chips – what I consider to be proper. We now have a chip that's very, very tiny, and has a number of computers built into it that automatically look at the task and adapt themselves. So you may have 10, 20, 30 computer chips working on 30 processes all at once.

KC: In the body of one robot?

DW: In a *chip*.

PP: Well, in the body of one little, tiny tenth-of-an-inch-square chip.

KC: That's operating the robot?

PP: That's operating a robot. But once we figured out the right language to use, and the right computer design to use, I then got involved with a number of people working on building an artificial intelligence chip that... we'll call... basically the call on it was a *fuzzy logic* chip.

It turns out the only logic that's not fuzzy is *fuzzy logic*. It's a chip that can look at a number of different inputs, and from those make a decision that's correct.

So, with the robot, you can be looking at bumps on the floor; you can be looking at a doorway as compared to a wall. You can look at somebody standing between you and the door; you can look at the width of the door and the height of the door and decide whether it can go through it or not. It can go over there and manipulate around the person, go through it, not trip over the cat on the floor, etcetera, etcetera, all using *fuzzy logic*.

Then, because a chip was doing digital computing – a fuzzy logic chip either does digitally (if it's high-speed enough) [or] it does analogue computing – it looks at things as we see them in the real world. The floor can be looked at digitally, like it had millions and millions of little tiny bumps, or larger bumps; or it can be looked at analogue-wise, because it can sense the roll of the floor and move the wheels and so-forth so it doesn't tip over.

KC: But, weren't the Japanese really advanced in terms of robotics?

PP: Well, I can tell you that when I went to the Idaho National Engineering Labs, which is what the Atomic Energy Commission became, which was one of the nation's largest research centers. It's in eastern Idaho. I think there are 2,200 Ph.D.s that work there. The whole town is built around... in fact several towns are built around that center, and *much* goes on there.

When we went there visiting with super-capacitors that I brought out of the Ukraine, I got talking to some people who found out I was the one who built the manipulators, and they said they had a large contingency of Japanese robotics experts. This was in about 1987, '88, somewhere in there. They had a large Japanese conference over trying to sell them manipulators and robots, and when they saw my robots they said: *My God, we don't have anything like this. Where in the world did these come from?*

We said: *Hell, we've had it for 50 years.* [laughs] So...turns out it was only about 43 years at that time, but...

KC: So basically, you were working in Black Projects, weren't you?

PP: Well, one could say that.

KC: I just have a curious question and we haven't gone over this ahead of time, so I don't know if you can even talk to this, but it's not diabolical or anything. But, I'm curious because I used to love robots, and sort of went on the Net and sort of studied, and was interested in how far they've progressed with all of that. One of the biggest problems they used to have was when they wanted them to walk upright like humans that they would fall over. How did you solve that?

PP: Well, we did it much the same way that Dean Kamen built his two-wheeled scooter. Are you familiar with the...

KC: Oh, yeah, the... what do they call that?

DW: Segway.

PP: Segway. The Segway. It's very simple to do.

KC: Which is? If you can say...

PP: Well, you simply have a sensor that senses whether you're upright or not. And if you're not upright, then you use fuzzy logic to put it back right.

BILL RYAN (BR): Presumably, that's the kind of stuff they put in the F-117. It would have fallen out of the sky if it hadn't had that kind of...

PP: Yes, it would.

BR: Right.

PP: For example, the programming language that we use is called FORTH, [spells] F-O-R-T-H. It should have been called F-O-U-R-T-H, because it was the fourth major programming language, but in those days, computers wouldn't take five characters, rather, six characters, so they had F-O-R-T-H.

KC: Okay, so this kind of segues into mind control, because I also know that you worked with SRI [Ed. note: Stanford Research Institute], and you worked with Hal Puthoff, right? And I understand you probably knew Ingo Swann and a lot of the people involved in remote viewing.

So, what I was wondering... I think you were involved in MK Ultra and you can probably talk about that since it's been declassified, right?

PP: Well, you can think about that all you want to think about it, and who knows whether it's true. I don't know whether that's true.

KC: All right.

PP: I know that I worked in a lot of very interesting areas.

KC: But you know that MK Ultra is declassified.

PP: I don't know anything about MK Ultra.

KC: Okay.

PP: I mean, I've heard about it, and heard about it, and heard about it. I don't know anything about it. I know some things that came out of it, and I know that I researched some of those things, and I built things that I thought were better and turned them over to the government. But other than that, I really don't know. I actually don't know that much about it.

KC: Okay. Is it true that you're still on call for the government?

PP: Well, I'm doing things all the time that I get calls on, for a number of different governments, actually. I'm actually a member of the Astronautics Association for Mankind, which is the Russian equivalent to NASA. I'm on the board of directors.

