

From Synthetic DNA and RNA-Based Self-Assembling Nanotechnology to Sequelae of COVID-19 Shots

Shimon D. Yanowitz, EE¹ and Daniel Broudy, PhD²

¹ Independent Researcher and Associate Editor for *IJVTPR*, Haifa, Israel; email: shimon.yanowitz@yahoo.com; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0636-0257>

² Professor of Applied Linguistics, Okinawa Christian University, Nishihara-cho, Okinawa 903-0207, Japan; and Associate Editor for *IJVTPR*; Email: dbroudy@ocj.ac.jp; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2725-6914>

Abstract

Lipid nanoparticles allegedly containing synthetic “mRNA” have reportedly been injected into 5.2 billion people. Forensic study shows the general public was lied to about the chemical composition, the toxicity, and the destructive powers of those shots, which, because of remaining regulatory and institutional barriers, can only be judged by their sequelae and by forensic examination of accessible vials. Post-injection outcomes include: (1) catastrophic effects commensurate with the rate of injection such as (a) rising rates of all-cause-mortality, (b) increases in spontaneous abortions and loss of fertility, (c) novel abnormal “white clots” being pulled from cadavers by embalmers and from living persons by doctors and nurses, (d) myocarditis, heart failure, strokes, and acute neurological sequelae of many kinds; (2) synthetic entities and undisclosed toxic elements have been discovered by forensic analysis and microscopy in the injectables and cultured samples of them *in vitro*, and *in vivo* in bodily fluids of living persons. In a more than 2-hour talk at West Point in 2018 and in a 2026 public statement for DARPA posted October 30, 2024, James Giordano, PhD — who became Director of the Center for Disruptive Technologies and Future Warfare (CDTFW) at the National Defense University on January 31, 2025 — announced the pursuit of non-surgical computer sensing and transmitting brain interfaces as part of the Next-Generation Nonsurgical Neurotechnology (N3), a form of brain invasion warfare, to implant synthetic technology and toxins by injection and other methods to gain control of and possibly injure or kill people. EE Ian Akyildiz, PhD, and fellow of IEEE, in a 2023 YouTube discussed ways to surveil and control people by implanting invasive synthetic technology to create a potentially global network in the cloud. Given that advances in bioengineering, being standardized by IEEE since 2012 as updated up to the present, provide the means to realize the plans laid out by Giordano and Akyildiz. Together with the availability of neurotoxins, such as Novichok mentioned by Giordano, the COVID-19 “plandemic” has theoretically provided a perfect opportunistic occasion to deploy and study self-assembling reactive entities such as the ones found in the injectables and in the bodily fluids of persons exposed to them. Here, we also discuss synthetic contagion by shedding, implicitly suggested by Giordano, along with other ways using electromagnetic waves to control nanotechnology inside people. After the rollout of the COVID-19 shots, emergent self-assembling entities that were disrupting cells, organs, and robbing native bodily energy and resources were found and designated as causally involved the catastrophic outcomes of the COVID-19 shots. The micron-level assembled entities can easily be seen under a darkfield/brightfield microscope as confirmed by multiple forensic microscopists. We raise here the urgent need for discovering safe protocols for decommissioning and clearing out the synthetic nanotechnologies to halt the synthetic contagion that is underway.

Keywords: *bio-electronic circuitry, bioengineering, cell-free protein synthesis (CFPS), DNA nanopores, injectable vaccines, macroscopic self-assembly, materials science, meta-DNA, nanorobots, nanotechnology, neuro-weapons, prototissues, resource harvesting, self-assembling nanotechnology, shedding, synthetic contagion, synthetic infection, synthetic parasites, synthetic-DNA and RNA, turbo cancer*

Introduction

Advances in materials science and nanotechnology, which is the self-assembly of synthetic-DNA molecules (or also proteins/peptides) that self-assemble into larger structures, also comprising other atoms and molecules — that is, technologies grounded at the nanoscale which manufacture entities defined by the Institute for Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE) ranging from “1 nanometer (nm) to 100 nm” (as defined in IEEE Standard 1906.1-2015) — have made synthetic biological artifacts from the nanoscale upward twenty-first-century realities. Together such entities account for a huge scientific, engineering, and pharmaceutical paradigm-shift (see “Nucleic acid junctions and lattices”, by Seeman, 1982; “DNA Nanotechnology” by Seeman & Sleiman, 2018). The resultant technologies are exponentially proliferating as manifested in IEEE standards pertaining to body area networks (BANs) incorporating people irrespective of their body size (IEEE Standard 802.15.6-2012) that enable computing devices in, on, or around the human body to read and write messages from and to those bodies undetected by the persons in the network. More recently, as we will show, according to DARPA’s most authoritative spokesperson, James Giordano — PhD, and leading neuro-ethicist advising the US military — such nanotech capabilities for wireless networks that are connected and managed by electromagnetic waves powered by cell phones and cell towers for 5G and 6G are elemental to dual-use technology and weapons systems (Oller, Broudy, & Santiago, 2025). Is it merely coincidental that the large scale construction of the 5G towers went into high gear around the globe in 2019 (Wikipedia, 2026a) just about the time of the announced beginning of the COVID-19 “pandemic” according to the World Health Organization (Ghebreyesus, 2020)?

Leading up to the COVID-19 era, the pharmaceutically influenced media and captured government institutions (especially the US CDC and FDA) drew attention to the work of Karikó-Weissman with the N1-methylpseudouridine (Ψ) modifications in the RNA supposedly coding for the “SARS-CoV-2 spike protein” purportedly¹ causing the fear-inducing “SARS-CoV-2” disease (2005). There was a considerable expenditure by the US Department of Defense in the work of Nance and Meier (2021) evidently aiming to promote the notion that certain lipid-nanoparticles containing synthetic nanotech coding for manufactured “messenger RNA” could save the world from the pandemic. It was to be focused on the supposedly deadly part of the alleged SARS-CoV-2 agent known as “spike protein” and would disable it, according to the authorities, by commandeering the ribosomal factories of nucleated cells in the bodies of recipients of the shots causing them to produce billions of replicas of at least part of the targeted (supposedly disease-causing) spike protein so that

¹ Hedge-words seem essential here because, from Segalla’s work especially, and that of not just a few others (e.g., Michels et al., 2023), it is obvious — by virtue of the published empirical evidence and in the observable damage done to human beings still being systematically and deliberately kept out of the “approved mainstream medical/pharmaceutical narrative — that the general public were, and still are, being deceived about the COVID-19 injectables. This communication practice has prevailed among the major manufacturers, in published reports often presented by officials such as former President Joe Biden, the talking heads (news stars) commissioned by corporate media, and authors such as Sohn et al. (2026) conducting research, for example, on behalf of Moderna. Six years into the COVID story, what precisely can the public trust concerning the plans, policies, products, mandates, directives, and claims being made in media and in captured journals to continue propagating the medical/pharmaceutical industry? With the continued propagation of easily identifiable half-truths and deceptions, the industry itself, vast as it is, has undermined the unquestioning trust it once enjoyed from the general public.

components of the virus would subsequently be attacked and destroyed by the body's immune defenses. Later, it was also alleged that all the various mutant forms of the SARS-CoV-2 virus supposedly dependent on spike protein would be disabled in what seemed to be an unending series of additional doses and boosters. The initializing nanotechnology was lauded by Nance and Meier as

a public health breakthrough, providing the first protective measures against the largest global pandemic to strike in over 100 years, . . . akin in scope and urgency to the famed Manhattan Project [2021, p. 748].

However, the touted breakthrough of the COVID-19 era, depended on a “cloaking” disguise for the genetically engineered synthetic mRNA so it could evade immune defense systems and escape natural deconstruction. Now we know without any question that the promoters of the Pfizer and Moderna nanotech products, not to mention other products added later on, again and again misrepresented their products in the captured media owned by the medical pharmaceutical hegemony. They said the injectables would prevent disease and save lives. The fruits of the concoctions, however, were altogether contrary to those claims (Beattie, 2021, 2022; Santiago & Oller, 2023; Boros et al., 2024; Kyriakopoulos, et al., 2024; Kyriakopoulos, Nigh, et al., 2024; Santiago, 2024; Mead, Seneff, Rose, et al., 2024; Mead, Seneff, Wolfinger, et al., 2024; Lataster, 2026). The COVID injectables have not only been shown to be incredibly toxic and harmful from the outset — as shown by Segalla (2023a, 2023b, 2024, 2026; also Michels et al., 2023) in documents published by Pfizer — but, as if the false claims of the manufacturers about “safety and efficacy”, etc., were not already damning enough, Sohn et al. (2026), a group of paid Moderna “researchers” publishing in the pharma owned ScienceDirect journal *Vaccine*, against all the independently amassed evidence now available, are still claiming that the COVID-19 products performed as advertised:

the evidence supports the safety and effectiveness of mRNA COVID-19 vaccines. Ongoing surveillance and rigorous evaluation remain essential to inform public health policy. Importantly, vaccine safety questions should be assessed using transparent, structured frameworks that systematically weigh benefits, harms, quality of evidence, values, and feasibility [2026, p. 128393].

Meanwhile, whatever nanotechnology is contained in those products now has access to the biological environment consisting of about 5.2 billion bodies (Pharmaceutical Technology, 2024) within which to work its plan transmogrified by the Department of Defense and DARPA to effect a form of clandestine warfare. It is a plan in which the brains of recipients become the present-day battlefield. Whatever synthetic products are being produced by the programmed nanosystems are now being carried out quite independently of the native biosignaling systems of the living hosts. Has the global COVID-19 experiment provided the biological basis for implementing the plainly stated purposes of DARPA, and other government agencies, to invade the “hackable animal” (Harari 2020) with nanotech — programmable materials that can be migrated to brains via electromagnetic fields to achieve “mind control,” or to enable the production of pain sufficient to subdue people by force (Giordano, 2018a, 2018b, 2022, 2023, 2024a, 2024b, 2026)? Some plausible answers to these questions appear readily available in a reading of the ambitious objectives explained in 2026 by Giordano:

The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)'s Next-Generation Nonsurgical Neurotechnology (N3) project is an ambitious initiative aiming to develop vast array of nanoscalar

sensing and transmitting brain-computational interfaces (BCIs). . . . introducing the nanomaterials via intranasally, intravenously and/or intraorally, and using electromagnetic fields to migrate the units to their distribution within the brain. . . . The system . . . takes on deeper implications when the sensing and transmitting dynamics involve “reading from” and “writing into” brain processes of cognition, emotions and behavior. . . . its dual-use is obvious. Yes, Pandora, this jar’s been opened. If we consider the sum-totaled operations of the embodied brain to be “mind”, and N3-type tech is aimed at remotely sensing and modulating these operations, then it doesn’t require much of a stretch to recognize that this is fundamentally “mind reading” and “mind control” . . . [n.d. viewed June 12, 2026].

Crucially, invasive architectures are no longer limited to commandeering natural or native biological processes nor are their malignant intentions limited to attacks on the central nervous system. Recent breakthroughs in artificial intelligence and generative modeling now enable petascale synthesis — that is, at rates of at least 1 quadrillion (10^{15}) computational operations per second in engineered synthetic DNA materials (Weinstein et al., 2026). Furthermore, the delivery envelopes similar to the lipid nano-particles of the COVID-19 concoctions protecting these synthetic structures from destruction by the body’s immune defense systems are supposedly designed by artificial intelligence (AI). The purported aim, promoted in the mainstream media, whether achievable or not with great precision, and whether the public narrative about that aim was true or not, was supposed to target *in vivo* particular entities (Su et al., 2026) such as the ribosomes commandeered to produce some portion of spike protein with the COVID-19 concoctions, or tissues such as brain neurons in the DARPA biowarfare of what Giordano called “Pandora’s jar”.

