

UPDATE ON STATEMENT MADE TEN DAYS AGO BY PROFESSOR ILIJA LAKICEVIC AND JACQUES BAUER CRA, RESPECTIVELY THE INVENTOR AND TEST CO-ORDINATOR OF THE BIOSHIELD DEVICE.

Ten days ago, we sent the BBC a statement in response to a report of theirs on May 28th which accused the distribution arm of the enterprise of operating, in so many words, a fraudulent scam. In defending ourselves and the science behind our device, we stated we have been grossly defamed. As such, we asked the BBC to take down their story on its website. They have not done so. We refer to the BBC's story on our website, but they decline to refer to our rebuttal on theirs.

So much for journalistic integrity...

Just days after it ran its piece the BBC took to task all those involved with BioShield for making no comment to their article. Our answer in our statement of June 4th was this was not achievable given that all those who are involved with the enterprise are scattered around the globe in lockdown and that necessarily we had first to consult each other and take advice. That we achieved a comprehensive rebuttal in a week was greatly to our credit.

How interesting it is that the BBC, which has no such logistical problems, has itself made no comment, more than a week after our refutation.

We have since sought advice and our assertion that we have been defamed has been confirmed. We are told that the likely defence of the BBC will be justification i.e. that we really are operating a fraud.

The BBC has a problem on two fronts here -

If the distribution arm of the enterprise was selling just a USB device with a sticker, as the BBC claims, why bother to involve real scientists with unquestionable credentials? Why not invent some phoney scientists with whom they would not have to share any proceeds?

The second problem for the BBC is that – in line with our previous findings - the double-blind pilot efficacy test that was conducted in Switzerland on Monday 8th of June proves again the efficacy of the BioShield device. The results of the test are attached below for all to read.

Our conclusion from this pilot study is – yet again - that an assault of man-made radiation really does have deleterious effects on people and that our BioShield device goes a long way to protect people from man-made radiation and ameliorate its harmful effects.

Mainstream science will doubtless continue its dismissive stance of our cutting-edge technology but for how long can it dispute its results?

As to the matter of the attack by the BBC on the device and, by direct implication, the integrity of us both, we will shortly be announcing the legal path down which we will go. It is a match between two scientists with limited funds and the BBC with its bottomless reservoir of British taxpayer's money. In this forthcoming contest of us minuscule Davids against the Goliath, that is the BBC behemoth, we are running a huge financial and personal risk. But if that is what it takes to restore our names and the reputation of the BioShield device, so be it.

Again, we request that the BBC and to all those publications to which its story was syndicated, the article is forthwith taken down, lest further damage on us is incurred.

Professor Lakicevic and Jacques Bauer - For any further information or questions please write to us at: press@globalscience.email

In addition -

To better explain our device, it is a USB key fitted with a nano layer programmed by Professor Lakicevic specifically for the purpose of creating a Bioshield against man-made radiation, among other effects. It is important to have a background of the groundbreaking science and life's work of Professor Lakicevic. Here are some examples of his peer reviewed papers.

1. "Aton" True Cell, Atom and Particle Concept

<https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v8i10/ART20201755.pdf>

2. The True Concepts, Laws and Equations of Creation

<https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v8i10/ART20202091.pdf>

3. The Right Therapy for Radiation Poisoning

<https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v9i3/SR20309224250.pdf>

4. The True Value of Pi Number and Squaring the Circle

<https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v9i4/SR20409190322.pdf>

5. Birth of the Planetary Being

<https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v9i4/SR20422181950.pdf>

6. Atom, Electric Current, Gravity, Magnetism, Energy, Mass, and Speed of Light are NOT what Science believes and Earth is NOT a Magnet

<https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v9i4/SR20427191555.pdf>

7. The True Nature of the Electricity and Secret of Motion, Matter, and Inert Gases"

<https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v9i5/SR20502204916.pdf>

8. Collective Responsibility for our Current Circumstances

<https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v9i5/SR20520184548.pdf>

9. Ilija Lakicevic, "What is Light?", International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)

<https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v9i5/SR20527215002.pdf>

10. Ilija Lakicevic, "Shaking Science's Foundations – Walter Russell Won Approval 90 Years Ago"

<https://www.ijsr.net/archive/v9i6/SR20531180317.pdf>

It is essential to have a rudimentary understanding of Professor Lakicevic's groundbreaking science to understand the efficacy of the nano layer. Its efficacy can only be tested through indirect measurements, carried out on coherent biological systems. This alone is what makes it possible to confirm or to invalidate its effectiveness.

In this context, the **double-blind efficacy study versus placebo** was conducted on Monday June 8th, 2020 at the Center for Prevention and Health near Neuchâtel, in Switzerland, under the aegis of Doctor Nathalie Calame, considered a top specialist in hyper-electro-sensitivity.

A rigorously established protocol is provided in the appendix to this press release. Ten patients were tested, after signing an informed consent on two essential biological parameters in response to the supposed impact of non-ionizing radiation coming from an unprotected cell phone:

- a) Analysis of living blood observed under dark field microscopy
- b) Measurement of cardiac variability and derived parameters (Dynamika 72)

To increase the objectivity of the results obtained, two independent experimenters carried out the two types of analysis taken into account in this protocol: one for heart rate variability analysis, and the other for blood analysis.

In addition to this test, other similar analyses have already been carried out by different experimenters in the previous months. These previous ones were carried out in a direct mode and not in the frame of double-blind efficacy studies versus placebo, as shared here.

The results of this pilot study will be published soon in full.

A brief summary of the results is released here below, after approbation by Dr Nathalie Calame:

Attached PDF file of testing study.