KC: So, why aren't you on the board of directors for NASA if you're on the Russian board?

PP: Well, mainly because I have no desire to be with a bunch of clowns.

KC: Okay...

PP: If I wanted to be with clowns, I'd join a circus.

KC: So, you're really aware of the secret space program, in essence, and you know that NASA is something of a front for... almost a distraction?

PP: I haven't been associated with them for years, so I have no idea what they're doing.

KC: Okay, but you said NASA's a bunch of clowns. Why are you saying that?

PP: Well, because all I have to do is look at the products they have.

KC: Why are they still...? I mean, I know they're going to retire the Space Shuttle any day, but it's basically a tin can going up in space. Why are they even dealing with that kind of technology at this point? Do you know?

PP: Because they have it and it works. They've had about, maybe... It depends on how you look at reality. They have what I consider to be about 10% of the budget that they really *ought* to have.

If you look at the things that came out of the space program through NASA, probably 50 to 60 percent of the technology we use today throughout all industries came out of NASA: the metallurgy technology and alloys; the temperature-resistant plastics and metals; large-scale integrated circuits, you know, basically even the whole transistor technology.

I worked in things like that. My cousin and I did quite a number of spy satellites. We did the sampling arm that went on the Viking Lander to Mars, which, by the way, was run by a FORTH-programmed computer.

So, I worked in and around that area. I worked with North American Rockwell.

KC: JPL?

PP: JPL. A number of different places, and got to see the things that came out of there. I got to see brand new things that were 20 years ahead of anybody on Earth actually applied, and things that were made from them, and they were sent into space, and they recorded things from space. The camera that you're shooting me on, the image sensor in there was basically made for use in outer space. That's where they came from.

So, if you look at return on investment, there isn't a corporation ever in the history of mankind that returned so much on the investment, even 10%, of the return on investment that came out of NASA. It literally transformed our lives into a whole new century.

Yet they take that, which is the only success story that I think man really has, and totally mal-funded it. Now, part of the reason was that they wouldn't pay the appropriate amount of money to get the brainpower that they needed. People early on worked for NASA, not because they got paid good money, but because they got to accomplish their dream. When finally Congress snuffed their dream, they quit working for NASA, so now you had clowns working for NASA. It should have been a circus.

Not that there weren't great people there, and not that there aren't great people there, but they're totally frustrated, I'm sure.

KC: Right. But there's also a lot of Black Projects going on under the table.

PP: I don't know that they're going on at NASA.

KC: Really?

PP: They may be. I don't know.

KC: What about your familiarity with things like superluminal travel?

PP: My familiarity... hmm... Well, no, I don't know anything about superluminal travel.

KC: Well we have testimony from Henry Deacon and from Jake Simpson, a couple of what we call whistleblowers, which, in essence, is what you are at this point in your career, in a way.

PP: Mmm... well, in a way.

KC: Okay, you're treading a fine line.

PP: Treading a fine line. [laughs]

KC: And they are testifying that we have superluminal travel, that we have craft that go outside the Solar System. Can you say anything about that?

PP: I know nothing about it.

KC: Okay. You told us, or at least you talked to me at one point about being a spymaster. Is that really true?

PP: I don't know a thing about that.

KC: Okay. Okay, well, we're kind of striking out here. Where do you think that we can go with all of this?

PP: Well, I told you the things that I'm [not] willing to talk about. [laughs] Now you're trying to get me to talk about them, and uh...

KC: All right. What do you know about a UFO detector?

PP: I was asked to build a UFO detector when I was about 14, and eventually built one.

KC: Okay. And it's operational?

PP: I have no idea when it's operational. The best I know, they smashed it immediately.

KC: Who's "they"?

PP: The government. Actually, the President of the United States at that time.

KC: Really? Okay.

PP: Now, here's a problem with it. I'd love to do something with it. It's a very simple, inexpensive technology.

KC: It's based on Wilhelm Reich's technology?

PP: No, it has nothing to do with Wilhelm Reich. It's based on science. The problem with it is that it works in such a manner that it will detect virtually every single type of thing in the universe. What that means is that it would be the best anti-collision device that ever went on board an airplane, because it could see every other airplane in the sky. That's the good news.

KC: Okay.

PP: The bad news is it can see any stealth plane just as easily as it can see a damned dirigible.

KC: So that's why they destroyed it?

PP: I have no idea why they destroyed it.

KC: Well, can we surmise that that's why they destroyed it?

PP: I have no idea. I don't know that it was destroyed. I'm just telling you that's my feeling, because I've never...

KC: Well, you told me they took it.

PP: I've never seen one.

KC: Well I thought you...