The worldwide industrialization of rapidly advancing nanotechnology has been a matter of corporate intent for over a decade, evidenced by pharmaceutical giants like Pfizer investing heavily in programmable, logic-gated DNA nanorobots as early as 2015. Even before that the IEEE had already begun publishing standards on February 29, 2012 for “Wireless Body Area Networks”:

Short-range, wireless communications in the vicinity of, or inside, a human body (but not limited to humans) are specified in this standard. It uses existing industrial scientific medical (ISM) bands as well as frequency bands approved by national medical and/or regulatory authorities. Support for quality of service (QoS), extremely low power, and data rates up to 10 Mbps is required while simultaneously complying with strict non-interference guidelines where needed. This standard considers effects on portable antennas due to the presence of a person (varying with male, female, skinny, heavy, etc.), radiation pattern shaping to minimize the specific absorption rate (SAR) into the body, and changes in characteristics as a result of the user motions [IEEE, 2012, p. 4 of 271].

It is worth noting that the PDF document available to qualified users from IEEE is quite detailed with many technical specifications, diagrams, etc. Then, as early as 2015, IEEE issued a standard of “Recommended Practice for Nanoscale and Molecular Communication Framework” summarized as follows:

A definition, terminology, conceptual model, and standard metrics for *ad hoc* network communication at the nanoscale are provided. Human-engineered networking is extended by the physical properties of nanoscale communication in ways beyond that defined in existing communication standards. These include *in vivo*, sub-cellular medical communication, smart

materials and sensing at the molecular level, and the ability to operate in environments that would be too harsh for macroscale communication mechanisms to operate. Collaboration among a highly diverse set of disciplines with differing definitions and connotations for some terms is required by nanoscale communication, thus a common terminology is necessary in order to aid inter-discipline collaboration. A common framework for thinking abstractly about nanoscale communication can aid in defining and relating research and development effort. Components of the framework are independent enough to allow them to be developed in relative isolation, yet the components are also interoperable [IEEE, 2015, p. 3 of 64].

As a result of the 21st century paradigm-shift, now underway, as documented in this paper, nucleic acids are transformed from passive information carriers into active, self-assembling materials, producers of nanorobotic systems and vast synthetic networks. Sanitized for public consumption, these industrial developments have been framed as medical advances for the greater good of mankind in spite of their terrifyingly real potential for the causation of disorders, disease, and death on a massive scale as iterated by Giordano in the ongoing DARPA “Next-Generation Nonsurgical Neurotechnology (N3) project”. Whereas Nance and Meier, and their uncountably many mainstream successors promoted the theme of modified synthetic RNA as the key element in the COVID-19 experiments, **synthetic DNA** is known to be more stable and easier to manage. Moreover, among the components discovered in the COVID-19 formulations are billions of synthetic DNA molecules that proponents of the injectables have dismissed as manufacturing residue. However, it is important to take into account that DNA is a great deal more stable and more manipulable in nanotechnology than synthetic RNA:

DNA has the most predictable and programmable interactions of any natural or synthetic molecule. It possesses remarkable binding specificity and thermodynamic stability and can be created with a nearly infinite choice of sequences that bind reliably to their complementary partners. It is structurally well defined on the nanometer scale and has a persistence length of ~ 50 nm under conventional conditions. It can be rapidly synthesized and modified using automated methods, and a large variety of DNA-acting enzymes can controllably further tune and modify its structure [Seeman & Sleiman, 2017, p. 1].

A Hierarchy of Scales with Nanotechnology at Its Foundation

The new science of nucleic nanotechnology (He et al., 2017) has evolved so that it is possible to begin with nanostructures of great intricacy and complexity that have been engineered to build themselves (self-assembly) and replicate exponentially (self-replication). At the nanoscale the synthetic entities that contain the coding and construction orders for the higher levels are undetectable. Once inside the living person, some of these synthetic programmed devices can cross every natural biological barrier in the body before they begin to self-assemble into entities of higher scales. They scale upward as suggested in Table 1 from entities at Levels 1 and 2 that are about a million times too small to be detected by any ordinary light microscope. Progressing upward through Levels 3 and 4, it is possible to arrive at Level 5 where entities the size of the monstrous, deadly, and hideous “white clots” being pulled out of cadavers that have been found by embalmers all over the world (ClarkCountyToday.com, 2022; Santiago & Oller, 2023; Kasner, 2024; Hulscher, 2026).

Table 1

The Hierarchical Classification of Synthetic Assemblies Beginning with Nanotechnology

Level	Classification	Size Scale & Observational Modality	Description & Structural Characteristics
Level 1	Sub-Nanoscale Precursors & Monomers	Angstroms to < 2 nm (invisible to standard microscopy)	The foundational raw molecular building blocks. Includes mineral atoms, toxin atoms, amino acids, small synthetic DNA and RNA molecules, synthetic nucleotides, and incipient DNA-origami crystals (Douglas, Bachelet, & Church, 2012).
Level 2	Nanoscale Metamaterials & Nanoparticles	Several nm to tens of nm (requiring Scanning Electron Microscopy or Atomic Force Microscopy)	Foundational structural components and dopants that modify the physical, chemical, electronic, optical, or biological properties of the DNA and RNA origami structures, structural scaffolding, nanoparticles (metallic, lanthanides, superparamagnetic iron oxide nanoparticles SPIONs, lipid nanoparticles, small hydrogels, and large protein molecules.
Level 3	Functional Nanorobots & Complex Tiles	Tens to hundreds of nm (requiring Scanning Electron Microscopy or Atomic Force Microscopy)	Very small, engineered functional structures. Specifically includes DNA-origami nanorobots defined by their capacity for active, triggered mechanical actions (e.g., using chemical logic-gates or external electromagnetic signals to open “box lids” and release payloads), larger hydrogel matrices, and self-assembling “tiles.”
Level 4	Micro-Scale Architectures & Protocells	Microns to hundreds of microns (visible with optical microscopy)	Includes rigid, geometric self-assemblies (filaments, tubes, ribbons) that frequently mimic biological parasites, alongside “soft” structures like liposome membranes, cell-scale containers, and small prototissues. When viewed developing from vial matter, these are observed actively during their stage of self-assembly. When viewed floating in bodily fluids, they have already self-assembled into their final morphological shape.
Level 5	Macro-Structures (“White Clots”)	Millimeters to > 1 meter (easily visible to the naked eye)	The ultimate physical accumulation extracted from vasculature. These are bulky, meat-like structures and large proto-tissues. While easily visible to the naked eye, optical microscopy reveals they are woven from elements of the preceding levels, often visible as striations.

Similar entities and the seeds for them have been found in living persons (Lyons-Weiler, 2023; Kell & Pretorius, 2024). DNA origami is a groundbreaking nanotechnology where long, single-stranded DNA molecules are folded into complex, custom 2D and 3D shapes using shorter “staple” strands. This programmable folding allows scientists to create nanoscale building blocks that can serve as scaffolding and containers for incorporating other material and molecules for creating biosensors, and drug-delivery vehicles (Ishida et al., 2025) of which Table 1 summarizes the hierarchy of scales. In brief, it shows the hierarchical classification of entities which scales upward from Level 1, where the building blocks consist of atoms in the less-than-150-picometer-range up to 2,000 picometers, or 2 nanometers. In the synthetic COVID-19 concoctions entities at that level would include the highly toxic electromagnetic or light frequency up-converting lanthanides discovered in the COVID-19 products by Diblasi et al. (2024). Distances at the atomic level within molecular structures are measured in picometers or ångströms (Å) — where 1 picometer is one thousandth of a nanometer or 100 ångströms (Å). Additional building blocks found in the Level 1 range are amino acids of which the smallest is glycine with a Van der Waals diameter at ~ 300 picometers, about the same size as a single molecule of H₂O in bulk water. The aminos that serve as building blocks for synthetic proteins, fragments of which are generally called “peptides”, may consist of rather long strings of amino acid residues built up under the strict sequencing required by synthetic DNA and/or RNA molecules.

To get into the range of a protein like, say, hemoglobin with a maximum Van-der-Waals length of about 5,500 picometers (or 5.5 nanometers) consisting of a string of 141 to 146 amino acids, we must graduate up to Level 2. The hemoglobin protein, to use an important and fairly well-known example, is a great deal larger than its amino acid components which are considerably larger than their atomic building blocks. Specifying the order and arrangement of the building blocks in any given protein (allegedly, according to “old-school” biology) requires a still more complex and larger molecule consisting of RNA, estimated at up to 50 nanometers in length (although its width is considerably smaller). Similarly, given that the RNA molecule in native biology is (allegedly) scaled down from a much larger and more complex structure in a DNA gene sequence with a diameter at approximately 2 nanometers and a length up to about 750 nanometers.

Therefore, when we come to synthetic DNA origami molecules — ones that are intricately designed planar “breadboards” (something like highly sophisticated and dynamic templates that build the products they specify) in the synthetic realm of nanotechnology — we might seem to be moving in the wrong direction, i.e., from large to small, because the synthetic RNA molecule is smaller than its corresponding DNA, and larger than its protein product. However, the fact that the synthetic coding molecules, the breadboards of synthetic DNA, are loaded with dynamic and actively functional information, enable the production of many exemplars of any protein products moving us quickly from Level 2 to Level 3 on the scale of Table 1. It should also be noted that even though the basic synthetic-DNA breadboard molecules are very small, engineers can pin into them nano-electronic components and devices with sub-nanometer precision which allows for the design and development of elaborate and yet very precise electronic circuits.

Then at Level 4, we come to entities of sufficient magnitude in the micron range that can be visible under the sort of microscope shown in Figures 1 and 2. Here is where forensic microscopy informs us of the amazing diversity of self-assembling entities that have been found both developing from

vials of COVID-19 liquids and in the bodily fluids of recipients and people who have been in proximity to those recipients of the COVID-19 concoctions (Y. M. Lee, Park & Jeon, 2022). In this paper we only provide a few illustrative micrographs but many thousands are accessible on the internet and other authors (see Hughes, 2022; Lee & Broudy, 2024; also Nixon et al., 2022) have provided comprehensive longitudinal evidence of the toxicity and lethality to bodily cells of the self-assembling entities.

At Level 5, in addition to all the smaller-scale entities already noted, we come to the grand scale of the polymerized elements found in cadavers and also in living recipients of the COVID-19 synthetic contagion that is manifested in the revolutive “white clots” shown below in Figure 3.

It is important to bear in mind and can hardly be over-emphasized, however, that all the structures that are possible in the hierarchy of DNA and RNA constructions begin at the nanoscale. Therefore, it is not only reasonable, but it is necessary, to recognize the entire hierarchy of entities as the products of nanotechnology. What is more, these are not hypothetical entities. They are real and cannot be lightly dismissed, as Ulrich (2024) suggested, as natural products “lipids on the loose”. To propose such an oversimplification requires an at least subconscious denial of the advances in materials science documented in IEEE standards for small, medium, and large IoBNT (internet of bio/nano things) BANs (body area networks) and IoB (internet of bodies), as well as DARPA’s published statements about the brain as the current battlefield of the world, along with a great deal of other scientific literature referenced in this paper and in ones cited in those references.

For rational skeptics who may doubt that the technologies discussed in this paper are already operational, there are multiple examples over the last seven decades illustrating the lag of about 5 to 30 (or more) years between secret government research and development projects and their subsequent revelation to the general public: (1) the theoretical basis for the Manhattan Project and the development of nuclear bombs was evidently known to Bohr in 1938 and also probably much earlier to Einstein but did not come into the public view until the Trinity test July 16, 1945, at least seven years later (Manhattan Project, 2024); (2) the U2 reconnaissance aircraft developed in the mid 1950s became known to the public in 1960 (Ellis, 2025); (3) classified research and development of the B2 stealth bomber as well as SR-71/A-12 (Oxcart) and the Have Blue/F-117 preceded their public acknowledgment by about 10 to 25 years (DARPA, 2020); and (4) the availability of GPS, now commonplace in our cars, cell phones, and everywhere was developed by research dating back to about 1960 but did not come into widespread public use until the 1990s, about 30 years later




Figure 1. The Neogenesis Systems Dark-field/Brightfield Optical Microscope shown in darkfield mode, with digital camera and computer interface.

