

The War Inside Your Mind: Unprotected Brain Battlefields and Neuro-Vulnerability

@RMcCREIGHT/2023

The War for your Brain -- Targeted Cognitive Conflict and Mind Wars

Brain theory and cognitive functional analysis rests as it does on various theories where the exact role of neurons, dendrites, axons, the Central Nervous System and external environmental factors such as electromagnetic sensitivity and interactive microbiome effects may act independently or in concert in ways much less clear than desired. Integrated neuronal elements and supporting neural systems which govern or influence thinking, perception, judgment, reasoning, CNS functionality, plasticity and proprioceptive behavior are equally ambiguous despite the pace, focus and scope of ongoing research. Now in the 21st century we must grapple with yet another threshold challenge and enduring mystery—externally based brain manipulation, cognitive influence and insidious targeted degradation is possible via technology designed to elicit harmful neurobiological effects where brain security itself is under threat. This is a wholly new form of brain research involving the very risky era of true mind wars.

In his 2006 book *Mind Wars*, author Jonathan Moreno speculates about the enthusiastic quest to discern what makes the brain function, how the mind operates, and what the interplay of thoughts, ideas and how emotions govern behavior with such sophistication in ordinary human life.. Over 15 years ago, Moreno wonders aloud in his book about what novel ethical questions are raised by the emergence of new neuroscience applications for war which will alter human identity by modifying memory, cognition, and core physical, emotional and spiritual capabilities? This is a classical challenge to serious neuroscience studies, brain activity research , normal neurological operations, plasticity and core brain functions.[1]

Surely since 1970 significant scientific inquiry and national security research has been conducted along two lines of pursuit which are equally driven in pace while they are quite different in perpetual focus. One aspect of this parallel energy has been rooted in medical inquiry focused primarily on ways to understand the brain, what governs neuromechanics, neurobiology, and the inherent neurobiological functions of the mind for purposes of healing it, maximizing its operation and fostering its restoration. On the other hand resolute military planners and analysts have been energetically engaged with zeal and passion very much in equal measure to discern and decode how the mind functions so that it can be insidiously exploited, impaired, degraded and externally influenced in potential stealthy ways to steer the outcome of future conflicts. This dichotomy is not accidental but underscores the inherent dilemma in brain science for the 21st century and beyond. The brain as battlefield is unquestionably the issue.

Given the function and operation of the CNS, the ANS, the Vagus nerve, dendrites, nerve cells, axons, synapses and other elements in the brain's operational environment and its apparent linkage to human behavior, certain ambiguities about it reside largely in mystery, speculation and theory. We know there are certain cognitive processes and foundational elements of thought and analysis but their direct causative triggers, operational sequence and biochemical aspects are the stuff of ongoing medical research. We retain some degree of confidence that cognition is vital and perception is crucial without being able to explain how plasticity works and happens as it does. Many unanswered questions exist.

We also reckon that cognition can be impaired, expanded, and diminished but it still reflects a puzzle in neuroscience which is rooted in studies of brain plasticity and what really governs that phenomenon. If cognition can be enhanced or reduced then specific influential factors essential to that must be understood. Therapeutic neuroscience research aims to heal, restore, treat and renew damaged or impaired brains. Brain warfare destroys that notion and identifies cognition and brain function as legitimate targets.

It may offend reason and sensibility to imagine brain wars as evidence of a looming contest where indirect influence of brain functions by hostile nations and implacable enemies target cognition,

perception and analysis without fear of discovery or forensic attribution. However we stand at the threshold of a contentious era latent with such pernicious and global threats which merit attention.

The enhancement, and targeted erosion, of cognitive processes such as memory and analysis, for example, raises questions about how it occurs, what technologies enable it, what aspects of cognitive function are truly vulnerable to degradation. We grasp a linkage between shortened telomeres as part of the aging process. Yet we pursue energetically cures for Alzheimer's and seek insights about driving factors behind autism and genius because of the belief that an underlying set of causes explains why it happens in our global population. Science and technology offers the opportunity for the engineered convergence of multiple technologies to magnify and enhance brain function. While seemingly benign and beneficial we must contemplate diversion of good science for evil purposes. Why not consider the same engineering paradigm for alleviating TBI as an alternate pathway to brain altering weapons? Does it make sense in blending nanotech, genomics, electromagnetics and other technological dynamics that only a more productive brain can result? Should this excursion in neuroscience fiction be encouraged or tolerated? Are the best experts pausing carefully to consider the impact or implications? What happens then?