PP: Yeah, they took it. So, what did they do with it? I don't know if they put it in their pocket or put it in the remnants of the Smithsonian. I don't know what happened to it. But I've never seen one out there in operation. I could tell if there were one in operation.

KC: But how could you tell?

PP: Because of how it works.

KC: Well, I mean...

PP: I'm not about to tell the secrets of it.

KC: I understand that, but you...

PP: I can't talk about it without telling the secret of it.

KC: You would know if somebody was operating your device?

PP: I'd know if anybody was operating one of them.

KC: How would you know that unless you're operating...

PP: I would know that because of how it works.

KC: Okay, would you remote view them, or would you be...

PP: No, not at all.

KC: You have a tracking device on your invention?

PP: It emits something that is absolutely unique to the device.

KC: Oh wow. Okay.

BR: There's another kind of detector which was destroyed upon Presidential order, I understand.

PP: Yes, there was.

BR: Are you able to talk about that? Because that's a fantastic story.

PP: Probably not. It's probably not healthy for you guys to talk about it.

KC: Okay, well I understand that you – and I don't know if you can talk about this – but my understanding is that with robots, with any kind of device that you're operating using AI or any other kind of, as you say, manipulator or whatever, that there sort of has to be a fail-safe or a command override such that... You call it a *gatekeeper*, I believe.

PP: No, a gatekeeper's a product that allows that to take place.

KC: Or not to take place.

PP: Or not to take place. And yes, there's a... Obviously it's like with atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs, nuclear devices, and Cruise missiles and whatever, one thing you don't want is your enemy to get hold of it and use it against you. So there must-be some methodology to handle that.

KC: Are you able to say that you had a hand in creating some gatekeepers?

PP: Oh, I created gatekeepers, and whether they use it there or not, I don't have any idea. I just know they buy a lot of gatekeepers, or bought a lot of gatekeepers. I know that right now we're in the process of negotiating a very large order for gatekeepers – what I call gatekeepers. What they're going to use them for, I really can't mention.

KC: Would you call yourself sort of an inventor? How would you...?

PP: I have always billed myself as an Instrument Maker.

KC: Okay.

PP: I build instruments that see things, or hear things, or measure things that, heretofore, nobody else builds. Anybody else builds something, I don't ever replicate it. I don't reinvent anybody's wheels, I invent my own wheels.

KC: Okay. I want to kind of go into a different area that we haven't really addressed at the moment, and I want to know if... because obviously, I realize there's a lot you're not talking about, and there's some stuff that we've got off the record, and all of this kind of thing. But, do you feel that you're protected?

PP: Yes.

KC: Do you feel you're protected on an Earthly level or on other levels as well?

PP: Definitely on an Earthly level. I have no idea about other levels. However, when you say *feel*, as compared to *know*, then I will tell you that I've had a charmed life.

KC: Okay.

PP: I can remember one time in Vietnam, standing in a firefight... And remember that basically only machine guns fire tracer bullets. Every fifth round, in our machine guns at least, is a tracer so the machine gunner can aim his weapon because they're jiggling and bouncing so much you can't really use a sight well, so you want to see where the bullets are going and place them where you want them. So every fifth bullet goes out and you see a little red glow where the bullet's going.

I was in firefights where the tracers were so thick it was like you were in the middle of a 30-foot campfire that was down to the ashes, with a weed-eater whipping up sparks. I remember about the third time, I looked up and said: *You and me, Big Al, all the way*, [laughs] because I knew I was being kept alive. There was no reason for me to be alive. Fifty percent of the Marine officers I went to Vietnam with were killed while they were there. They were there for 13 months; I was there for 23 or 24 months. But, anyway...

KC: And to this day, you feel that you're protected?

PP: Well, I've been in other places that were even scarier than that. And I've done crazy things all my life, to invent things fast rather than slow, and take it the hard way instead of the easy way, and so forth, and somehow lived through all of it.

You know, I get the biggest kick today out of... some kids spilled a little tiny bottle of mercury in a town nearby, and they came and dug an Olympic swimming pool in their front yard and

hauled all the dirt off, and charged them thousands and thousands of dollars to get rid of the mercury. Hell, I used to spill two or three ounces of mercury a day in my lab, which was down in a basement, and the only thing it did, probably, is drop my IQ by 30 or 40 points, but...

KC: But that didn't really matter, considering how high it is.

PP: I used to go around with a piece of lead solder hanging out of my mouth. I must have spent 20 years with a piece of solder sticking out of the corner of my mouth, getting that good lead. All that did was drop my IQ another 10 or 20 points.

KC: [laughs]

PP: So, yeah, I've been charmed.

KC: Okay. Have you been threatened?

PP: Oh, yeah. I've been threatened a number of times, by just about every kind of person that would want to threaten me.