(Wikipedia, 2026). All of these, like the pandemic known as COVID-19 (Willis, 2020; Icke, 2020), were all extant realities long before they were even whispered to the general public.

Forensic Microscopy & Synthetic Infiltrates from COVID-19 Injectables

Beyond theoretical models and independent chemical analyses, original forensic microscopy of both raw injectable vials and live peripheral human blood samples (and other bodily fluids) has documented the real-time formation and systemic infiltration of the nanotechnology structures. For instance, Lee, Park & Jeon (2022) showed side-by-side micrographs demonstrating the virtual identity of entities found in the vials of COVID-19 injectable liquids and also in the centrifuged blood plasma of recipients of those concoctions. Since then, forensic microscopy has been extensively applied by multiple researchers confirming the findings of Lee et al. For instance, see Hughes (2022), Lee and Broudy (2024a, 2024b), and Yanowitz (2023a, 2023b).

The Neogenesis Systems Darkfield/Brightfield Optical Microscope, pictured in Figure 1 and functionally described in **Error! Reference source not found.**, coupled with a 3.3X secondary cropping magnification for the digital camera interface), the optical image is projected onto a 1/2.6-inch (diagonal) 4K sensor. Beyond this optical baseline, the final apparent magnification is highly dependent on the display medium. For instance, displaying the 1/2.6-inch sensor capture on a standard 8-inch diagonal computer screen introduces an additional digital magnification factor of 20.8 (calculated as 8 inches multiplied by 2.6). Therefore, a 20X objective yields an equivalent total on-screen magnification of approximately 1,373X ($20 \times 3.3 \times 20.8$), when presented on an 8-inch screen. Many computer systems employ even larger, 27-inch screens. As a general rule, the objective magnification is effectively multiplied by a factor of 50 to 100 depending on the final display-size, meaning a 10X objective easily produces a 1,000X final magnification when viewed on large monitors. Crucially, because the camera (Figure 1 **Error! Reference source not found.**) captures in native 4K resolution — readily reduced by software to standard HD resolution of 1920 X 1080 pixels — the immense digital scaling remains smooth and free of pixelation in the final image.

Brightfield microscopy uses light from the source that is focused, as a cone (Figure 2), on the specimen by a condenser lens that is part of the light path. The condenser lens focuses the light on the specimen from below. The refracted light passes through the specimen and is collected by the microscope objective to create a low-contrast image of the specimen on a bright background. In




Figure 2. Brightfield versus darkfield microscopy.

darkfield, a central stop is placed in the path of the light to block the central light such that only perimeter light from the source is focused obliquely on the sample, as a hollow cone. This oblique light (coming from the edges in the specimen) is scattered upwards by said edges in the specimen toward the objective, collecting only this scattered light, to yield a high contrast, bright image, enhancing the edges in the specimen on a dark background. Thus, the darkfield image can be thought of as a 2D derivative of the brightfield image.

While optical microscopy provides undeniable morphological evidence of self-assembly, it cannot determine the elemental or molecular composition of the emergent observed structures. To get down to the atomic size described in Table 1 as Level 1 of the nano, researchers must rely on advanced equipment, such as Inductively Coupled Plasma – Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS). However, even that equipment cannot easily detect the presence of complex chemical compounds or biochemical materials such as specific proteins, etc. To assess chemical conjugates and complex molecular structures additional equipment, all of which is costly, is needed. Unfortunately, access to such advanced equipment is restricted not only by costs but also by the maintenance of regulatory opacity, secret contracting, and deliberate withholding of access to thoroughly independent researchers even if they are able and willing to pay for the use of the equipment.

Although Diblasi et al. successfully used ICP-MS to identify many undeclared chemical elements — such as optogenetic lanthanides and heavy metals — within the vials of COVID-19 injectables they processed, mass-spectrometry cannot be used to identify complex chemical compounds of arbitrary constituents and sizes. Consequently, the morphological interpretation of the optical images presented below relies on correlating our own visual findings using microscopy with the elemental data from Diblasi et al., assisted as well by direct



Figure 3. A long “white clot” that extracted from the vascular system of a cadaver by an embalmer.




Figure 4. Part of a nanotechnology structure in a blood sample taken from a finger-prick drop of blood of an unjabbed volunteer. The structure is a razor-sharp ribbon that is a few hundreds of micrometres long, folded over itself.

visual comparisons to diagrams, other microscopic images, and self-assembly behaviors documented extensively in the advanced materials science literature (e.g., Saeki et al., 2014).

As we noted above in reference to Table 1, when nanotechnology is scaled up to Level 5, structures such as the “white clots” seen in Figure 3 are produced and are easily visible to the naked eye. The expected trauma and leftover debris attributable to laceration of the endothelial linings of blood vessels by the razor-sharp ribbon-like entities — such as the one shown in Figure 4 which is similar to ribbons developing in the Pfizer product as shown in Figure 5 and Figure 6 — is confirmed by embalmers extracting the “white clots” illustrated in Figure 3. They consistently report that the anomalous “white clots” adhere tenaciously to the inner vascular walls, making them exceptionally difficult to pull out intact (O’Looney et al., 2022, 2025; Trigoso, 2022; Clark County Today.com, 2022; Zee et al., 2024; Kasner, 2024).

Structures similar to the ribbon in Figure 4 that have been found circulating freely or stuck in capillaries within the human vascular system have been discussed previously by M. Lee et al. (2022), and in the *Journal of Biomedical Research & Environmental Sciences* by Jeon et al. (2023). Yanowitz first discussed the facts at issue in 2023a and his work has been done in parallel with that of other microscopists and researchers as described by Y. M. Lee



Figure 5. A synthetic structure, resembling a “parasite” that self-assembled on a glass-slide with some fluid from a Pfizer vial placed there and located under a coverslip.




Figure 6. Both a) and b) are very large “ribbon” type structures that self-assembled on the glass-slide of the microscope from a drop of Pfizer vial matter with a coverslip on top, restricting the height and causing the structures to fold over themselves.

and Broudy (2024a) and by Hughes (2022). They described physical shapes, patterns, and geometries of nanomaterials, including those that can cause mechanical damage by puncturing, abrading, or lacerating tissues such as blood vessels, organs, or tendons. Donaldson et al. (2010) focused on how the physical properties of carbon nanotubes and asbestos — such as their long, thin, and needle-like

geometries — can lead to retention and inflammation in the lungs. Their research showed that the sharpness and length of nanofibers can cause physical harm to internal organs. Lee and Broudy (2024a) documented “real-time self-assembly” of “stereomicroscopically visible artificial constructions” in incubated samples of synthetic mRNA injectable fluids. They described geometric shapes, including “rectangular”, “square”, and “ribbon-like” rigid entities with sharp-edges. Campa (2021) detected graphene two-dimensional, sheet-like structures with razor-sharp edges that certainly have the potential to mechanically disrupt cell membranes. Therefore, taking all the forensic evidence from these independent researchers — which it should be emphasized unlike the marketers representing the COVID-19 manufacturers whose livelihood and employment depend on their support for their employer/funder’s products, stand to gain only institutional opprobrium by challenging the mainstream medical/pharmaceutical hegemony — it is a virtual certainty at this point in history that the abnormal proteinaceous structures are, in fact, direct sequelae of the synthetic contagion attributable to the worldwide distribution of the COVID-19 injectables (Santiago & Oller, 2023; McCairn et al., 2025; McMillan et al., 2025; Westman et al., 2025; Hulscher, 2026).

Furthermore, direct visual evidence has captured massive, synthetic cell-scale containers engaged in cell-free protein synthesis directly within the fluid matrix of the vials, functionally mimicking living biological cells as seen in Figure 5. It is noteworthy that the image of the wormlike structure pictured there shows coarse vial particles all over the glass slide except near the parasite-like entity which has a clean void around it. It appears that it has gathered up whatever material formerly surrounded it, perhaps in order to use it up in assembling itself. At any rate, there seems to be an empty void in the vicinity of the wormlike entity.

Similar structures also appear in Figure 6a and Figure 6b and do not remain localized. They have been documented (as already assembled entities) not only in the blood, but systemically infiltrating seminal fluid (Lee & Broudy, 2024a) and the highly conductive, ion-rich environment of the blood plasma (Lee, Park, & Jeon, 2022), as well as cerebrospinal fluid (see a video of foreign matter similar to the ribbon-like structures in Figures 3 and 4 in Yanowitz’s own spinal fluid [here](#)).

The Biological and Medical Blind Spot

Confronted with the ongoing and still compounding reality of macroscopic geometric lattices, undeclared optogenetic lanthanides (see Diblasi et al., 2024), and real-time live-blood observations of massive synthetic cell-scale containers such as the ones seen here in Figure 5, Figure 6a and Figure 6b, a critical question comes to mind: Why has the global medical establishment remained oblivious to the evident worldwide infiltration of harmful nanotechnology into human bodies that is now impacting billions of people?

It appears that the current health crisis is hiding in plain sight because of a “biological blind spot” while the attention of the medical profession is directed elsewhere. It is as if the Department of Defense and other government agencies of the world were a like a clever magician using one hand to shine a spotlight on Karikó-Weissman’s N1-methylpseudouridine (Ψ) modifications, announced with trumpets blaring and fireworks by Nance and Meier (2021) that they are commandeering natural biological systems, while with the other hand the magician shields from view the whole

history of IEEE advances and their corresponding infrastructure in synthetic biology and the plethora of scientific literature describing DNA nanotechnologies that completely bypass any need to make use of the body's native biosignaling systems. In fact, the synthetic nanotechnologies systematically bypass the native systems and hide from the body's natural defense systems. Nonetheless, traditional medical clinicians, virologists, and researchers, based on their concern for natural physiological threats seem to take no account of the engineered, non-biological, pathogenic nanotechnology that seems to have been introduced right in front of them in the COVID-19 injectables. In fact, many of the mainstream marketeers representing themselves as researchers have continued to publish false praise of their own COVID-19 products in prestige journals owned by the medical/pharmaceutical manufacturers of the injectables. For instance, Sohn, et al. (2026) are still saying that the "safe and effective" COVID-19 concoctions did what they were advertised to do, preventing contagion and saving lives. Meanwhile, independent researchers examining the facts have reached a diametrically opposed conclusion: the COVID-19 injectables have only done harm and have increased all-cause mortality commensurate with the extent of their distribution to the people in countries throughout the world.

It seems that the mainstream medical professionals are being encouraged to keep on thinking in terms of classical virology, or idiopathic biological malfunctions of native biosignaling systems of the body. Consequently, they erroneously identify the current global malaise in millions of people, along with far more unexplainable sudden deaths than have ever been witnessed in the past (Dowd et al., 2024), not to mention the huge increase in numbers of demented people on the streets walking into traffic gesticulating violently with curses, or sitting like zombies talking to themselves by the roadside, as new forms of anxiety or possible rare "viral variants of COVID-19", extreme instances of "long-COVID", or with spontaneously emergent new "autoimmune" diseases. In some cases, as with the "mysteries" of autism (Children's Health Defense Team, 2019), physicians have even blamed the patients — "oh, you're just over-stressed and may need to see a psychiatrist who can prescribe anti-anxiety or anti-hallucinatory medications".