Will acceptance of humans on a developmental curve of intelligence mean that efforts to maximize brain function and mental power in the future are risk free, dangerous or ill advised? If serious transhumanism and brain implant research is launched where brain-machine interface is fundamental who will govern it and what baseline moral imperatives or ethical standards will guide it? Will the net result be a better world, one where ordinary people are better off, or open the door to totalitarian mind control? Or can one assert that open ended Pandora's box of totalitarian mind control been already been loosened? Can the risks, implied dangers and unexpected negative outcomes be casually assumed away? Is the carefully engineered augmentation of human brains a desirable or lofty societal goal with no hidden or implied drawbacks? Instead is it evidence of true genius or simply the manifestation of madness itself?

The single best revelation which serious neuroscientists must confront is that for all the laudable therapeutic and treatment augmentation approaches, benign technologies and creative devices developed for brain healing and cognitive wellbeing a parallel arena of covert brain weapons, insidious cognitive disruptive technology and palpable ongoing research to maximize neural threats and exploit neurobiological vulnerability are being researched, developed and perfected in covert settings. This is the paramount challenge, emerging global threat, and enduring medical dilemma of the 21st century.

Technological Progress in Neuroscience and the Dance with the Devil

Technologies we hardly imagined 50 years ago such as cell phones, hypersonics, advanced genomics, quantum computers and vehicles for transiting space are prevalent and ubiquitous. The human brain has launched and nurtured these ideas and infused these technologies in ways that cause one to ponder if the brain itself is truly without limits. Is it desirable that brain enhancement and expansion of human cognition become the salient goal of human activity after 2030? Does this goal displace the quest for peace, an end to poverty or the odyssey of ending human hunger and suffering? Does it open the door to human experimentation and risky neuroscience projects to attain brain enhancement? What cautionary standards and guidelines should govern medical research in this domain? If we are simply trying to end a variety of painful and devastating brain diseases and erase the causes of cognitive decline why not invest a full scale Manhattan Project on the matter? Such a fulsome inquiry must confront, discern and discover the risks and implied dangers as well as the benefits of neuro-maximization. Absent an array of signals that the risks outweigh the benefits should we expect or encourage medical science to run down this road?

We must always balance the good with the bad, the expected with the unexpected, the known with the unknown. Outcomes are not guaranteed and negative or harmful results on open ended neuroscience research does impose a cost on its sponsors, creators and subjects. Basically we raise the important question of whether the goal of enhanced brain function and maximized cognitive health should be

pursued regardless of the risks involved. After all science and technology has brought society great things and may do so in this arena as well. Although we can seldom see or anticipate the actual end of all things we embark on today we can pursue legitimate research as a worthy, acceptable or tolerable risk to embrace. The offsetting reality is that science and technology has both beneficial and destructive potential owing to its dual-use nature and that exploitation of the best ideas for evil outcomes never goes away.

Now we generally accept certain technologies can alleviate troubling emotional or mental health issues and relieve those with traumatic brain injury. For example, the MRI and the MeRT [Magnetic Resonance Therapy] used by neuroscientists offers a benign and helpful pathway to reduced mental stress and reductions in chronic brain problems. Here the admirable skills of public health aim to heal and restore people suffering a variety of mental and cognitive woes. It can readily be extolled as marvelous and conferring verifiable relief on those afflicted. Neuroscience remedies are doubtless wonderful things.

However, can we also contemplate for a moment the deliberate redirection and repurposing of MRI technology for mentally harmful or disruptive effects? MRI treatments are delicate and include the risk of incorrect treatment dosage and exposure risks which can be injurious. Basically, our brains lack sustained defenses against inadvertent MRI accidents as well as external nefarious efforts to degrade and distort ordinary thought and cognition. Instances of MRI resonance errors and accidents are very real. Should we accept that a hostile nation could subvert cognitive functions and redirect certain technologies such as MRI and TBI insights to instead disrupt and destabilize the brain? The idea is not far fetched and medical science must reckon with the reality of this scenario as the inherent risks of devising deliberately harmful neuro-cognitive technologies and neurobiological disrupters for warfare use is genuine.

There should be few experts surprised at the highjacking of legitimate medical and scientific research away from therapeutic purposes to instead create harmful weapons technologies. This has been the history of dual use science for years as benign and helpful science is perverted and re-engineered for weapons purposes. The overall concept of devising a technology to deliberately impair or degrade a healthy brain and diminish its cognitive functions seems alien but is genuine, macabre and very real.