BR: You can make a joke about *Bastard School* as well. That's a good one.

KC: Well, that was what I was trying to get to, but...

BR: You can talk about *Bastard School*.

DW: A.K.A. Terrorism School.

KC: Can we talk about *Bastard School* at all?

PP: Well, yeah.

KC: Okay. And what was your experience with that?

PP: Well, I call it *Bastard School*. When I was an officer in the military, very obvious, I was trained in military things. I was taught to be the biggest S.O.B. on the block. I got so good at it, they finally turned around and had me do some other things, because it scared them to death. Because I was a mean, green, killing machine.

So, instead of teaching terroristic things, they had me teach anti-terroristic things. Then they – in both cases – one, they were afraid that the enemy would learn what I was doing that was nasty; then they thought the enemy might learn what I was doing to disrupt being nasty. So then they moved me on to other things.

KC: You've dealt with mind control in some ways, in some fashions. You know something about the mind, clearly, and about this information field. I'm wondering if there's something within the information field and/or the mind-body interaction that can be set up to protect oneself against, let's say, mind control devices such as the digital television that is now projecting – you know, able to communicate with people in their houses and so on, so forth.

PP: Well, that's an assumption that we're making.

KC: Right. I'm making that assumption, not you. So I'm just asking is there something, some technique?

PP: There are things that were designed specifically. As an example, in the probably, '80s, the Russians had a thing that was... because it sounded like a woodpecker on the shortwave radio, was called the Woodpecker.

They had three large locations that were transmitting probably several million watts per location, and they were phased in a particular area, so they could move where the peak of that electromagnetic wave would fall. It turns out that one of the places here they had it fall was in a town called Eugene, Oregon.

People there were getting sunburns while they slept at night, and they were getting headaches, and they were having birth defects and so forth. The Woodpecker had a very strong signal there and a highly interfering signal. It was also at a psycho-active frequency, so that it would disrupt the appropriate thinking capabilities of the brain.

KC: This is all documented, by the way, on the Net.

PP: Oh yeah. It's all documented on the Net. Also, a good friend of mine was the man who

discovered they were bombarding the Moscow Embassy with microwaves that had much the same frequency content.

So, there was a fellow that designed a little device that you could wear under the collar, which was provided to all of our personnel that we needed to make sure had clear thinking, that they could carry with them and it would send a signal, a close-by signal... remembering that electromagnetic waves decrease with the cube of the distance. After a very short distance, the signal's very, very weak.

So you put a weak signal near the person, and drive their mind into a range of brainwaves that would be benign or even, hopefully, beneficial. They found a very simple way to find out what was beneficial, and then a very simple way to tune the device so that it would put those waves out. They were carried by all types of diplomats and military personnel for years and years and years.

KC: So, we can assume that the president and various people are using these devices to this day?

PP: I would certainly think they would be. I know that I carry one around.

KC: Okay, and you're saying this person who invented it... you're saying you're not the person who invented it?

PP: I didn't say anything about it.

KC: Okay. But there's also a technique involved, such that one can do it without the device if one learns?

PP: Yeah, you can learn to hold your mind pretty much in whatever mode you want.

KC: It has to do with the informational field, is that right?

PP: No, it doesn't. It has to do with the electromagnetic field.

KC: Oh, really?

PP: Yep.

KC: So you use your mind to affect the electromagnetic field?

PP: No. You just use your mind to generate its own electromagnetic field at a benign frequency, or even a helpful frequency.

KC: To counter it?

PP: To counteract it. I'll give you an example. You get three or four people that are very close, or two people that are even closer, and what you'll get is you'll get heartbeat synchronization – which just occurs – and then you'll get brainwave synchronization. Then, unfortunately, or fortunately, depending on the situation, you get hormone production, and hormones are very, very powerful messengers, and then you get into trouble, [laughs] or not.

KC: It's a form of entrainment, right?

PP: It's a form of entrainment, and you get an entrainment. So, a very weak signal can give you great entrainment.

Nicola Tesla made a device that used compressed air, and it was a little weight. He could stick that on the ground outside of a skyscraper in New York and this thing would sense ground-wave oscillations and tune itself to them.

So, it would start out very rapidly and slow down, and then it would find where it was affecting the environment. It would resonate with it.

It's like if you have a wineglass here and you play your violin up scale, eventually you'll find where if you stop real quick, you'll hear the wineglass vibrating. Then if you play that note exactly, pretty soon the wineglass will break, because ... just a little bit... It's like pushing a swing. If you push the swing in phase, the swing will go way high. If you push it out of phase, it'll stop, it won't go very high, it'll go high, and then low -- a number of things. You want to get it resonant or in phase.