The traditional view of natural nucleic acids that are native to human bodies, completely, or so it seems, occludes the synthetic nucleic nanotechnology already engineered and injected into billions of people worldwide. The present-day materials science is already employing engineered synthetic DNA molecules aptly termed "non-genetic DNAs" that are designed to function as programmable computing architecture and molecular baits ("Non-genetic DNAs . . .," 2026) — such "baits" consist of short, programmable DNAs designed to couple other materials and together and to recruit and bind specific proteins inside cells to "bait" and capture targeted proteins. Their potential for good and bad purposes, both in the healing arts of medicine and the destroying powers of warfare, are limited only by the extent to which their real effects once inside the bodies of living persons can be controlled. As Giordano pointed out in his authoritative 2018b talk at West Point, near the end of that more-than-two-hour-long presentation, military applications targeting the brain or other organ systems don't have to be very accurate to cause debilitating and potentially lethal consequences in the form of tissue and organ damage. It is only in the domain of healing applications where the accuracy of targeting is critical as pointed out by Butnaru and Chapman (2019). Bombs, hand grenades, generalized poisons, and magnetic disruptors migrated to the brains

of human beings don't need very precise targeting as Giordano 2018b acknowledged repeatedly in his talk at West Point.

The very real “blind spot” which probably impacts mostly well-meaning medical professionals has the effect of hiding the extant impact of the COVID-19 technologies on billions of people. At the same time, ordinary desperate patients eager to find help and hopeful for some effective “recovery protocol” seem to be trying many approaches that cannot even detect, much less dismantle and expunge, any of the synthetic entities of the nanotechnology hierarchy shown in Table 1. Yet it seems that it is the global impact of such technologies is the prevailing force in the present-day challenge to traditional medical science. Those patients feeling most desperate and abandoned by the medical community are turning in record numbers to suicide (Kikuchi et al., 2023; Bouza et al., 2023; and de la Torre-Luque, 2023). Witness the recent well-documented case of the French biostatistician and whistleblower about the deceptions of Pfizer's widely distributed COVID-19 injectable known as “Comirnaty”, Christine Cotton, who announced why she felt compelled in despair to take her own life. She just could not see any end to the interminable misery from unknown causes that befell her after she initiated her insider campaign against the synthetic mRNA Pfizer concoctions (Leake, 2025).

Cell-Free Protein Synthesis (CFPS)

In today's bioengineering science, contrary to popular medical doctrine and traditional old-school training, protein generation is not dependent on hijacking living host cellular machinery. Proteins can be synthesized predictably, reliably, and in massive quantities through cell-free protein synthesis (CFPS) systems (Silverman et al., 2020). Foundational research demonstrates exactly how to extract and prepare highly simplified, crude cellular lysates to drive potent CFPS entirely outside of the body's native cells (Gregorio et al., 2019). Consequently, the biological machinery driving industrial CFPS is rarely derived from human cells. Instead, the manufacturing process uses cellular lysates (extracts) harvested from bacteria, fungi, or other non-human organisms. The favorite among those is the *E. coli* bacterium, whose lysates are found in the COVID-19 products (Speicher et al., 2025; and Kaiser et al., 2025). Some trade secrets still apply to this process, which is also used to synthesize therapeutic proteins, such as insulin, for example in manufacturer's labs, more than a decade ago, bioengineers successfully demonstrated that CFPS machinery can be miniaturized, compartmentalized, and packaged into semipermeable microcapsules for injection as illustrated in Figure 7. Employing microfluidics, researchers encapsulated template DNA and translational bacterial enzymes into uniform, cell-sized microcapsules (approximately 25 to 50 micrometers in diameter of the sort seen in Figure 8) featuring semipermeable poly-ion complex membranes composed of polyethyleneimine-coated alginate (Saeki et al., 2014). Figure 7 gives a step-by-step view of the process.

At Stage 1, lysate translation machinery is harvested from source organisms, e.g., a bacterium such as *E. coli*, or some fungus. Then, at Stage 2, the extracted lysates are mixed with a template DNA platform, energy producing adenosine-triphosphate (ATP), and amino acids *in vitro*. The next step at Stage 3 is to put the mixture into microcapsules which are at Stage 4 infiltrated into bodily blood and tissues where they work like a semipermeable diffusion bioreactor taking nutrients from the body and outputting synthetic proteins and toxins to do whatever work they may be designed for. Again,




Figure 7. An illustration depicting the transfer of CFPS manufacturing from the lab to a microcapsule. This manufacturing process tends to produce tear-shaped microcapsules (or “protocells”). See Saeki et al. (2014).

we must bear in mind the caveat that military harm does not require very precise targeting to send the synthetic proteins and toxins to particular cells or tissues, whereas healing purposes demand precision per remarks by Butnaru and Chapman (2019).

The morphological presence and functional capacity of such cell-sized CFPS capsules has been extensively documented and analyzed (Yanowitz, 2023b).

The semipermeable nature of their outer membranes allows raw biological substrates (such as ambient amino acids and ATP) from the host environment to continuously diffuse inward to fuel the reaction, while specific synthesized proteins, toxins, and byproducts are secreted into the host (see Figure 7). It is also a well-researched fact that the permeability of artificial CFPS or native cell membranes can be dynamically modulated by external electromagnetic force-fields and pulses (Kuo




Figure 8. A very large (about 75 micrometers) spherical shaped, compartmentalized, cell-sized capsule (“protocell” including a smaller rectangular compartment potentially containing meta-DNA) — encapsulated in a lipid bilayer straight from a Pfizer vial that was present beforehand or was self-assembled upon thawing of the cryogenically-frozen Pfizer liquid.

& Chen, 2010; Angelova et al., 2025; Agrawal & Khurana, 2026) which have special importance in militarized applications as noted by Giordano in various contexts (also Oller, Santiago, & Broudy, 2025).

The microscopic images of Figure 9, where b, c, and d have something like the expected teardrop shape of CFPS produced microcapsules, may actually be examples of the sort of products detailed in Figure 7. It seems that the ongoing secretions of CFPS-generated proteins, recall the “molecular bait” constructs that provide the substrate for DNA-guided protein polymerization (McMillan et al., 2018; Hundt et al., 2022).




Figure 9. a) Protocells that look like CFPS cells floating in a drop of a Pfizer vial under a coverslip. Under larger magnification some cells (see b, c, d) look like teardrop-shaped CFPS cells as shown by Saeki et al. (2014), whereas a larger protocell (see e) looks different and could be an entirely different kind of protocell, as discussed later in the paper.

We assert that such DNA-guided protein polymerization is the most plausible underlying cause of the “white clots” (see Figure 3 above). We suggest that such long protein polymers are just the result of synthetic DNA as well as RNA.

Synthetic DNA has been stripped of its natural biosignaling role and has been transformed by artful engineering into a programmable macroscopic building block that can serve as an engineered “meta-DNA” structure (Yao et al., 2020) working in continuous single-stranded origami frameworks (Han et al., 2017). Nearly the whole of the mainstream medical profession, it would seem, and many researchers working with funding in the mainstream context, are operating under severe constraints that are often deeply concealed in the background but nevertheless rigidly enforced to restrict published outcomes to ones that are favorable to the goals of the manufacturers of vaccines. It seems that many of them have been lured into thinking only in terms of Ψ -modified RNA while independent forensic analysts have been uncovering vast, undeclared concentrations of plasmid

DNA and even the allegedly cancer producing “SV40 promoter-enhancer” sequence in the synthetic mRNA coding for spike protein (Speicher et al., 2025). Broudy and Ueda (2026a; 2026b) discuss in detail the organized “bait and switch” approach that seems to have deceived the greater part of the healthcare professions and, by extension, has greatly impacted the general public. Applied to the nanotechnology in the injectables — people expected some forthright answers about the toxicity of the injectables, but, according to Broudy and Ueda, received a fake “‘contaminant’ [reclassified] as an undeclared biologically active component”. In the meantime, manufacturers and regulatory bodies have dismissed the presence of as many as “ 1.23×10^8 to 1.60×10^{11} plasmid DNA fragments per dose encapsulated in lipid nanoparticles (although we have yet to see electron microscopy images of that) designating them as merely “manufacturing impurities”, or possibly residual templates left over from production filtration failures (Kaiser, 2025). We believe and assert that the extensive literature on synthetic meta-DNA and self-assembling nanotechnology vaporizes any reasonable confidence in such a benign explanation.

Designing Synthetic DNA and RNA to Evade Host Clearance Systems

To achieve the hierarchical growth detailed above in Table 1, the initial nanostructures must survive the hostile, nuclease-rich environment of the human body. For that reason, a highly sophisticated suite of stealth and even fortification technologies have been developed. The integration of chemically modified nucleotides into DNA strand displacement reactions is a fundamental, recognized prerequisite for operating DNA nanotechnology inside living systems (Kabza et al., 2022). Structural insights confirm that specific nucleobase modifications are explicitly engineered to prevent enzymatic degradation by host nucleases, artificially enhancing the extreme thermodynamic stability required for precise geometric folding (Hottin & Marx, 2016).

To enhance biostability of synthetic nanotechnology entities in the hostile environment of natural physiological fluids, synthetic oligonucleotides and their lipid delivery vehicles are frequently conjugated with polyethylene glycol (PEG). This pegylation creates a dense, synthetic hydration layer that sterically hinders nuclease access, effectively rendering the nanostructures invisible to the body’s primary clearance defenses and significantly prolonging their lifespan in circulating blood and lymph (Roberts et al., 2020). The process of PEGylation is itself notoriously cytotoxic and genotoxic (Segalla, 2023a, 2023b, 2024, 2026) as are the other stealth measures associated with the COVID-19 concoctions including the lipid nanoparticle envelopes that supposedly contain all the payloads. The biotechnology industry is acutely aware that standard synthetic nanoparticles are inherently and violently inflammatory, which should trigger rapid immune destruction (Ndeupen et al., 2021). To circumvent this, the delivery envelopes are engineered with highly specific “anti-inflammatory lipids” that actively suppress and paralyze the host’s innate immune response during transport (Patel et al., 2026).

For permanent structural integrity, DNA architectures can undergo a process known in synthetic materials chemistry as “fossilization”. Recent advances have demonstrated the ability to envelop DNA origami nanostructures in an ultrathin silica (SiO₂) coating. This creates a rigid, ceramic-like shell that faithfully preserves the underlying 3D nanoscale geometry while rendering the metamaterial impervious to enzymatic erosion (Nguyen et al., 2020). In doing so, the modification effectively transitions a fragile nucleic acid assembly into a permanent, indestructible synthetic

physiological fixture, shielding the enclosed bio-electronic circuitry and CFPS microreactors from natural biological degradation.

The extraordinary biostability results in what appears to be a potentially fatal flaw in the supposed “transient biological mRNA” marketing mantra. The 2025 peer-reviewed study by Ota et al. documented the persistent expression of the targeted SARS-CoV-2 spike protein within the cerebral arteries of patients up to 17 months after they received one or more injections. We have reservations about the touted specificity of the so-called “spike protein” because CFPS can produce any number of other proteins and the histochemical means of detecting the presence of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein are controversial and hotly debated. Nevertheless, it appears that some proteins and toxins are produced post-injection for a very long time indeed, raising further questions about a lack of any “kill-switch” to decommission this process. As if that were not enough to prove the potential lethality of the technology, the power of nanoscale vectors to breach natural biological barriers inside the body, such as the blood-brain barrier (BBB), the placental barrier (PB) protecting an unborn child, the blood-CSF barrier or the blood-testis barrier (BTB) guarding the production of male spermatozooids, is not accidental. The unhindered biodistribution transient nanotechnology across such barriers is not only the result of the minute size of the ionizable lipid nanoparticles carrying the information laden payload of synthetic RNA, but may also be the result of deliberate design with AI directing materials to particular tissues (Su et al., 2026). The human brain, of course, was not a target for the synthetic RNA coding for part of the spike protein, so whatever spike protein or other toxins ended up there, or in the amniotic fluid with an unborn child, or in the protected compartment where sperm cells mature before they are released, is evidence of an experiment in nanotechnology that has either gone terribly wrong, or was something other than what it was represented to be from the start. In any case, the known fruits of the experiment are universally bad according to independent researchers while the marketeers (e.g., Sohn et al. (2026) keep singing praises of the COVID-19 products.