Targeting healthy brains to disrupt, impair, destabilize and degrade their innate functions using stealthy technology sounds like Science Fiction but it isn't. While many of our cognitive instincts against danger are sound our brains stop short of being alerted instinctively to every conceivable pitfall, calamity and risk. We can fall victim to shock and surprise without warning. Try for a moment to picture our brain as a target and an objective to be conquered, neutralized and crippled by a determined clandestine foe. As wild and criminal as it seems this has happened to many people and has been verified as a confirmable neuroscience assault incident. Those adversely affected by targeted disruptive cognitive degradation technology in recent years have stepped forward to claim harm and seek relief knowing a shroud of serious doubt and medical derision is often levied at them. If this harmful technology exists where is the proof of its existence the naysayers claim. Worse, the medical profession appears stymied at the absence of a coherent case definition and uniform treatment protocol for these victims. However, these randomized attacks on human cognition and brain function are significant, affecting hundreds and have continued to inflict adverse effects. Evidence abounds regrettably that this is happening in our midst.

Brain Vulnerability—Scalar Waves and NeuroStrike

Brain vulnerability to RF signals, electromagnetic forces, and other indirect or external technologies shown to be potentially hazardous and harmful to cognitive function, and which contain the genuine risk of injury if not properly dosed or calibrated by medical professionals is well established. What is far less well known is the episodic evidence, and fragmentary array of compelling facts which indicate that nefariously engineered, designed and devised technologies which aim specifically to impair, disrupt or degrade brain functions and reduce cognitive performance are real. These technologies operate

clandestinely but frequently and often effectively as the novel deliberate new weapon of the 21st century. Here the suspension of disbelief and foundational medical curiosity should guide our inquiry.

Two rudimentary examples of this neuro-disruptive and cognitive degradation technology can be found in the metaphysical and biophysical realms of Tesla waves and their bio-effects along with remote convergent technology platforms targeting individuals for the purpose of eroding their cognitive abilities. This is not specious speculation, nor does it depict a future technology risk decades away, instead both are here now despite being misunderstood, ignored or overlooked purposely because of the challenge they truly represent. Deconstructing and decoding these harmful technologies is a crucial medical challenge.

Aside from well know brain vulnerability to RF and electromagnetic forces we must confront the reality that fundamental aspects of Tesla wave [or scalar wave] technology includes certain discernible effects on human biology. Scalar waves are three-dimensional self-contained waves that spin on one fixed axis. These non-linear waves disseminate throughout the bodies through crystalline lattices of elaborate collagen networks as they help in increasing every hydrogen atom's energy covalent level in the body. These hydrogen bonds are crucial to our body's ecosystem as they hold our DNA together. Scalar waves operate at a frequency range that aligns with the Schumann Resonances which reflects the massive electrical activity between the surface of the Earth and the ionosphere in the form of standing perpetual waves of electricity. Schumann Resonances are standing waves which resonate with human biosystems at 7.83MHz. Each lightning burst creates electromagnetic waves that circle Earth between its surface and the ionosphere. Some of the waves — if they have the right interactive wavelength combine and increase in strength to create a Schumann resonance with human effects. Evidence from research shows a degree of cellular, neuronc and immune suppressive factors influenced by elements of scalar waves.[2]

Quantum biologist Dr. Glen Rein in 1989 described scalar waves as “non-electromagnetic fields” that transmit information and other fields of consciousness. Scalar waves operate independently of distance and time and propagate at faster-than-light speed. Their effect is 3–5 times stronger than that of electromagnetic fields and cannot be detected by conventional instruments for measuring electric and magnetic fields. They are also referred to as quantum fields, tachyon fields, neutrino fields, Tesla waves, non-Hertzian waves, and longitudinal waves. Rein theorized that coupling between harmonic oscillators represented by scalar wave action potentials generated from active neuronal networks in the central nervous system reveal a non-linear nature exhibiting several types of quasi-particles, each with their own characteristic resonant frequencies. These allegedly mediate the non-linear phenomenon carriers of biological information along macromolecules like DNA. He posited that scalar waves influenced alpha-helical intra-membrane proteins involved with signal transduction mechanisms in the brain [3] His research tried to explain the implied interactive effects of scalar waves on human biophysiology and its plausible impact on neurobiology.