So, that's what Tesla's device would do. It would move a weight up and down, up and down, up

and down using pneumatic pressure and pneumatic valving, and he'd make a skyscraper just wag like a dog's tail... in New York.

KC: So, isn't this like sort of the kernel behind mind control? Getting a very slow resonance set up, and then affecting it one way or another? No?

PP: No, no... no. Doesn't have much to do with mind control. But part of what you want to do, perhaps, with mind control, is get your mind in a certain frequency. But that's old-style mind control. What you want to do now... Basically, if you want to look at neuro-linguistic programming, using the principles of neuro-linguistic programming is much more powerful than getting a brainwave entrainment.

Brainwave entrainment will drop the IQ, it'll drop the attention span, it'll change the memory, so there are a number of things that can be done there. But, what we use now is a thing that changes the way the brain is attached to itself, and the way the brain hooks together, and we just change the neural pathways.

You can cause a person to forget; you can cause a person to do things that they have no intention of doing. You can make a stimulus that would cause one thing, like a stimulus that would cause me to reach out and grab some water and take a drink because I was thirsty; you can very quickly and easily change that stimulus to when I get thirsty, I'll reach out and grab a glass of water and pour it down my neck, pour it down the front of my suit.

KC: So, what about the idea that you were telling us about the piece of the heart? You could cut off a piece of the heart and give it to somebody who would recognize it – a doctor – who would recognize it as a part of the brain, or have resonance on the...

PP: It would appear to be brain tissue.

KC: And this is a medical fact, right?

PP: It's a medical fact. There's a very good book that anyone who has a child that doesn't read this book, should be jailed. [Kerry laughs] I'm serious. It's called *The Magical Child* by Joseph Chilton Pearce, [spells] P-E-A-R-C-E, and he has follow-up books on it. For example, *The Magical Child Matures* tells you why that no center-city, fatherless child is ever going to amount to anything, ever. They can't because their brain doesn't form properly.

KC: Really?

PP: Yep.

KC: A fatherless child?

PP: Well, or motherless.

KC: An orphan.

PP: A child that's raised outside of a normal family environment, let's put it that way. That's much more accurate. It'll tell you why that can't happen, why they can't really become useful to society.

KC: Well, is this the thing you were telling us about the heart? Being close to the heart?

PP: It's part of it, that's part of it; that's just part of it. There are a number of different factors. But one of the things that Pearce writes about in *The Magical Child* is, for example, that during the first 16 days or so after the amniotic fluid breaks, the child is exposed to the electromagnetic field from the mother's heart beating, and that field is modulated by what's in the brain cells in the heart, which are the emotions, and those emotions are transferred to the child.

So, they thought: *Well that may be true*. They went to Europe, where a lot of women have their children raised by wet nurses who nurse them on their breast, and they find out that the child takes on the emotional content of the wet nurse. Or children who are raised without a father never get the emotional – the male emotions – from the father, as compared to the female emotions.

KC: But you're saying it happens in the first 16 days, after that...

PP: The greater part of it happens in the first 16 to 18 days.

KC: Incredible.

PP: It turns out, for example, the Russians did brilliant and massive research on this. They found out that if the child is born underwater in a fluid – remember, the child's already in a fluid, it isn't going to hurt him to be underwater for a while. The child's born under water in the fluid about body temperature and moved up, with contact with the mother, to the breast.

Where, if you look at how you would naturally hold your arms and nurture a child, the heart of the mother and the heart of the child are going to be right next to each other. The child starts picking things up. If the child is kept in that position for the first 12 to 14 hours, the child usually develops speech by six months of age and is able to stand on their own at six months of age.

KC: Can you talk about that Russian doctor?

PP: I... unfortunately... I could if I remembered his name. I can't remember his name. He was brought to the United States... I can tell you that his techniques were used by Madonna in having her children.

BR: We were talking about generating an IQ as high as 275 in the children.

PP: Right. I can tell you that her children are some of the most brilliant children on the face of the Earth because of that. I know that she worked using those techniques for a year to a year and a half before they were conceived, just to become ready. That could well be privileged information, but it leaked out to me, and I know it to be true.

DW: So you're saying that the heart has an information field component, which somehow entrains the formation of the nervous system?

PP: No, I'm not saying anything about the information field. I'm saying the heart has an electromagnetic component that is there because the heart beats and it takes a large electrical current to beat the heart.

DW: Okay.

PP: The body is bioelectric. Anything near a magnetic field or an electric field that's conductive, then, has components that come from the things around it that are electric or magnetic or conductive.

KC: Okay.

PP: So, you can see that stuff in the heart field. The *information* – not the information field – the *information* transfers to the – just like programming a ROM chip – transfers to the heart of the child.