To justify the existence, continued funding, and mass physiological integration of the self-assembling platforms, the biotechnology industry, it seems, has categorized them as “therapeutic drug delivery systems” — certainly that has been the case with the majority of the COVID-19 injectables. The literature is replete with claims that logic-gated DNA nanoboxes (Douglas et al., 2012) and highly engineered lipid nanoparticles (Hou et al., 2021) are benevolently designed to deliver targeted chemotherapeutic toxins directly to cancerous tumors. As established earlier, however, the intention to transition DNA nanorobots into therapeutic oncology has been documented in Pfizer’s corporate history for more than a decade (see Pfizer, 2015).

Deceiving the body’s immune defenses, however, is essential if the hierarchically assembled meta-DNA lattices which trigger “frustrated phagocytosis” (Donaldson et al., 2010) are going to be able to work at all. As macrophages continuously secrete digestive enzymes, they must be disabled, misdirected, or destroyed by the synthetic nanotech architectures — ultimately rupturing their own lysosomes and spilling highly acidic enzymes into the intracellular space. All of that is certain to cause chronic systemic inflammation, innate immune suppression (Seneff et al., 2022), and rapid cell death to follow. While the resulting phenomena have been referred to in public discourse as “turbo cancers”, that outcome is formally recognized in the independent clinical literature as rapidly progressing cancer, reigniting of prior malignancy, and/or disease exacerbations that are nothing

other than COVID-19 sequelae coming from injected persons and/or shedding or other means of transferring the synthetic contagion from one person to another. The dynamic at issue is thoroughly articulated by the “multi-hit hypothesis of oncogenesis” (Valdes Angues & Perea Bustos, 2023), which links mRNA-LNP injections to immune-mediated cancer progression. Furthermore, peer-reviewed clinical case reports have vividly documented the unexpected, highly aggressive, and rapid progression of specific cancers — such as T-cell lymphomas — immediately following the administration of these platforms (Goldman et al., 2021).

Meta-DNA Bio-Electronic Circuitry and the Brain as a Battlefield

The progression of the DNA-based engineered nanotechnology follows a distinct, scalable path beginning with raw synthetic DNA-based material woven into architectural structures, which are then used, together with other (undeclared) materials, to manufacture discrete electronic components, which are ultimately deployed into the human body and central nervous system.

Beyond functioning as physical architecture and prototissues, DNA origami and higher synthetic




Figure 10. A structure that looks like an electronic circuit assembled on a breadboard (or pegboard), as per the illustration in Figure 8.

DNA-based structures serve as an unparalleled template for assembling functional nano-electronics. As detailed in *Nature Reviews Methods Primers* (Springer Nature, 2026) these meta-DNA nanostructures act as highly precise, programmable “breadboards”. They are designed to spatially organize metallic and lanthanide and other nanoparticles, semiconducting carbon nanotubes, and fluorophores into active plasmonic and electronic circuits, specifically field-effect transistors (FETs; Dey et al., 2021; Zhan et al., 2023). Unlike flexible biological morphologies, the synthetic bio-electronic circuits adopt rigid, rectangular geometries reminiscent of traditional silicon microchips.

Figure 10 is a micrograph obtained without placing a cover-slip on the glass slide so as not to restrict the height into which the self-assembling rectangular object that looks like some kind of circuit board could develop. The background does not appear as black as most of darkfield images because a thick layer of liquid from a Pfizer vial was placed on the glass slide without a coverslip to allow this electronic circuit to assemble to its full, unrestricted height, and that thick layer contained particulate matter that was imaged by the darkfield mode of the microscope pictured in Figure 1 and **Error! Reference source not found.** above. Notice also that the darkfield seems to capture organized electronic components laid on the planar surface with interface points.

Next, in Figure 11 we illustrate graphically the concept of a synthetic “DNA breadboard”. The foundational architecture at the top is the flat latticework template-like structure integrating various carbon nanotubes and plasmonic electronic circuits. Then, in part B, we depict the delivery of the technology through the circulatory system while scavenging energy from heartbeats and muscle movement through piezoelectric nanogenerators to harvest mechanical energy and turn it into electrical supply to the electronic circuits and devices (Wang & Wu, 2012). Then as seen in part C, if one’s purposes are nefarious, pathology can be caused by electrostatic pulses, toxicity, damage from rigid fibers that puncture membranes (or razor-sharp structures that cut them), or hydrogel layers that smother cells starving them from oxygen or nutrients. The chillingly efficient theft of energy converts the human body into a perpetual biological battery to power its own synthetic infiltration and destruction.




Figure 11. An illustration depicting the integration of micro and nano electronic devices and circuitry into a meta-DNA breadboard (or pegboard) that continually harvests mechanical energy from the body and converts it to electrical energy to power the electronic structures and all their nefarious purposes downstream including the associated synthetic pathologies.

By precisely docking gold and silver nanoparticles, superparamagnetic iron oxide nanoparticles (SPIONs), and semiconductor quantum dots can be introduced onto the synthetic nucleic acid template/breadboard of Figure 11 to create highly complex, light-manipulating metamolecules. When metallic nanoparticles are arranged in extreme proximity upon a DNA origami template, their conduction electrons collectively oscillate in response to electromagnetic stimuli, yielding a light emitting plasmon-resonance. Plasmons excited in adjacent metal nanoparticles interact, mix, and hybridize, allowing for the creation of plasmonic waveguides that route electromagnetic energy well below the optical diffraction limit (Lal et al., 2007). Furthermore, the integration of semiconductor quantum dots into these plasmonic matrices introduces highly tunable, size-dependent electronic, and optical properties (Alivisatos, 1996).

Crucially, such quantum dots — e.g., the kind presumably seen in Figure 10 — can function as high-fidelity nanoscale light emitters. By precisely tuning their emission spectra, they act as the primary transmitters of opto-electronic signals directly into the self-assembled nanoscale optical fibers detailed in the body area network (BAN) protocols as discussed in the next two sections.

When configured within the host, the DNA-assembled waveguides function as highly efficient nano-antennas, optical fibers and logic gates. To sustain and amplify these signals for broader intra-body communication, the architecture employs surface plasmon-polaritons (SPP) amplifiers and lasers, effectively compensating for inherent ohmic losses and ensuring high-fidelity data transmission (Berini & De Leon, 2012). This provides the exact physical hardware required to establish the graphene-enabled terahertz broadcasting gateways. The electronic infrastructure also stores and emits MAC-address that should be specific and uniquely identify the emitting nodes previously researched at MIT by McHugh et al. (2019) sponsored by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. It is possible that we have observed such quantum dots in action with the COVID-19 rollout of injectables (Saralangu et al., 2021; European Forum for Vaccine Vigilance, 2021). There is, at least, abundant evidence that some entities received in the bodies of recipients of the COVID-19 concoctions became broadcasters of certain MAC addresses. Yanowitz himself (as did many others) was able to detect such MAC addresses using the Bluetooth scans easily available on any smartphone with Bluetooth connectivity. Unlike standard Bluetooth devices, however, that show up in the scan with a manufacturer's name and some description of the device — e.g. “headphones”, or “speaker” — the MAC addresses emitted from injected people show no manufacturer's name and no device-type. Instead they retain the generic hexadecimal form of numbers and letters separated by colons, as mentioned above, and cannot be communicated with using smartphones.

Crucially, these plasmonic assemblies are not inert. By using light-responsive DNA nanostructures (Madhanagopal et al., 2026), the architecture can execute optical commands deep within the body. While visible light cannot penetrate deep tissue, deep-penetrating near-infrared (NIR) light can. When this ambient or externally applied NIR light reaches the embedded optogenetic lanthanides, it is up-converted into high-energy ultraviolet (UV) emissions. This localized UV light acts as a precise optical key, triggering photo-switchable molecules (such as azobenzene-modified DNA segments) to dynamically alter the nanostructure's geometry, opening “DNA locks” and releasing sequestered toxins or initiating communication pulses, as discussed earlier.

Perhaps the most devastating application of the integrated plasmonic and super-paramagnetic iron-oxide nanoparticle (SPION) architecture is that they can sidestep the thermodynamic barrier of *in*

in vivo exponential self-replication. True runaway self-replication via hybridization chain reactions (HCR) requires severe thermal cycling, which the human body's native 37°C environment cannot tolerate. However, DNA-assembled plasmonic hot spots and embedded SPIONs function as local highly efficient optothermal and electromagnetic nano-heaters. When subjected to specific ambient electromagnetic frequencies or up-converted optical radiation, the surface plasmon resonances of these metallic nanoparticles and the SPIONs induce intense, highly localized thermal spikes. The resulting engineered "kinetic agitation" provides the precise, microscopic thermodynamic fuel required to melt and re-anneal the DNA scaffolding, artificially driving the exponential replication cascade, and facilitating systemic "synthetic contagion" without fatally raising the host's overall core body temperature.

Traditional rigid electronics introduced into the body and brain trigger a chronic foreign-body immune response (FBR), leading to rapid astrocytic encapsulation and glial scarring that isolates and neutralizes the device. To circumvent this biological defense, advanced neural interfacing relies on ultra-flexible, macroporous "mesh electronics" engineered to mimic the mechanical stiffness of biological brain tissue (Hong et al., 2018). Bottom-up *in vivo* self-assembly evades the need for direct mechanical injection into the brain. Instead, the lipid-encapsulated payloads cross the blood-brain barrier as nanoscopic seeds. Once inside the neural environment, the synthetic components autonomously multiply and merge into macroscopic prototissues as diagrammed in Figure 12.

Autonomous *In Situ* Assembly of Electronics-Integrated Synthetic Prototissues




Figure 12. An illustration depicting the assembly of protocells to a porous-mesh prototissues that can interface individual neurons and provide the pegboard for mounting electronic circuits devices and connectors that can "read and write" to and from that neuron.

The process is conceptually simple: first sub-micrometer scale building blocks at A are assembled into GUVs (giant unilamellar vesicles), that can be from 1 to more than 100 micrometers in diameter and that mimic cell membranes. These "hairy" protocells at B — called that because of their

appearance being anchored with DNA nanotubes and fibers that are anchored in the lipid bilayer — are then gathered into the sort of prototissue mesh formation shown at C, to integrate at D with neuronal circuitry. The deployment of these bio-electronic components into the central nervous system is no longer theoretical. Yadav et al. (2025) successfully demonstrated “circulatronics” — subcellular, wireless electronic devices fused with living cells administered via simple intravenous injection.

The cell-electronics hybrids autonomously traffic through the bloodstream, breaching the physiological barriers (such as the blood-brain barrier), and self-implanting into targeted regions of the brain and nervous system. Furthermore, direct nose-to-brain nanomedicine delivery presents another formidable route for introducing these structures directly into the cerebrospinal fluid (Yokel, 2021). The technologies at issue are the nuts and bolts of modern non-kinetic warfare as laid out by James Giordano. He insists that the human brain already is the primary battlefield of the 21st century (Giordano, 2018b).

Before exploring the clinical sequelae of the COVID-19 injectable nanotechnology, it is crucial to understand the mechanical and biophysical friction such synthetic devices cause simply by operating within the body and, in the COVID-19 experiment accidentally, it seems, invading the brain. The individual components inflict a multi-vector assault. Conductive meta-DNA circuits embedded within the highly conductive myelin sheaths act as nano-antennas. This constant electrical activity agonizes the central nervous system, short-circuiting natural neural signals (Pressler et al., 2025). The rigid, unyielding nanotechnology structures physically embed themselves into delicate neuron fibers and mechanically lacerate neurons, cells and organs as they circulate. Devices are frequently coated in meta-topological hydrogels (Tian et al., 2026) that smother brain tissues, impairing the glymphatic clearance of the brain and trapping synthetic proteins (CFPS) that are toxic to delicate neurons. Synthetic prototissues (Arulkumaran et al., 2023) possess the architectural foundation to physically interlink with host neural networks. As these individual electronic components establish themselves within the neurological framework, they lay the groundwork for a much more insidious threat: they stop functioning as isolated devices and begin networking.

