The truth about 5G and corona

Bram Nauta is a professor of IC design at the University of Twente.

25 August

The conspiracy theories are true: the corona pandemic was engineered to inject the world's population with 5G chips. One brave scientist who helped develop the technology steps forward.

I have a confession to make. I've kept my mouth shut for a long time, but my consciousness is getting the better of me. So I'll tell the world the shocking truth, no matter the consequences: 5G and the corona pandemic are inextricably linked. I know because I helped to develop the technology.

It must have been a decade ago when Bill Gates started attending IEEE meetings. I didn't think that was weird at the time. On the contrary, I was delighted that he showed an interest in microchips and wireless technology – even more so when it turned out that he was funding a worldwide research program. I was happy to participate, of course.

Sure, it was a tough NDA to sign. I especially hated having to send away a few bright students whom I feared I couldn't trust to keep quiet. But the rest was amazing: plenty of bitcoins, without ever having to publish a paper. Bill preferred to keep the significant innovations – some of which conflicted with the laws of nature at that time – for later disclosure. We held secret conferences and launched an underground journal to exchange our ideas. We even established a professional organization under the IEEE flag: the SSCS, Secret-State Circuits Society.

The research was second to none. We had to standardize radio interfaces and develop completely new analog and digital hardware, as well as software and antenna technologies – all cutting-edge stuff. I also enjoyed working with biologists and medical doctors for a change.

When 5G was starting to be deployed, our 5G-activated chips went into mass production at a secret wafer fab in Washington DC. The pharmaceutical

industry was on standby to include our chips in their production processes. Our Wuhan chapter was the first to do a field test, and the rest is history!

I'm joking, of course, but a surprisingly large number of people take stories like this dead seriously. Over the past year, I've been approached by several news media and interested individuals to explain why it isn't possible. My answer is that chips don't fit in tiny vaccine needles. And even if they did, and millions of people have been injected with tracking/mind-controlling/whatever chips, where would these devices get their energy to operate and communicate? It's simply impossible with today's or tomorrow's technology.

Judging technological information on the web is difficult
Understanding advanced technology is challenging, but judging technological information on the web is even more difficult. Somebody pointed me to online information, which looked quite serious. Real scientists described 'nanobots,' molecule-sized, self-propelled controllable robots that can travel through your veins and fix all kinds of diseases. The article didn't actually state that these devices exist, but a layman would probably simply overlook that.

Scientists need funding, and to get funding, they make amazing promises for the future. In the end, they might develop a nut or a bolt for the application they promised, or maybe not even that – doesn't matter, they got the funding.

University marketing and communication departments like to fantasize about future technology, too. Once the funding has been received, the amazing possibilities are described in popular media. A liquid metallic robot? Superconductivity at room temperature? A swallowable quantum computer? You'll find it! Such articles aren't removed when the project generates the actual papers, which only experts can understand, and which describe results that don't even come close to what was promised.

It's our duty as scientists and engineers to be honest about our work. Yes, we may dream a bit now and then, but we should always carefully check the information being published about our work. And if the technology doesn't exist or simply is impossible, we have to be transparent about that. If we're not careful, we'll start believing in our own 'amazing innovations.'