As an example, one of the final proofs of this is: There was a man who absolutely hated the odor, the sight and the taste of mustard, and got a heart transplant, and all of a sudden, couldn't get enough mustard. Just by happenstance, the wife of the donor somehow got word to him that her husband loved mustard. So he had the heart; that came along with it.

A number of people were, in essence, SOBs, or were very tense individuals and they got a heart from a man who was a very calm man, and all of a sudden, their wife and their children didn't even know who they were. They were a completely different person.

That information was encoded in there, and when the nerves were sewn together and some of them grew back, that information got out of the heart. It may well be that the magnetic field of the heart transmitted, and the brain picked it up.

I don't know that. But, I know that we instrumented peoples' hearts and would let them see things that would excite them. The heart rate picks up, adrenals produced; maybe what they see causes anger or fear. And if you anesthetize that part of the heart, then they don't have those fears and those angers, and so forth.

So, that emotional information and some things like preferences in flavor, or color are transferred and transmitted in there. So, it's very important to get the child up into a nurturing position. Children who were nurtured by both mother and father have both male and female components. Children nurtured by one or the other have only the one component of their emotional make-up.

BR: And it's the first 16 days that does it, is that right?

PP: Well, read the book. The greater part of it occurs in the first 16 to 18 days. And yes, maybe

that's 30%. Maybe another 10% occurs in the next 50 days; maybe another 10% in the next 180 days.

KC: Okay, but very early on as opposed to later...

PP: Very early on. You want to get that in there very early on.

KC: Okay. I want to go in another direction.

DW: Wait a minute – is there any other tissue in the body, besides the heart, that acts like neurological tissue?

PP: Oh, absolutely. Now, if you want, you can call the pineal part of the brain. Even though it doesn't do brain function, it's part of the brain. The pineal and pituitary are mostly a substance called melanin. A type of melanin makes the skin pigment, but they're a slightly different kind of melanin.

I, in my research, have found that the melanin in the pineal – which, in Eastern medicine is the third eye, the seat of the third eye – is very, very, very good at picking up informational signals and adding a time content to them, thus subtracting a non-time content, so it's always been attributed to clairvoyance, clairaudience and so forth. Those are signals that are taken out of a signal that appears to be everywhere, every-when. It coheres that for the person and they have certain abilities that they wouldn't have.

The Tibetans drill a hole in the front of the forehead with a little rock drill, and then they poke a bamboo skewer in and manipulate the pineal to "open" the third eye. What it does is it gives it a hole through the *Faraday Cage*, speaking in science terms, and it makes a sensitivity by making a piece of scar tissue that opens up, or opens the third eye, or opens clairvoyance or clairaudience, or remote viewing, or remote influencing, or a number of different things.

KC: Isn't it true that fluoride deadens or hardens the pineal gland?

PP: Absolutely, but what it mostly hardens...

KC: And since we have fluoride in our water, basically you could look at that as an Illuminati plot to deaden the intelligence and the psychic ability of the population.

PP: What I try to do, as a scientist, is stay to scientific things. I don't presume about what the Illuminati want to do.

KC: Okay.

PP: But, I can tell you that the main thing that halides – which are chlorine, fluorine, bromine – mainly what they do in the body is congeal cholesterol into arterial plaque. I mean, that's well known.

KC: So, it slows down the blood flow in the arteries.

PP: Yeah, it closes down the arteries. So there are many ways to sterilize water other than chlorine and fluorine. There are many ways, for example, they say: *Well, we use fluorine for tooth decay.*

You have a whole fleet of boats up and down the West Coast of the United States and the East Coast of the United States that can't fish anymore, because we've killed all the fish, except there are bottom-feeders called... I won't tell you the name of the fish, but they're bottom feeders. That's a fish that consists of... 60% of the weight of the fish is liver, and about 60% of the liver is that particular fish liver oil, which contains a compound called "Activator X" by Price of the [Price-Pottenger Foundation](http://Price-Pottenger-Foundation.org) of years-ago fame.

He found out right after World War II that one drop of that... Well, you can take that fish oil, which is highly-fishy-tasting. Get it cold; the waxes and false isomers will solidify. You can filter those out and the oil left over has very little or no taste to it. That oil, you can put in the sunlight and it won't turn rancid for hundreds of years. It should have been used in place of sperm whale oil for lubricating watches, but they didn't use it for that.

KC: Is this cod liver oil?

PP: No, it's not cod liver oil. It's a different oil, but those boats could go out and bring back boatloads of this fish. It grows from Antarctica to [the] Arctic and everywhere in between.

KC: What does that have to do with fluoride in the water?