Intra-Body Networks and the Internet of Bio-Nano Things (IoBNT)

The devices and structural anomalies described in the preceding section do not operate in isolation; rather, they form the foundational hardware nodes of a sprawling, hierarchically coordinated communication architecture. This theoretical framework represents the realization of the internet of bodies (IoB), built upon its microscopic foundation: the internet of bio-nano things (IoBNT).

The conceptual blueprint for the IoBNT has been methodically developed over the past fifteen years, evolving from the macro-scale internet of things (IoT and its subpart, the internet of bodies IoB that focuses on connectivity to “bodies”), scaling down to the internet of nano-things (IoNT; Akyildiz & Jornet, 2010; Alabdulatif et al., 2023), and ultimately merging entirely with wet biology (Akyildiz et al., 2015).

Before the network envisualized can perform its communication functions, its physical infrastructure must be introduced and assembled inside the host as suggested at position A. The path leads from the internet of things, to nano things, to bio-nano things with “dual use” capabilities (i.e., for good and/or for evil) delivering drugs or toxins while monitoring their impact.

Communication protocols at B graduate from quasistatic messages within the body to electromagnetic transmissions that link the body (at least initially via smartphones, carried by just about everyone nowadays) to the 5G and later directly to the 6G/7G internet of bodies (IOB, the cloud). At C we come to the real control aspects of such graduating networks where messages influencing thoughts and behaviors can theoretically be both read and written by an “external operator” to the real body of the individual as well as a “digital twin”, created in the cloud. At C the ultimately controlling purpose seems inevitably to be population control with near complete loss of autonomy, no more freedom of will, at the individual level. Can such a network be construed as benign and not evil? The whole architecture of an internet of bio-nano things (IoBNT), it seems, driven by meta-DNA-based self-assemblies (Yao et al., 2020) exists mainly for societal control. It consists mainly of the synthetic meta-DNA breadboards upon which lanthanide-doped components, SPIONs, and sensors are assembled to form electronic circuitry — transmitters, routers, and graphene antennae.

It is vital to distinguish between the biological scaffolding and the electronic circuitry. Biocompatible materials such as hydrogels and protocells (Arulkumaran et al., 2023) are used only at the genesis of this process. They act as the “glue” to physically anchor the assembling sensors to host nerves and neurons. Once anchored, the meta-DNA directs the assembly of the functional electronic nodes. The nature of these advanced bio-synthetic platforms has been openly articulated by the architects of the field. Regarding 6G/7G bio-nano networks, researchers note that synthesized genetic materials function effectively as programmable nanoscale machines designed for injection and deployment (Akyildiz, 2023). By bridging the gap between biological processes and digital infrastructure, the IoBNT creates a “virtual-physical future” where the human body is remade from the physical home of an autonomous person, to just another node in a networked electronic system (Boddington, 2023).

The Multilayer Topology: From Atomic Interface to the Cloud

To comprehensively understand the system, the architecture must be divided into four distinct functional layers as shown in Figure 14. In that illustration, the atomic/nano interface for the internet of bio-nano-things (IoBNT) at Layer 1 interfaces directly with host biology. In that layer, nanoscale sensors employ lanthanides and optical electronics to read signals directly from nerves and neurons, and to write back to them, translating biological states into transmissible data. Then at Layer 2 we come to the nano-node relay to the internet of nano things (IoNT). It transmits signals acquired at the atomic interface to localized receiving nodes which act as internal routers, aggregating the electronic and optical data and preparing it for broader intra-body transmission. Layer 3 consists of the covert body area network (BAN). To move data from localized nodes to a central hub, the system uses the host’s conductive tissues. The covert BAN uses quasistatic electromagnetic signals within the body’s physical boundaries, rendering it undetectable to external radio frequency scanners while efficiently routing data to a centralized internal transceiver (Das et al., 2019, Chatterjee et al, 2023b).

We should also note that recent empirical microscopy has identified a complementary modality for Layer 3 transmission consisting of self-assembling nano-scale optical fibers. While tissue-based conduction provides broad coverage across the host’s conductive pathways, synthetic optical fibers

function as high-bandwidth backbones. They enable significantly higher transmission rates and more efficient multi-source aggregation, connecting numerous endpoints to a central receiver with superior speed and security, while maintaining the intended covert nature of the BAN (Chevalier et al., 2015).

Layer 4 is the terahertz gateway and the cloud, where the great internet of bodies (IoB) expands upon the already existing concept of BANs. The centralized transceiver serves as the gateway to external infrastructure. The terahertz gateway using graphene-based antennae and surface plasmon polariton (SPP) waves — ones that have both electromagnetic (photon) and electron-charge (plasmon) properties and that are confined to a flat area very near the surface of the graphene with limited propagation lengths ranging from microns to millimeters — converts the aggregated data

Intra-Body Networks, the Internet of Bodies (IoB), and the Internet of Bio-Nano Things (IoBNT)




Figure 13. An original illustration showing the genesis of the internet of bio-nano things — a threat to the very existence of human life as it now exists on Planet Earth. A) From an Internet of Things, to Nano-Things, to Bio-Nano Things; B) intrabody communications optical and electromagnetic; C) reading and writing modulatory commands to the digital twin; D) self-powered digital shackles violating personal autonomy and free will.

2023) that route the information into the cloud and formally establish the internet of bodies (Abadal et al., 2024; Jornet et al., 2024). The integration of wireless bio-cyber interfaces establishes a

connection that is not merely “read-only” for biometric and/or behavior surveillance, but also “read/write” (active modulation to control the biology and/or behavior of the individual (Chatterjee et al., 2023a). The bidirectional data flow of information and commands enables the creation of a human body digital twin — see Figure 13 — which is a real-time, mirrored digital profile of an individual’s biology and neurology maintained in the cloud (Tang et al., 2024). By manipulating this digital twin, an external human or AI operator can simulate and calculate the precise inputs required to transmit commands *back* into the body via the IoB.




Figure 14. An original illustration showing the topology and organization of layers in an intra-body network created per IEEE standards. Layer 1 is at the level of the atomic interface; layer 2 aggregates and forwards signals to routing nodes; layer 3 delivers quasistatic electrical signs to a central transceiver; and layer 4 is the terahertz gateway to the graphene based digital twin.

In Figure 14, the connections across Layer 1 and Layer 2 use localized optical routing via lanthanide-doped upconversion nanoparticles (UCNPs) — signified by the light inside the red sphere at the bottom left of Figure 14 — which can absorb deep-penetrating near-infrared (NIR) light and upconvert it into high-energy ultraviolet (UV) emissions, executing localized, “stealth” commands directly at the neural interface (Auzel, 2004). All this enables nano- node routing to Layer 2 governed by protocols designed for extreme nanoscale environments. The translation of digital data

into biochemical assembly on the DNA-breadboards was formalized by IEEE 1906.1-2015 (2015). Demonstrating the rapid maturation of this technology, it was recently designated “Inactive-Reserved” to make way for the highly detailed IEEE 1906.1.1-2020 data models.

The covert body area network of Layer 3 in Figure 14 is executed via electro-quasistatic human body communication (EQ-HBC). The blueprint for this intra-body routing, which relies on advanced human body communication transceivers (Huang et al., 2025), was established in IEEE 802.15.6-2012. Its global trajectory is evidenced by its harmonization into the international ISO/IEC/IEEE 8802-15-6:2017 standard which employs biphasic quasi-static signaling (alternating positive negative pulses) to ideally (but perhaps not perfectly) maintain a net-zero charge, required to prevent charge buildup and its inflammatory consequences. It seems likely that the constant, unrelenting internal electromagnetic “chatter” required to maintain this BAN over-stimulates host neural architecture leading to metabolic stress and neuro-inflammation (Vizziello et al., 2023).

Complementing the IEEE standards pertaining to the IoBNT incorporating BANs are optical wireless links (OWL) within BANs. These links provide a high-performance alternative to traditional radio-frequency (RF) or quasi-static methods, particularly in environments requiring high data rates and low latency (Chevalier et al., 2015). By using optical frequencies for intra-body communication, the network bypasses the bandwidth limitations of conductive tissue, allowing for a more secure and robust data relay from multiple high-resolution sensors to the central gateway (Nixon, Yanowitz & Taylor, 2022).

The final translation of biological data into external cloud infrastructure requires the conversion of signals into the terahertz (THz) band (0.1–10 THz which occurs at Layer 4 in Figure 14. The deployment of such external broadcasting links was formalized by IEEE 802.15.3d-2017 (2017) and the amendment has been completely consolidated into the active, overarching IEEE 802.15.3-2023 standard for wireless multimedia networks, establishing the current reality of its integration into modern telecommunications. Because traditional metals fail catastrophically at the nanoscale, the THz transmission at Layer 4 relies entirely on graphene-based plasmonic nano-antennas using surface plasmon polariton (SPP) waves (Jornet & Akyildiz, 2013; Berini & De Leon, 2012).

An analysis of IEEE engineering standards — as summarized in part b of Figure 14 — confirms that the blueprint required for every layer of the network under consideration already exists. The continuous updating and international harmonization of the IEEE standards demonstrate a serious, ongoing industrial commitment to bio-cyber infrastructure (Zafar et al., 2021). The IEEE (2020) has formalized the architecture for an IoBNT in Standards 1906.1-2015 and 1906.1.1-2020 for a nanoscale communication framework and data model, and in Standard 802.15.6-2012, which explicitly defines MAC-layer addressing for devices communicating in and around the human body. Furthermore, energy harvesting from biological motion or ambient electromagnetic fields (Wang & Wu, 2012) provides a physically plausible power source to sustain such transmissions indefinitely.

It has been widely claimed by independent investigators and groups that individuals inoculated with COVID-19 injectables emit radio frequencies that can be detected as media access control (MAC) addresses on standard Bluetooth scanners (COMUSAV, 2022). It is frequently asserted that the nanomaterial graphene, specifically in the form of graphene oxide, has been found within the bodies

of inoculated individuals and provides the physical antenna substrate for emitting MAC addresses as headers for more elaborate communication sequences. The foundational claim crediting the discovery of graphene or its derivatives within the injectables stems from the spectroscopic analysis (2021) conducted by Pablo Campra, PhD, and professor at the University of Almería. Supporting Campra’s work, Akyildiz and Jornet (2010, 2015, 2023; Abadal et al., 2024) have demonstrated mathematically that graphene nanoribbons of sub-micron dimensions resonate in the terahertz band, functioning as antennas capable of both transmitting and receiving electromagnetic signals. Crucially, they have proposed that networks of such nano-nodes inside biological tissue could be organized into addressable topologies — the internet of bio-nano things (IoBNT) — in which each node carries a unique identifier functionally equivalent to a MAC address. Akyildiz (in his 2023 presentation) addressed graphene specifically as an “enabler” for his envisioned terahertz antennae.

The Digital Twin, Bidirectional Control, and the 4th Industrial Revolution

The ultimate application of the technologies at issue in this paper crystallizes in the seamless convergence of the physical, biological, and cyber domains. The explicit purpose of this pervasive connectivity is not merely data aggregation; it is the establishment of a personal digital twin (PDT) or biological digital twin, fundamentally altering the definition of human sovereignty.

