Microchips, Nanotechnology and Implanted Biosensors: The New Normal?

Microchips, Nanotechnology and Implanted Biosensors: The New Normal?

by **Pam Long,** *Children's Health Defense*
October 1, 2020

U.S. military personnel will be the first subjects in nanotechnology trials in the pursuit of optimizing health and early detection of disease outbreaks. Profusa has research contracts for bio-integrated sensors with the U.S. Department of Defense and Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), pending U.S. Food and Drug Administration approval in early 2021.

Health technology undermines freedom and privacy

Profusa's promotional video shows how the bio-integrated sensor enables a soldier to be tracked by remote computers using GPS in addition to monitoring real-time biomarkers, such as oxygen levels and heart rate. While this biotechnology is portrayed as potentially lifesaving to a soldier on the battlefield, the implications of GPS tracking individuals is a terrifying step towards a surveillance state in the general population. Furthermore, tracking people in stages of sickness can only result in medical tyranny in the hands of any government. The Profusa influenza study requires patients to wear the wearable version of the reader 24 hours a day, with continuous biomarker information collection into a database, and aims to detect four stages of infection: healthy, infected, asymptomatic and recovery stage. These unreliable

detection stages could become the criteria for different levels of individual participation in society as experienced in the unsustainable COVID-19 state-level lockdowns for the masses.

Can it be reversed? Can it be refused?

This Profusa nanotechnology has three components: an inserted sensor called hydrogel, a light-emitting fluorescent sensor reader on the surface of the skin and an electronic software component that transmits to an online database. The SARS-CoV-2 vaccine plans to incorporate this technology and there is no information on how the technology could be removed, if at all. "Tiny biosensors that become one with the body" could imply a lifetime commitment.

The nanotechnology research at DARPA is very controversial and aims to create "super soldiers" with artificial intelligence that gives enhanced capabilities to humans such as heightened senses, tenfold vision and extraordinary strength. According to a statement from DARPA, the program, known as the Neural Engineering System Design, "aims to develop an implantable neural interface able to provide advanced signal resolution and data-transfer bandwidth between the brain and electronics." Would these "super powers" and any side effects be permanent or life-limiting? The webpage of DARPA's program notes that "the most effective, state-of-the-art neural interfaces require surgery to implant electrodes into the brain."

Is it ethical to require a soldier to implant nanotechnology as mission essential or for force protection? Can military personnel refuse nanotechnology embedded in a vaccine mandate or health order from the chain of command? Informed and uncoerced consent is the foundation of medical ethics.

Vaccines: the trojan horse for worldwide adoption of

nanotechnology?

The Institute for Soldiers Nanotechnologies at MIT and the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases are researching the use of nanotechnology based adjuvants in new vaccines for the military against malaria, tuberculosis, HIV and Ebola.

According to this document, "Project 1.6 proposes to develop two platform technologies that safely and efficiently promote immune responses in the vaccination and therapeutic settings: lymph node targeting amphiphile-adjuvants and immune-targeting amphiphilic ligand-coated metal nanoparticles. These two approaches are ideally suited to targeting adjuvant compounds to lymphoid tissues and immunomodulators to immune cells during infection, respectively."

In addition to the concerns of experimental vaccines for military personnel, civilians will likely follow in vaccine mandates with nanotechnology. Tracking individual location and personal metabolic data is far too much power for any government or health department. And moreover, if the technology can send biochemistry signals from the person to the government, then likely the technology has capability to also send biochemistry altering signals from the government to the person. What are the limitations and safeguards for the government's remote ability to affect or control a person's thoughts, emotions and vital functioning? Nanotechnology could give data-based omnipotence to the controllers and create an oppressive world of governance in the guise of public health.

What you can do? Become more empowered to advocate for your health by registering for the Protecting Health and Autonomy in the 21st Century online conference Oct. 16-18 with 40 speakers, including Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.