Scalar waves may have a significant, but poorly understood, series of effects on human physiology and brain function as well as neuronal networks inside the CNS-Central Nervous System. Rein also suggested that scalar waves are more biologically influential and active than their linear electromagnetic counterparts. Some studies of the direct effects of scalar energy on nerve cells in tissue culture indicate that scalar energy can modulate the basic biochemical communication between nerve cells mediated by neurotransmitters. It suggests scalar energy can directly effect the nervous system apart from any autonomic feedback signals from the body and may indicate that scalar energy, like electromagnetic energy, can have a direct effect on the cell membrane and neurotransmitter uptake. He also theorized that scalar energy waves could ultimately convert to electromagnetic energy in biophysical membranes.

Research on the bioeffects and neurobiological implications of electromagnetic systems have been undertaken by several experts since the late 1960s. During the cold war experts disagreed over the existence of so-called ‘bioenergetic weapons’ and whether Soviet scientists were developing them. One Pentagon contract scientist named Delgado strongly asserted the plausibility electronically inducing emotions and behaviors remotely by focusing on specific areas of the brain claiming that “*radio stimulation of different points in the amygdala and hippocampus might product a variety of effects such as elation, enhanced concentration, super relaxation and other responses.*” Likewise the indirect ability to induce negative cognitive and behavioral effects is implied as well. US scientist Alan Frey discerned that microwaves could directly transmit sounds via the auditory nerve which sounded like “..a buzz, clicking, hiss or knocking..”concluding firmly that the brain is a passive net receiver of electromagnetic waves. This reinforced work by Dr Ross Adey who found effects of electromagnetic fields on the efflux of calcium from brain tissues’ and their sensitivity to weak intrinsic and environmental fields with major biochemical, physiological, and behavioral effects was genuine [4]

When US diplomats first reported suspicious and bizarre brain maladies in the 2016-2018 period arising from their posting to Havana it was embraced by the media with a mixture of acceptance, doubt and denigration. Numerous studies and reports on these incidents can be found which reflect a widening series of attacks on diplomats, US military personnel, intelligence community staff and those assigned to work in selected embassies on trade, commerce or energy issues. A very large group of persons has been adversely affected by this electronic form of cognitive warfare where nanopulsed RF, acoustic factors and elements of nanotech combine to inflict serious neurobiological impairment in its victims. It is far less illuminating to know the actual number of verified victims than to ponder instead the mere existence of this harmful technology, its pernicious use against defenseless people, its possible military applications and discerning exactly what form and structure of technology could be causing this series of cognitive impairment events. This technology and its insidious effects I have officially termed **NeuroStrike**. [5]

Thinking about how silent, covert and insidious neuro-modulators can impair cognitive functions, damage analysis and decimate ordinary reasoning along with speech, memory and spatial orientation is likewise relegated to a time cloaked in distant science fiction. We know otherwise Are we truly aware and cognizant of the persistent problems quantum computers and AI can resolve—or regrettably and inadvertently generate? If anything, enhancing **NeuroStrike** scope and effectiveness via quantum AI, and unlimited IOT involves risks we can hardly envision let alone regulate If a convergently engineered mix of IOT, AI, quantum, nanotech, ChatGPT and other technologies yielded a healthier brain why would anyone aim to thwart that? Our caution flags remain subdued. As a result we have placed our support behind mixing these technologies in explicitly convergent strategies to attain a better future. [5] In effect we openly create an electronic gateway to a more ideal, tranquil, stable and secure future where that formula is attractive. Is this as a calculated gamble resulting in brain maximization or servitude?

What criteria should govern the application of risks in these areas of neuroscience exploration? The explicit convergence of these technologies contains zero risks according to some critics who see mostly benign effects. The energetic pursuit of AI to replicate or augment human brains illustrates the dilemma. AI designers consider text based regurgitation of massive databases, integration of disparate knowledge repositories, and a less than subtle ability to persuade, influence, reason or imagine in complex cognitive operations to parallel key brain functions as essentially equivalent to the human brain itself. Just blending these cutting edge technologies includes great complexity mixed with a largely manageable set of risks they say. But how best to evaluate, estimate and judge the net implications of that work?... The merger and explicit convergent engineering of nanotech, quantum, IOT and cyber over the next few years in overall efforts to parrot brain functions contains risks and unseen consequences which even the experts themselves cannot—or refuse to—fathom. The inspired venture into an abyss is one of our own making.

Then there is the question of brain research and its net impact on human free will, judgment and rational thought. If we allowed ourselves to imagine how neuroscience might inadvertently diminish those precious qualities while pursuing a ‘better brain’ would that be enough to impose a halt on enhanced brain research? Likely not. Worse we fail to grasp the subtle uncharted influence of such research on the building blocks of human biological systems.