The concept of the digital twin was originally formulated for inanimate manufacturing, designed to monitor and optimize industrial lifecycle management (Grieves, 2023). However, as the drive to “make more digital twins” accelerated (Tao & Qi, 2019), the technology scaled down to the microscopic level. This evolution facilitated the leap from industrial monitoring to the modeling and manipulation of complex human activities via the personal digital twin (I & Zheng, 2023).

By continuously aggregating data from the atomic interface (Layer 1) and offloading it via the terahertz gateway (Layer 4), the IoBNT network constructs a real-time simulation of the host’s internal physiological, metabolic, and neurological states. This establishes an inescapable, continuous cyber-physical feedback loop, allowing for the precise modeling of biological systems at an unprecedented resolution (Mihai et al., 2022; Tao et al., 2024).

Managing the immense complexity of an IoBNT-driven biological digital twin requires advanced artificial intelligence. Recent engineering frameworks demonstrate the integration of the IoBNT with convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and federated learning, empowering the system to securely process vast amounts of localized biological data (Jamshidi et al., 2024). Such integration allows the digital twin to not only mirror current biology but to accurately simulate molecular dynamics and anticipate pathological shifts. Furthermore, the application of physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) embeds fundamental biophysical laws directly into the deep learning models, ensuring that the remote prediction of tissue evolution and metabolic changes operates with extremely high mathematical precision (Jamshidi et al., 2025a).

The most existentially alarming capability of the bio-nano digital twin is its bidirectional nature. It is not a passive, “read-only” surveillance tool; it establishes a functional, real-time “read/write” paradigm (Jamshidi et al., 2025b). By running predictive simulations on the digital twin in the cloud, an external human or AI operator can calculate the precise electromagnetic, quasistatic, or photonic inputs required to induce a specific biological outcome. These “write” commands are then

transmitted back through the overarching network, routed down the intra-body protocol stack, and translated by the synthetic-DNA breadboards into localized biochemical actions. This allows for the remote modulation of neurotransmitters, the initiation of cell-free protein synthesis (CFPS), or the triggering of specific cognitive states — **effectively transforming the human body into a programmable endpoint.**

To understand the geopolitical and societal motive behind this multilayered assault vector, it must be contextualized within the framework of the fourth industrial revolution (4IR). As articulated by World Economic Forum founder Klaus Schwab, the 4IR is explicitly defined by a fusion of technologies that “*blur the lines between the physical, digital, and biological spheres*” (Schwab, 2016). The architectures detailed above are the physical manifestations of this ideology. The stack of networks starting at the IoBNT and ending the IoB is not a byproduct of the 4IR; it is its foundational infrastructure. By embedding the digital sphere directly into the biological sphere, the human body ceases to be an independent, sovereign entity and becomes an interoperable node within a managed global network. If a biological digital twin perfectly replicates a person’s neurology and biology in the cloud, and the “read/write” protocol allows an algorithm to dictate the physical responses of the host, profound philosophical and societal questions emerge: ***Which entity is the primary citizen, and which is the avatar?***

In this paradigm, human populations risk becoming conceptually and functionally redundant. This is already happening as seen in millions of people losing their jobs to AI. If the digital twin — processed by AI and governed by external societal algorithms — makes optimized decisions regarding health, emotional regulation, and productivity, the physical human body may be reduced to a (potentially redundant) biological peripheral. The host exists merely to execute the calculated commands of its digital counterpart. This represents the ultimate subjugation of human consciousness to algorithmic governance, creating a societal control matrix where individual free will is stealthily preempted by cybernetic bio-regulation.

Shedding, Exponential Self-Replication, and Synthetic Contagion

As the scientific understanding of the injectable payload evolves from transient biological vectors to permanent structural nanotechnology and networked bio-electronics, we must address the mechanisms of its proliferation and transmission. The observed phenomena cannot be fully explained by static structural formation alone; the clinical and biophysical data strongly indicate an active, contagious technological proliferation. The technology deployed is not merely a static, finite deposit; it acts as an actively proliferating, horizontally transmissible synthetic pathogen. It is, in effect, a **contagious technology**, responsible for **nanotechnology-induced physical malaise of various kinds**, while they are attempting to converting humanity to a connected network of peripheral endpoints.

The most definitive evidence that the observed macroscopic structures are non-biological lies in the documented methodology of their creation (Figure 15). Advanced DNA and RNA nanotechnology does not rely on natural biological mutations or cellular cloning; it is explicitly engineered, industrialized, and driven by well-documented corporate and institutional intent using synthetic (unnatural) biosystems. Researchers and bioengineers use graphical user-interfaces and powerful

CAD/CAM software to design these assemblies. Tools such as [caDNAno](#) are used to manually route a long “scaffold” strand of DNA and generate hundreds of complementary “staple” strands (Douglas et al., 2009). Concurrently, software packages like [NUPACK](#) are relied on for the deep computational analysis and design of complex, interacting nucleic acid systems (Zadeh et al., 2011).

To ensure the structures fold correctly in three-dimensional space, the architectural files are analyzed through rigorous finite-element engineering software such as [CanDo](#) (Computer-Aided Engineering for DNA Origami), which predicts thermodynamic stability *in silico* (Kim et al., 2012). Furthermore, advanced algorithms like [vHelix](#) allow for the direct rendering of complex polyhedral meshes at the nanoscale (Benson et al., 2015), while symmetry mapping enables the arbitrary design of DNA-programmable 3D crystals (Kahn et al., 2025). Once the CAD software finalizes the architecture, it exports a simple digital spreadsheet containing the exact nucleotide sequences required. This file is transmitted to commercial oligonucleotide manufacturers that synthetically mass-produce the DNA at industrial scale using solid-phase phosphoramidite chemistry. This digital-to-physical pipeline completely demystifies the payloads, proving how effortlessly these complex architectural instructions are designed, digitized, and manufactured.

This file is transmitted to commercial oligonucleotide manufacturers that synthetically mass-produce the DNA at industrial scale using solid-phase phosphoramidite chemistry. This digital-to-physical pipeline completely demystifies the payloads, proving how effortlessly these complex architectural instructions are designed, digitized, and manufactured.

In 2015, Pfizer established a formalized research contract with Bar-Ilan University and Ido Bachelet, PhD, to explicitly evaluate these DNA nanorobots for targeted “drug delivery” (Pfizer, 2015). The foundational corporate infrastructure was funded and established long before the current global deployment. DNA conjugates are now actively programmed to execute Boolean logic operations, acting as autonomous computing sensors that assess their biological environment to conditionally trigger the release of cytotoxic payloads (Chen et al., 2026).

The triggering mechanisms for the nanorobots inside living persons extend far beyond simple localized chemical logic gates. As publicly presented by Bachelet in multiple technology symposia, these DNA-origami nanorobots can be equipped with conductive metallic nanoparticles (SPION antennas) that allow them to be forcefully unlocked from afar using specific electromagnetic frequencies (Bachelet, 2014a; Bachelet, 2014b). To protect the delicate internal bio-electronic




Figure 15. A graphic illustration, recreated for this paper, of the Douglas & Bachelet DNA-origami nanorobot based on the illustration in their 2012 paper. The nanorobot has an enclosed barrel-shaped container with a cover held in the “locked” position by staple strands. The enclosure contains toxins that are normally sequestered from the host’s body after multiple such robots are injected. Upon a commanding signal, the cover is designed to open and expose the nanorobot’s toxic contents to the host’s system at a desired destination.

circuits, recent advances in materials science definitively establish the use of “meta-topological hydrogels” specifically engineered to coat electronic circuitry, providing multi-source and frequency-tailored artifact mitigation (Tian et al., 2026).

Human lungs continuously aerosolize and exhale extracellular vesicles (EVs), and breath condensates have been proven to contain highly intact, functional lipid vesicles capable of escaping into the surrounding environment (Dobhal et al., 2020). Similarly, EVs are actively secreted through the transdermal matrix in human sweat (Karvinen et al., 2020). The immediate, aggressive toxicity of this aerosolized content was catastrophically demonstrated when a broken inoculation vial caused severe, acute ocular and skin injuries to clinic staff simply from exposure to the resulting ambient fumes (Chantra et al., 2022).

Furthermore, horizontal gene transfer between bacteria in the human gut provides an insidious potential mechanism where host microbiome bacteria can absorb these nanotechnological “seeds” and metamaterials, actively participating in the internal and horizontal spread of the synthetic contagion (Lerner et al., 2017). Because synthetic lipid nanoparticles and DNA-based cell-scale containers are explicitly engineered to precisely mimic natural vesicles, an injected host effectively operates as an unwitting bio-manufacturing facility, continuously exhaling and sweating active nanostructures into their immediate environment. If an unexposed individual inhales these aerosolized cell-scale containers, or absorbs them through transdermal contact, that single absorbed structure acts as a transmissible, exponential “seed” (Yanowitz, 2023a).

The biophysical reality of synthetic shedding aligns perfectly with established geopolitical biodefense objectives and emerging medical frameworks. In October 2018, a report from the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security explicitly outlined “self-spreading vaccines” as an emerging technology designed to address global catastrophic biological risks (Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, 2018). If the host’s internal environment becomes depleted of the necessary elemental components for continued self-replication, building materials must be supplemented through alternative administration routes. This introduces the critical role of environmental “smart dust”. Foundational materials science has long established the viability of smart dust, including self-assembling photonic crystals (Link & Sailor, 2003) and highly advanced, active nano-biosensors powered by molecular biological motors (Fischer et al., 2009).

While smart dust serves as an effective method for the aerial dispersal of meta-materials, the replenishment of nanotechnological building blocks is not restricted to inhalation. To ensure the success of the exponential replication cascade, these precursor components can be seamlessly integrated into the global food chain, municipal water supplies, and common beverages, even pharmaceuticals. Furthermore, transdermal and mucosal routes are easily exploited by adding nanotechnological precursors to everyday consumer commodities, including sanitary products, toiletries, cosmetics, and fabrics. This omni-directional resupply strategy ensures that the host is continuously saturated with the raw metamaterials and active nano-robots required to sustain the self-replicating architectures, regardless of their primary injection status.

Finally, the acceleration of oncological presentations is explained by this overarching cellular disruption. Cancer is fundamentally a disease of mitochondrial metabolic dysfunction (Seyfried et al., 2014). As the dual-vector assault destroys the mitochondrial electron transport, the cell is forced to

abandon oxidative phosphorylation and default to a primitive fermentative metabolism — the Warburg Effect. The biophysical destruction of mitochondrial respiration that follows, compounded by the total exhaustion of the innate immune system and the continuous release of toxic payloads via logic-gated nanorobots (Douglas et al., 2012), cultivates the exact physiological environment required for rapid, unchecked, and systemic cancer pathology.

The aggressive legal suppression of clinical research into such compounds reflects the worldwide institutional complicity of oversight agencies that have been captured, as HHS Secretary Kennedy has stressed (Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., 2022). Not only do global health agencies maintain absolute secrecy regarding the self-assembling nature of these architectures (US Government Accountability Office, 2021), but they actively prosecute researchers seeking effective therapeutic protocols. Most damningly, they continually fail to pursue the very research required to address the health crisis billions of people are facing. We believe there should be a complete and absolute global moratorium on the distribution and administration of the dangerous and potentially lethal COVID-19 injectables and any similar synthetic DNA-based engineered therapeutics while clinical interventions are brought up to speed with the materials-science engineering underlying the completely un-natural disorders and disease conditions from the COVID-19 era.

