

This video is utter garbage. I applaud the attempt, but it is so flawed. Not only that, they don't even realize how flawed it is, and so when they get "contamination" they blame it on PCR tests and transfer of nanobots between people. Did it ever occur to them, that they're simply picking up devices from father away? Clearly not.

Here are my detailed notes from the walkthrough:

I can 100% confidently say that I have yet to see ANY credible evidence of Bluetooth signals emanating from vaccinated people who aren't carrying Bluetooth devices or who don't have pacemakers.

George

In the introduction, they claim that Dr. Campos "proved" graphene was in the vaccine. This is scientifically not accurate. They only did a spectrometry test, and even with the studies they reference on their website, they need multiple different types of tests to determine definitively the presence of graphene. One test is not sufficient may detect "probable" graphene, but "probable" is not proof.

Now, at ~ 5:00, the scientist claims that the graphene in the vaccine isn't magnetic until it's injected into the body, heated up, and reacts with water. So why don't they take some vaccine, heat it up, and mix it with water? We should see it turn magnetic, no? That seems to be a very simple test to validate their hypothesis, no?

08:00—The "cyber" expert talks about detecting Bluetooth signals from cars. Yes, most cars have Bluetooth, and they have for over a decade.

08:15 - he talks about self-assembly now -- not proof, just "purportedly"

08:35 - they flash up a scary-sounding study: Engineering self-organization of neural networks using carbon nanotube clusters.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S037843710401413X>

Yay, now we can go read the study to see what they are actually writing about. You would think from the topic being discussed in the "documentary" and the title, the nanotubes are self-assembling (because he's talking about nanobots).

What the study is actually about is they print a template using sophisticated equipment, "photo-lithography" (i.e., circuit production equipment), micro-contact printing and applying the nanotubes through chemical vapor disposition. This is all very high-tech manufacturing equipment (operates in a vacuum) that they are using to create a nanotube matrix or template. (i.e., this is not self-assembling and would require a microchip factory with a vacuum inside your body to reproduce...)

Next, what they did was apply cell cultures with neurons, and the live CELLS with neurons self-assembled. But we already knew cells self-assemble... That's how we stay alive!

Now, they list a whole bunch of other studies, all of which center around the same basic technology described above.

9:10 -- The doctor claims they proved electronic devices with electron microscopy. No evidence is provided and frankly, I doubt this fellow will know what electronic devices would look like.

9:24 - The cyber expert now talks about an analog radio frequency that doesn't transmit digital data but "energizes" and some other stuff that doesn't make any sense.

10:07 - Now we are in a stone house to see how far away a Bluetooth signal shows up.

1500 Bluetooth codes come up at his workplace.

11:40 - They find a Bluetooth device purportedly on the person

12:03 – Next, the computer voice comes back and has a diagram for Mac addresses and a website (dnschecker.org) where you can look up the

manufacturer of the Mac address. Sadly, I went to this site, and it's looking up network device (not Bluetooth) MAC addresses which are different. The claim by the computer is false. Especially in the case of Bluetooth, many manufacturers don't register their MAC addresses. Also, any device can change its Mac address through software; we do it all the time.

12:18—Next, we see them looking up the MAC address on a different vendor site: macvendors.com. I went there as well and verified they are using the IEEE list, which is network card MAC addresses, NOT Bluetooth MAC addresses, which are registered and maintained by a different body, the Bluetooth Special Interest Group (SIG).

These guys simply don't know what they are doing.

12:33 -- Apparently, the other fellow notes the Bluetooth signal “turns on and off.” Maybe it disappeared even though the guy was literally standing right in front of the computer. More likely, a distant signal moved out of range, no?

13:40—This is when we know their experiment is suspect. When the second person arrives, they pick up the exact same Bluetooth signal as the previous guy, but he's gone! Then they pick up two new signals—two different ones!

14:06 - next person, and now there are 4 signals, two repeats and 2 new ones. These are all BTLE devices that have a range of 330 ft, which means they could be picking up those signals from anywhere in a space of 350,000 square feet!

15:38 Now we find out people have cell phones they carry around, but the Bluetooth is "off." Does anyone verify this?

16:21—They left their cell phones in their cars. Their cars? How far away were the cars?

16:38 - Metals were removed, except I saw a couple of men wearing belts...

17:24—Wait, now he's talking about them turning on the cell phones to "energize" the devices? And he's talking about an 'intracorporeal nano network.' Technobabble.

18:20 – Now, as they note, everything is speculation. I've read better science fiction from Spider Robinson.

19:21—Now he's talking about how these "transmitters" charge. According to him, they use your cell phone signal. I'm not aware of any devices using cell phone signals to charge themselves. Why would you ever need to charge your Fitbit if it could be charged from cell phone signals? They would never need charging, right? Not in a city anyway. Your Apple Watch? It never needs to be charged if it can charge off of Wi-Fi signals, right?

19:37—Now, the cyber guy starts talking about the addresses being intelligent as they change codes. Now, I know again, they are talking nonsense. These are addresses; they don't communicate data using address changes, so there would be no way to cross-reference any data. There are many other Bluetooth protocols one would use to change the address. Plus, if the address is changing, how would he know? How would he be able to differentiate from a new device?

20:11—The white-coated fellow from Switzerland comes on and tells us that "evidently I know that the measurement has been done well." There goes his credibility. Nothing was done well in that "experiment." Why on earth don't they have a simple EMF meter to determine the source of the signal?

20:44 - Oh, here we go with the cemetery stuff that I've seen before. He's good enough to provide the dimensions. 5000 square meters. Given that BTLE transmits 100m with a phone you could pick up signals covering 35,000 Square Meters.

Yeah...

21:24 - No person beside us... OMG. They just showed someone walking far away, but well within 100M!

23:57 - testing the unvaccinated, and they say no codes, except I see 3 codes on the computer and it looks like 2 on the other device!

24:52 - now they test an unvaccinated person who shows a signal, ruining their experiment, so they start making up other reasons -- PCR tests! Did it even cross their minds that the signal might be coming from one of the billions of Bluetooth devices?

It should be obvious to them by now that their methodology is highly flawed. Sadly, this thought didn't cross their minds. It's pretty evident that they either don't understand radio frequencies or are trying to deceive us.

Utter Trash.