Telomeres are DNA-protein complexes located at the end of chromosomes which protect chromosome ends from degradation and fusion and wither with age. Nobel prize winning scientists Elizabeth Blackburn in 2006 showed the influence of telomeres on genes and DNA diminishing with each instance of cell division.. Telomere length (TL) in blood cells is well known as a biomarker of human aging and disease; however, little is known regarding variability in TL in nonblood, disease-relevant tissue types. Telomeres have the job of protecting DNA during its replication and progressive shortening of them can result in DNA damage. It has been demonstrated through research that telomere shortening is associated with cognitive impairment. The exact extent to which telomeres can be adversely influenced or impaired by external electromagnetic factors or scalar waves or [even **NeuroStrike** technology] is largely unknown. However, it is fair to assert that telomeres are likely vulnerable, along with other aspects of tissue integrity, to the negative effects of that technology. Research already shows telomeres exhibit radiosensitivity in older adults and suggests there may be a wider scope of influence.[6]

The essential warning derives from a fundamental awareness of how our bodies, brains and internal systems respond to electromagnetic waves, signals and influences. Understanding that engineered externally mounted gateways to exploit human cognition and systems designed to impose nefarious neural degradation or misdirection starts with a keen awareness of how electromagnetic phenomena interact with our brains and nervous systems. We know that transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) is a technique used to induce a short-term interruption of normal activity in a relatively restricted area of the brain caused primarily via rapid changes using a strong magnetic field near the focus of treatment activity. Modern technology, including nonionizing radiation from power lines, wireless devices, cell phone towers is ubiquitous in our society and practically unavoidable. Along with that are risks arising from extremely low frequency electromagnetic fields (EMF) which routinely surround home appliances as well as high-voltage electrical transmission lines and transformers. Evidence of adverse health effects from EMF, including its controversial influence on the brain, ranges from studiously inconclusive to menacingly harmful. Few experts today wish to conclusively state that continuous EMF exposure is a genuine health hazard. However we do know that exposure to high levels of non-ionizing energy, such as at radio wave frequencies, can potentially damage the structure and function of the nervous system. In some ways the perverse politics of environmental science mitigates a deeper dive into human health implications. Human tolerance of unrestricted technology application is the paramount ethical and moral dilemma of our time. [7] A prime lesson for neuroscience is to learn more about what it all means.

Humans are distinctly composed biophysically and biochemically as repositories for electromagnetic activity and the record of human sensitivity to, and influence by, electromagnetic factors is beyond debate. Human sensitivity to, influence by and reaction to electromagnetic fields [EMF] is indisputable. The intensity of electromagnetic radiation in the human environment emanating from these fields-- which are ubiquitous and normally found in developed areas—are both significant and plentiful in human health terms. Normal EMF impact on living organisms derives from its direct tissue penetration and even more. specifically, the nature of our brains as a biological organ automatically includes a degree of electromagnetic sensitivity and responsiveness to EMF. Scientific theory and research into human intelligence notes that in order to retain intelligent thinking and sustain cognitive systems there needs to be a constant, globally available, synchronization system that continuously stabilizes the brain. Here the

significance is found in the electromagnetic signalling system, supported by a biochemical system. EMF exerts both a thermal and nonthermal effect on brain tissue and its effects on other parts of the body [nervous system, endocrine system, visual system, cardiovascular and immune systems] are well established. More specifically EMF radiation is reported to affect the central nervous system, brain chemistry and histology, and traverses the blood-brain barrier. We lack better evidence to ascertain what the biophysical and neurological impact of EMF on human life really indicates or implies.

Radiofrequency (RF) EMF and extremely-low-frequency (ELF) MF have been classified as “possibly carcinogenic” to humans by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). The production of reactive oxygen species (ROS), potentially leading to cellular or systemic oxidative stress, was frequently found to be influenced by EMF exposure in animals and cells [8] We also understand limited medical applications of EMF for treatment and diagnostic purposes found in the electroencephalograms (EEGs) and MRI [magnetic resonance imaging] used to treat neural disorders are commonplace. Repurposing and re-engineering these technologies for harmful, disruptive and damaging effects is just as real.