PP: What it has to do with is that that oil, one drop put in a slice of bread – eaten daily – and you [will] have no caries whatsoever; there's no tooth decay. It eliminates tooth decay. And they did this on thousands and hundreds of thousands of children in Europe after World War Two.

KC: And likewise you can guard against hardening of the arteries.

PP: Well, then you don't get the hardening of the arteries from the fluoride or the chloride. Now, what happened was... and I'll take the hit for this, let's put it that way. It's my conjecture that the only reason we use chloride in the water was because the politicians have already spent all of the Social Security money, so you've got to have something there so that people die at retirement age.

KC: [laughs]

PP: Then because of health care getting better, we had to have something else that made it happen even faster, so we put fluoride in the water.

KC: Wow. That's something.

PP: They could have gotten rid of tooth decay with an absolutely benign substance that we had a whole industry here that could go out and bring us back all we could ever use for the whole world, very inexpensively and totally non-negatively in the body. But we didn't do that.

Now, the reason that that fish oil doesn't turn rancid is, obviously, because it's an antioxidant. It's the best antioxidant known to man as far as I know. Price called it Activator X. It has a definite chemical formula. It could definitely be put out there. But it'd eliminate most of heart surgery; it would eliminate tooth decay, so it's not put out there because that isn't efficient in our capitalistic system.

KC: Well, you're talking worldwide though, as well, right?

PP: Yeah, it would be worldwide. Like I say, we did it in Europe after World War II, for years, but we took that Activator X... By the way, there's a small amount of it in wheat germ oil, so that was taken from wheat germ oil. Now we found – I found – the ratfish had this stuff in, you know, massive amounts.

BR: When you said Price, did you mean Dr. Weston Price?

PP: Weston Price, yeah. So it's my conjecture they're only... I mean the only reason I could see that we would be using that is to kill people off. Why else would you do that?

DW: You're saying, about the pineal gland. Because I have a whole long section in my video that everybody's seen, most of this audience has seen it, all about the pineal gland. So, you're saying that this oil, if taken, would help to decalcify the pineal gland, or somehow increase its sensitivity?

PP: If the pineal gland is calcified by halides, yes it would.

DW: Okay.

KC: But you're not naming the fish.

PP: I wasn't really naming the fish.

KC: Other than the ratfish that you just talked about?

PP: No. And that's not the...

KC: ...not the main source.

PP: No, that's what it's called in certain areas of the world.

KC: Hmm. Okay. But I was curious. You said something about, you know, there's camps being built around the United States. Do you know the purpose behind them?

PP: Yes. They're camps to detain people.

KC: Is this something that goes on the tail-end... because I'm looking for the agenda that goes behind the crash of the dollar, that basically you're saying is coming at some point in the near

future, quite possibly. Right? That's what your sources are telling you?

PP: I think that's a great possibility. I'm planning for it.

KC: Okay. And then, on top of it, there are camps being built, and you can verify that?

PP: Well, they're giving tours of some of them, and you go on the Internet and you'll find out that there are a number of locations where people say: *Well, here's a camp that's built.*

KC: Okay, and what about the role of viruses in eliminating the population? Is there any validity to that?

PP: I have no idea. It's not my area of expertise. I have suppositions.

KC: Well you clearly are a healer, so have you got advice on how people can protect themselves from viruses?

PP: Well, I think all that advice is available if you just download it from the FDA websites or the various websites of, say, FEMA and Homeland Security.

KC: Really?

PP: Oh, absolutely. Wear a mask, wash your hands; they're absolutely correct.

KC: Okay.

PP: Another good thing to do is go someplace [where] there's not a lot of people. We're sitting here filming in an area that there's not a lot of people. The town says *Entering the Town* on one side of the sign, and on the other side of the signpost, it says *Exiting the Town*, and 1st Street's in some great big city somewhere else, because [laughs] there's not another street.

KC: [laughs] Okay. Well, so what is it that you think is coming in the future in terms of... Let's talk about outer space a little bit. Do you think that there's anything out there that we need to be aware of?

PP: Well, I think there're all kinds of things out there [that] we need to be aware of.

KC: Okay. I mean, is the only threat... In other words, is the only threat...

PP: Well it's a major threat that we right now don't have any deterrent for.

KC: What threat?

PP: A threat from outside the planetary bounds.

KC: Well, what about the satellites that have recently been classified, such that they won't tell us about incoming bodies? That's all classified suddenly.

PP: Well, that I don't know about. I didn't realize that had been done, but if it's been done, it's obviously been done for some reason. And that reason may be to stop panic.

I know the government has a tremendous belief in: *Whatever you do, don't cause panic in the people.* Because, when you cause panic in the people, then it draws attention to the lawmakers, the Senate, the Congress, the Presidency, and the ruling party. And they're not looking...