Effects of pulsed and sinusoidal ELF fields on the electrical activity of the nervous system have also been studied extensively. While only high-intensity sinusoidal electric fields or rapidly pulsed magnetic fields induce sufficient current density in tissue to alter neuronal excitability and synaptic transmission or to produce neuromuscular stimulation their net effects at verified intensities are beyond dispute. When a person focuses attention or tries to remember something this activity fires thousands of neurons simultaneously at the same frequency generating a wave — but at a rate closer to 10 to 100 cycles per second. If that were not enough to ponder, aside from the brain the heart is the largest most potent electromagnetic field inside the body exceeding brain electromagnetic sensitivity by 60 times.

It is well known that weak EMF could cause all sorts of dramatic non-thermal effects in body cells, tissues and organs. When other technologies are mixed in such as nanotech and genomics they complicate the task of discerning whether these factors, or other environmental factors, are controlling or influencing behavior, analysis and perception. When nanotech aspects are added to EMF influences available research shows high risks of ambient neurotoxicity exists not only from nanotech in foods but adds a degree of mystery to the challenge of decoding all influences on neuroplasticity. It is quite a leap of geopolitical conspiracy to assert that certain nations have already embarked on a deliberate and perverse campaign to degrade human cognition and devise a neurobiological weapons. However, the fact that it is scientifically possible to achieve doesn't nullify the risk of its covert and ambiguous existence. Some evil and dangerous regimes may actually want to leverage nanoparticles resident in humans as silent bio-transducers of external ELF signals. [10] This view assumes in the array of contending states already committed to a global arms race of exotic futuristic weapons that some would find this stealthy non-kinetic form of covert warfare intriguing. [11] Neuroscience is not accustomed to seeing itself as the object of wanton weapons development, super power lust and redirection of perverse energy. Instead this is simply to draw attention to the ramped up risk for human health based on the presence of nanoparticles in various aspects of our normal lives dwelling covertly there largely without our knowledge or consent. Their inherent potential as magnifiers of neural degradation must be studied, examined and grasped.

A decade ago in 2012 chemists at New York University (NYU) created a nanoscale robot from DNA fragments walking on two legs just 10 nm long. This so-called “nanowalker”, with the help of psoralen molecules attached to the ends of its feet, takes its first baby steps: two forward and two back. Its creators envisage a future molecule-scale production line, where molecules are shifted until the right location is reached. In this unique way a nanobot injects chemistry like “spot-welding” on a car assembly line. This is a decent example of “biomimetics”, where with nanotechnology they can imitate some of the biological processes in nature, such as the behavior of DNA, to engineer new methods and perhaps even improve them. [9] The ‘nanowalker’ implies a high intensity level of serious research which by itself seems benign but when convergently mixed deliberately with other technologies such as nanotech, neurotech, biotech and others paints a different picture as one contemplates the distribution of dangerous weapons systems.

UN agencies have also noted this development asking whether the developmental trajectory of nanomaterials as they potentially affect biological systems is really a worthwhile thing. The WHO recently went on record as well saying, *“The properties of nanomaterials, and of engineered nanoparticles in particular, have raised concern about unwanted or unexpected interactions with biological systems, which could result in adverse consequences to human and ecosystem health. Though rapidly growing, knowledge on these aspects is limited and many uncertainties remain.”* [12]

So we are left to speculate about the interactive aspects of nanotech embedded as it is with RF, electromagnetics and other advanced technologies thus far mentioned on human neurological health and cognitive performance. The sheer magnitude and interactive complexity of these convergently engineered technologies creates a widely unknown degree of risk and possible misuse by those engaged in doing so. There is no international oversight or treaty based system which governs, directs or depicts the true nature of ongoing convergent technology research on a global scale. Worse, we lack the kind of reliable data which points to specific neurobiological impacts on human cognition and neurophysiology which connects with extended use of laptops, smart phones and immersive virtual games. In keeping with an open minded consideration of factors which can both stimulate and degrade cognition we cannot afford to rule out the insidious effects of certain social media platforms such as TikTok.

Aside from its appeal as periodic but engrossing entertainment, serving as a platform for exchanges of video material among people, it provides a subtle but powerful impact on human cognition especially among young adults whose brains are still undergoing cognitive growth and biophysical maturation. Their brain chemistry and neurological stability are still developing and yet that offers the ripest and most delectable target for TikTok to exploit or influence. What does or should neuroscience know about this?

In a 2022 Harvard medical review of the issue involving Tik Tok it was found that the first known examples of social media-induced sociogenic illness were recognized in the period 2020-2022, a time coinciding with the pandemic. Neurologists began seeing increasing numbers of patients, especially teenage girls, with unusual, involuntary movements and vocalizations reminiscent of Tourette syndrome. After ruling out other explanations, the tics in these teenagers seemed related to many hours spent watching TikTok videos of people who report having Tourette syndrome and other movement disorders. Posted by social media influencers, these videos have billions of page views on TikTok; similar videos are available on YouTube and other sites. [11] This is not intended to condemn TikTok but merely refer to it as a platform of high level psycho-social influence on a population whose cognitive immaturity makes them highly susceptible to its immediate and downstream influences. As such, it is a legitimate area of neuroscience research which enables a better grasp of its genuine immediate and more subtle long term effects on a developing brain. Entertainment and diversion aside, if TikTok is truly benign in cognitive impact terms we should know it just as much as knowing if it inflicts hidden harmful effects./

Just as the maturation of quantum, AI, IOT, nanotech, neurobiological factors, EMF, magnetobiology, scalar waves and NeuroStrike all evolving together in parallel but interactive ways demonstrates the implied global risks involved it is accordingly crucial to understand what the net cognitive and neurobiological effects actually are. Idle speculation, sensational allegations, and wildly unconfirmed rumors about grossly negative or positive effects of these combined technologies on human cognition and neurobiological health are unknown. This is not only disadvantageous for attaining a healthy society and globally secure population but essential and critical for the security and wellbeing of the planet itself.

What is missing is a full scale international program of research and sponsored study on these issues

- Effects of RF, nanotech, scalar waves, neurotech and other advanced technologies on global human health and cognitive wellbeing
- Latent and observable effects of social media platforms, systems and virtual technologies which allow people to absorb and accept experiences which may be cognitively harmful
- Conduct long term research on external technologies designed to deliberately attack or degrade human cognition, neurobiological health and devise programs to restrict and curtail their use.

=====

NOTES

[1] **Mind Wars//Brain Science and the Military in the 21st Century**// Jonathan Moreno, Bellevue Press, 2012 ...

[2] **PROC. 7TH INTERNAL.ASSOC.PSYCHOJRONICS--Lecture, DEC., 1998**

Dr. Glen Rein “Stanford University Medical Center” Stanford, CAELF Cocoon International* St. Francisville, IL Meyl, K. Scalar Waves: Theory and Experiments. Journal of Scientific Exploration, Vol. 15, No. 2, p. 6, 2001
 Meyl, K. Scalar Waves: Theory and Experiments. Journal of Scientific Exploration, Vol. 15, No. 2, pp. 199–205, 2001

Rein G., "Biological Interactions with Scalar Energy- Cellular Mechanisms of Action," Proc. 7th Internat. Assoc. Psychotronics Res., Georgia, 1988.
 Rein G., "Effect of Non-Hertzian Scalar Waves on the Immune System," J. U.S. Psychotronics Assoc. Vol. 1, p. 15, Spring, 198

[3] **Ibid, Rein and Meyl**

[4] Intracerebral radio stimulation and recording in completely free patients J Nerv Ment Dis [J M Delgado, V Mark, W Sweet, F Ervin, G Weiss, G Bach-Y-Rita, R Hagiwara](#) 1968 Oct;147(4):329-40.//THE ENERGY AROUND US W. Ross Adey January-February 1986 <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2326-1951.1986.tb02827.x> NY Academy of Sciences, / Allan H. Frey, "Human Auditory System Response to Modulated Electromagnetic Energy," Journal of Applied Physiology 17.4 (1962): 689-692, here 689./ — Hannah Maslen, Thomas Douglas, Roi Cohen Kadosh, Neil Levy, and Julian Savulescu, "The Regulation of Cognitive Enhancement Devices: Extending the Medical Model," Journal of Law and the Biosciences 11 (2014): 68-93

[5] Neuro-Cognitive Warfare: Inflicting Strategic Impact via Non-Kinetic Threat//By R. McCreight <https://smallwarsjournal.com/jrnl/art/neuro...> Web Sep 16, 2022 · see also The Significance of Convergent Technology Threats <https://trajectorymagazine.com/the-significance->The Significance of Convergent Technology Threats to Geospatial Intelligence//SSincavage/RMcCreight // USGIF | January 25, 2019 see also **New Report Assesses Illness Among US** Government...<https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/2020/12/new..> Web Dec 5, 2020 · 202-334-2138; e-mail news@nas.edu Featured **Report** 2020 An Assessment of Illness in U.S. Government Employees and Their Families at Overseas Embassies In late 2016, U.S. Embassy personnel in **Havana, Cuba**