You know, it's like the old Chinese curse: *May you live in interesting times.* You know, try to live in times that are not at all interesting; they're boring as hell -- nothing's going to happen.

So, I think that anything that might happen that would cause people to start thinking about: *Well, why isn't something being done here?* We're out of money. We've been out of money for years. So we don't have money to go do anything about it, so why let the people worry?

KC: Okay, but you were telling me something about the fact that you think there's really only ten months left for the, sort of, rollout of what could be, like, reversing the agenda. I mean, I don't even know if you believe it's possible to reverse the agenda that's being rolled out at the moment. You've said we've got about ten months, because the Earth... we've polluted our own nest.

PP: Okay. Here're just a few things that you can look up, and the things I talk about are things that are openly available on the Internet; Library of Congress or a lot of things now on

YouTube; a lot of things on, you know, Ask.com and Google.com, and so forth. You can go in there and start making searches, and looking, and you can find a lot of information. There's a tremendous amount of information.

KC: About?

PP: About the things that you just spoke about, and specifically you can find out that – oh, it's about a couple weeks ago, we just had a very near flyby of a huge asteroid that would've caused, depending on where it hit, thousands, if not millions of deaths on the Earth, if it had hit the Earth. And it was a near flyby.

Now, maybe that nearness was 100,000 miles, but 100,000 miles is sure different than the distance between here and Mars, or here and Pluto. It came by very close. It could have been one of those things that hit the Earth, and we have nothing to stop something like that.

KC: Okay, you're saying we have nothing to stop something. Is it possible black people in black projects have something to stop that? [Ed. note: no reference to African-Americans intended]

PP: No, I don't believe so.

KC: Okay, and what about...

PP: If they did, I don't believe they've had the money to build it.

KC: And what about positive aliens? Do you think that they might interfere with something of that nature?

PP: Well, if there are such things as positive aliens, I think that, yeah. You know, I wonder. I look at Earth, and I look at the things we've done to destroy this fragile little spaceship that we live on going through space. You know, we talk about burning, we talk badly about all the burning of the rainforests in Brazil, and yet most of the oxygen's produced by plankton.

Our use of nickel-cadmium batteries, and lead batteries, and putting them out into the environment has killed a good part of the plankton. Cetaceans are beaching themselves so that there's enough food left for the others.

KC: Because they're that wise. And self-sacrificial.

PP: Well I think that they are, and of course, you had to have worked with them in some of the military programs to understand how wise they are.

KC: Okay, well I'm going to have to wind this up. I would love to talk to you all night and all day, and especially if you were able to come out with some of the more fascinating things that you're involved in.

But Project Camelot wants to thank you very much. I want to thank you for your service to humanity. You've clearly been involved in some things that are healing for the population out there. You're here, trying to testify to something coming that you firmly believe that people need to be aware of, and so I want to thank you.

PP: I appreciate your interest – anything that can get information out to the people. And my suggestion to the people is... because this stuff is not really hidden. It may be squirreled away somewhere, but it's there, and you can go out and find the information for yourself.

My suggestion is you do it. My suggestion is that you prepare yourself for an emergency, because no matter what you do in life, you're going to run into an emergency. If you prepare yourself for it, then you stand a very good chance of surviving it, and if you don't prepare yourself for it, you stand a very good chance of not surviving it.

KC: Okay. Thank you, and Pete Peterson, I really want to thank you again. Bill, you want to say any closing words yourself?

BR: I think this is the most important interview we've ever done.

KC: Okay, and David, you got anything you want to add to that?

DW: Well, Pete, I just want to say I appreciate your courage for inviting us out here. I think that the data that you've given about the consciousness and the information field is really instrumental in my work, and I hope we can continue that discussion.

PP: Well, I think that we'll probably continue a relationship for a long time, and I'm perfectly

willing to share that information. I'm at a point in my life that the only thing I can do now to make my life worthwhile is to share the wisdom that I've obtained as a stone rolling through this interesting experience of life on Earth.

[music fades in]

PP: ... been involved with trying to build flying saucers, you usually found that with flying saucers, if you look at most of the movies, there always seems to be a robot involved with it...

[Click here](#) **for the video interview**

Transcript provided by the hard-working volunteer members of the Divine Cosmos/ Project Camelot Transcription Team. All the transcripts that you find on both sites have been provided by the Transcription Team for the last several years. We are like ants: we may be hidden, but we create clean transcripts for your enjoyment and pondering.

Support Project Camelot - make a donation:

[Make A Donation](#)

Donations are not tax deductible for U.S. citizens.

*Thank you for your help.
Your generosity enables us to continue our work.*

Bill Ryan and Kerry Cassidy

kerry@projectcamelot.org

bill@projectcamelot.org