[6] **Biochimie Volume 90, Issue 1, January 2008, Pages 60-72**
Review Telomeres: Hallmarks of Radiosensitivity Ali Ayouaz, Christophe Raynaud, Claire Heride

[7] **How The Human Body Creates Electromagnetic Fields**

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/quora/2017/11/03/how...>

Web Nov 3, 2017 · In some circumstances, this “messaging around” is what leads to atomic bonding — the atoms and their **electrons** “find a way” to coexist in a way that minimizes their mutual energy, and they resist...and see= [Radiation: Electromagnetic fields - World Health ...](#)

<https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-also> Web Aug 4, 2016 · **Human**-made sources of **electromagnetic** fields. Besides natural sources the **electromagnetic** spectrum also includes fields generated by **human**-made sources: X-rays [Electromagnetic field induced biological effects in humans](#) <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27012122/> Web Electromagnetic hypersensitivity (EHS) is a **phenomenon characterized by the appearance of symptoms after exposure of people to electromagnetic fields**, generated by EHS [also Human intelligence: the brain, an electromagnetic system ...](#) <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12699709/> Web Rapid intelligence and reactions requires and **electromagnetic** signalling system, supported by a biochemical system. The Schumann Resonance signal provides a **brain** frequencies [What Magnetic Fields Do to Your Brain ...](#) <https://www.discovermagazine.com/environment/what...> Web May 25, 2018 · A magnetic field arises whenever a charged particle, like an **electron** or proton, moves around. Since the electric currents running through blenders, hairdryers, and wires in the walls of our

[8] WHO Guidelines on Protecting Workers Who Work with Nanomaterials <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-r> Web Feb 2, 2017

[9] **Biomimetic Autonomous Enzymatic Nanowalker of High Fuel Efficiency** [Meihan Liu[†]](#) [Juan Cheng[†]](#), [Shern Ren Tee[†]](#), [Sarangapani Sreelatha[†]](#), [Iong Ying Loh[†]](#), and [Zhisong Wang^{*††}](#) *ACS Nano* **2016**, **10**, **6**, 5882–5890 // June 13, 2016 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsnano.6b01035> 2016 American Chemical Society

[10] **Nanoparticles in Food: Small Size, Big Health Problems?** www.webmd.com/news/breaking-news/food-additives/20150723 Foods that contain nanoparticles Titanium dioxide, the most common nanoparticle in food, helps make candy such as **gummy bears opaque, and it enhances colors. Most often, though, it's used to add a brilliant whitening effect to foods such as powdered doughnuts.** It does not add any nutrition. The FDA has classified titanium dioxide as "GRAS," or generally regarded as safe. // see also [Nanoparticles in the Food Industry and Their Impact on ...](#) <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33669290/> Web Feb 16, 2021 · Use of **inorganic nanoparticles (NPs)** has expanded into various industries including food manufacturing, agriculture, cosmetics, and construction. **Author:** Merry Ghebretatios, Sabrina Schaly, Satya Prakash **Nanoparticles in foods raise safety questions** <https://www.sciencenews.org/article/nanoparticles-foods-raise-safety-questions> Web Oct 16, 2015 · His findings, published in 2012 in *Environmental Science & Technology*, show that many processed **foods** contain titanium dioxide, much of it in the form of **nanoparticles**. Candies, cookies, powdered // also [Biomaterials for nanoparticle vaccine delivery systems - PubMed](#) <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24848341/> // nanoparticle vaccine delivery systems. of **Author:** Preety Sahdev, Lukasz J. Ochyl, Jame // [Let's talk about lipid nanoparticles | Nature Reviews Materials](#) <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41578-021-00281-4/> Web Feb 9, 2021 · Lipid **nanoparticles** have been developed as vehicles for small molecule **delivery** by the nanomedicine and materials communities and are now a key component of COVID-19 mRNA **vaccines**. Food and Nanotechnology Center for Food Safety <https://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/issues/682/> ... also see *Int J Mol Sci.* 2021 Apr; 22(7): 3772. 2021 Apr 6. doi: [10.3390/ijms22073772](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms22073772) PMC8038719/PMID: [33917298](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33917298/) **Manmade Electromagnetic Fields and Oxidative Stress—Biological Effects and Consequences for Health** [David Schuermann^{1,*}](#) and [Meike Mevissen](#)

[11] Tics and TikTok: Can social media trigger illness? January 18, 2022 By [Robert H. Shmerling, MD](#), Senior Faculty Editor, Harvard Health Publishing

...