Conclusion

Synthetic DNA/RNA nanotechnology has transitioned to AI-guided (Su et al., 2026) and petascale generative synthesis (Weinstein et al., 2026) of materials-science payloads deployed and injected into a majority of the world's people. Engineered via commercial software and triggered by electromagnetic logic gates, the nanotechnology architectures are causing not only widespread post-injection malaise but also life-threatening and even fatal conditions, ranging from sudden cardiac failure and demyelinating neuropathies to explosive oncogenesis. Pathologies currently dismissed as standard autoimmune reactions, or typical fibrin clots, are, in fact, the end-stage manifestations of mitochondrial puncturing, profound macrophage apoptosis induced by silica shedding, localized heavy metal toxicity, and the unyielding vascular occlusion owed to synthetic “white clots”. All this is being driven by DNA “seeds” that constitute, we believe, a horizontally transmissible synthetic contagion transmitted through the COVID-19 injections. The absence of “kill switches”, or decommissioning protocols for the nanotechnological devices is driving the injected parties toward unsound recovery protocols such as anti-parasitic medicines that fail completely to address the underlying materials-science pathology. Addressing the crisis that is stealthily exponentiating in the “blind spot” of traditional medicine requires abandoning the fiction that the misnomer “mRNA technologies” are mainly about the spike protein of the bioengineered SARS-CoV-2 bioweapon. Successful treatment will probably require rigorous thermodynamic chelation to fracture the synthetic structures, aggressive enzymatic cleavage, mechanical hemoperfusion, and advanced metabolic management to clear the resulting debris. Even so, at the end of the day, all such measures remain secondary to the non-negotiable imperative of a permanent global moratorium on the distribution by any means of the self-cloaking, fortified nanotechnologies in the self-assembling and self-replicating synthetic disease agents in the COVID-19 injectables.

Acknowledgments

The authors extend their gratitude to the independent researchers, microscopists, and materials scientists across the globe who continue to pursue empirical truth about the COVID-19 nanotechnology in the face of unprecedented institutional opacity, reproaches, and stigmatization. Six peer reviewers approved this paper for publication in its present form. They include Stephanie Seneff, PhD; Robert M. Davidson, MD, PhD; Tamara Tuuminen, MD; Asgeir Saebo, MS; Daniel Santiago, PharmD; and John W. Oller, Jr., PhD. There were two negative recommendations and two readers who abstained from voting but who joined with all those who examined this document with comments about how to surmount perceived speculation and to improve the paper by amplifying one or several aspects of the research. We thank the Editor-in-Chief for addressing those suggestions in the **Appendix** which follows our list of **References**.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Author Contributions

Shimon D. Yanowitz is the main author of this manuscript, responsible for the conceptualization, literature review, hypothesis generation, drafting of the text, obtaining microscopic images, and preparing illustrations with the assistance of automated drawing tools. Daniel Broudy is coauthor, contributing to the conceptualization, literature review and drafting of the text. Both acknowledge improvements made in response to comments from the Editorial Board pro and con. Any remaining errors are our own responsibility.

References

- Abadal, S., Han, C., Petrov, V., Galluccio, L., Akyildiz, I. F., & Jornet, J. M. (2024). Electromagnetic Nanonetworks Beyond 6G: From Wearable and Implantable Networks to On-Chip and Quantum Communication. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 42(8), 2122–2142. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSAC.2024.3399253>
- Agrawal, A., & Khurana, A. (2026). Stretch-dependent electromagnetic properties of circular membrane: A dynamic analysis. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 324, 113654. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsolstr.2025.113654>
- Akyildiz, I. F., & Jornet, J. M. (2010). *The Internet of Nano-Things*. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 17(6), 58–63. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MWC.2010.5675779>
- Akyildiz, I. F., Pierobon, M., Balasubramaniam, S., & Koucheryavy, Y. (2015). *The Internet of Bio-Nano Things*. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 53(3), 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MCOM.2015.7060516>
- Akyildiz, I. F. (2023). *6G/7G and the Internet of Bio-Nano Things* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YAtQFkEg5-w&t=787s>
- Alabdulatif, A., Thilakarathne, N. N., Lawal, Z. K., Fahim, K. E., & Zakari, R. Y. (2023). *Internet of Nano-Things (IoNT): A comprehensive review from architecture to security and privacy challenges*. *Sensors*, 23(5), 2807. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s23052807>
- Alivisatos, A. P. (1996). Semiconductor Clusters, Nanocrystals, and Quantum Dots. *Science*, 271(5251), 933–937. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.271.5251.933>

- Angelova, B., Paunov, M., Kitanova, M., Atanasova, G., & Atanasov, N. (2025). Investigation of the Effects of 2.45 GHz Near-Field EMF on Yeast. *Antioxidants*, 14(7), 820. <https://doi.org/10.3390/antiox14070820>
- Arulkumaran, N., Singer, M., Howorka, S., et al. (2023). Creating complex protocells and prototissues using simple DNA building blocks. *Nature Communications*, 14, 1314. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-36875-5>
- Auzel, F. (2004). Upconversion and anti-Stokes processes with f and d ions in solids. *Chemical Reviews*, 104(1), 139–174. <https://doi.org/10.1021/cr020357g>
- Bachelet, I. (2014a, December). *DNA-Origami Nano-Bot* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GCgDmTvVxlA>
- Bachelet, I. (2014b, May). *Ido Bachelet talks Surgical Nanorobotics* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aA-H0L3eEo0>
- Beattie, K. A. (2021). *Worldwide Bayesian Causal Impact Analysis of Vaccine Administration on Deaths and Cases Associated with COVID-19: A BigData Analysis of 145 Countries*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356248984_Worldwide_Bayesian_Causal_Impact_Analysis_of_Vaccine_Administration_on_Deaths_and_Cases_Associated_with_COVID-19_A_BigData_Analysis_of_145_Countries
- Beattie, K. A. (2022, February 13). *Worldwide COVID-19 Vaccine Impact on Cases and Deaths: A Bird's Eye View*. <https://www.trialsitenews.com/a/worldwide-covid-19-vaccine-impact-on-cases-and-deaths-a-birds-eye-view>
- Benson, E., Tajwar, A., Hejesen, S. K., Kelly, B. D., Bull, J. R., Gartland, V. J., ... & Högberg, B. (2015). DNA rendering of polyhedral meshes at the nanoscale. *Nature*, 523(7561), 441–444. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14586>
- Berini, P., & De Leon, I. (2012). *Surface plasmon–polariton amplifiers and lasers*. *Nature Photonics*, 6, 16–24. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nphoton.2011.285>
- Boddington, G. (2023). *The Internet of Bodies — alive, connected and collective: The virtual physical future of our bodies and our senses*. *AI & Society*, 38, 1897–1913. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-01137-1>
- Boros, L. G., Kyriakopoulos, A. M., Brogna, C., Piscopo, M., McCullough, P. A., & Seneff, S. (2024). Long-lasting, biochemically modified mRNA, and its frameshifted recombinant spike proteins in human tissues and circulation after COVID -19 vaccination. *Pharmacology Research & Perspectives*, 12(3), e1218. <https://doi.org/10.1002/prp2.1218>
- Bouza, E., Arango, C., Moreno, C., Gracia, D., Martin, M., Perez, V., Lazaro, L., Ferre, F., Salazar, G., Tejerina-Picado, F., Navio, M., Granda Revilla, J., Palomo, E., & Gil-Monte, P. R. (2023). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the mental health of the general population and health care workers. *Revista Española de Quimioterapia*, 36(2), 125–143. <https://doi.org/10.37201/req/018.2023>
- Broudy, D. & Ueda, J. (2026a). The killing of informed consent: A case for procedural fraud. *Propaganda in Focus*. <https://propagandainfocus.com/the-killing-of-informed-consent-a-case-for-procedural-fraud/>
- Broudy, D. & Ueda, J. (2026b). Constructive fraud and racketeering: A framework for exposing the demolition of informed consent. *Propaganda in Focus*. <https://propagandainfocus.com/constructive-fraud-and-racketeering-a-framework-for-exposing-the-demolition-of-informed-consent/>
- Butnaru, D., & Chapman, J. (2019). The impact of self-replicating proteins on inflammation, autoimmunity and neurodegeneration—An untraveled path. *Autoimmunity Reviews*, 18(3), 231–240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autrev.2018.09.009>
- Campra, P. (2021). DETECTION OF GRAPHENE IN COVID19 VACCINES. *ResearchGate*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355979001_DETECTION_OF_GRAPHENE_IN_COVID19_VACCINES

- Chantra, S., Chaitanuwong, P., Seresirikachorn, K., Brinks, M., Serirat, O., Chamberlain, W., & Ruamviboonsuk, P. (2022). Ocular Surface Erosion after Suspected Exposure to Evaporated COVID-19 Vaccine. *Case Reports in Ophthalmology*, 12(3), 944–951. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000520500>
- Chatterjee, B., Mohseni, P., & Sen, S. (2023a). *Bioelectronic sensor nodes for the Internet of Bodies*. *Annual Review of Biomedical Engineering*, 25, 101–129. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-bioeng-110220-112448>
- Chatterjee, B., Nath, M., Kumar K., G., et al. (2023b). *Biphasic quasistatic brain communication for energy-efficient wireless neural implants*. *Nature Electronics*, 6, 703–716. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41928-023-01000-3>
- Chen, S. K., López-Tena, M., Russo, F., et al. (2026). DNA–drug conjugates enable logic-gated drug delivery amplified by hybridization chain reactions. *Nature Biotechnology*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-026-03044-0>
- Chevalier, L. S. Sahuguede and A. Julien-Vergonjanne, “Optical wireless links as an alternative to radio-frequency for medical Body Area Networks,” in *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 33, no. 9, pp. 2002-2010, Sept. 2015, <https://doi.org/10.1109/JNSAC.2015.2432527>
- Children’s Health Defense Team. (2019, July 9). The autism blame game: This time, it’s the womb. *Children’s Health Defense*. <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/news/the-autism-blame-game-this-time-its-the-womb/>
- ClarkCountyToday.com. (2022, September 8). *More embalmers report bizarre blood clots amid COVID vax campaign—ClarkCountyToday.com*. <https://www.clarkcountytoday.com/news/more-embalmers-report-bizarre-blood-clots-amid-covid-vax-campaign/>
- COMUSAV. (2022, June 11). *BLUETRUTH DOCUMENTARY ENGLISH VERSION JUNE, 11 2022* [Video]. Brighteon. <https://www.brighteon.com/5b7c9506-aa3a-4663-9baf-5ff6640fe9b8>
- DARPA. (2020, June). *Stealth aircraft*. <https://www.darpa.mil/news/features/stealth>
- Das, D., Maity, S., Chatterjee, B., et al. (2019). *Enabling covert body area network using electro-quasistatic human body communication*. *Scientific Reports*, 9, 4160. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-38303-x>
- Davidson, R. M., Broudy, D., Yanowitz, S., Santiago, D., & Oller, J. W. (2024). True or false? at least 55 undeclared chemical elements have been detected by ICP-MS in COVID-19 “Vaccines”. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(2), 1394.1-1394.28. <https://doi.org/10.56098/98sw8e86>
- de la Torre-Luque, A., Pemau, A., Perez-Sola, V., & Ayuso-Mateos, J. L. (2023). Suicide mortality in Spain in 2020: The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Spanish Journal of Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 16(2), 116–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rpsm.2022.01.003>
- Dey, S., Fan, C., Gothelf, K. V., et al. (2021). DNA origami. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers*, 1, 13. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43586-020-00009-8>
- Dibiasi, L., Monteverde, M., Nonis, D., & Sangorrín, M. (2024). At least 55 undeclared chemical elements found in COVID-19 vaccines from AstraZeneca, CanSino, Moderna, Pfizer, Sinopharm and Sputnik V, with precise ICP-MS. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(2), 1367–1393. <https://doi.org/10.56098/mt1nj52>
- Dobhal, G., Datta, A., Ayupova, D., Teesdale-Spittle, P., & Goreham, R. V. (2020). Isolation, characterisation and detection of breath-derived extracellular vesicles. *Scientific Reports*, 10, 17381. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-73243-5>
- Donaldson, K., Murphy, F. A., Duffin, R., & Poland, C. A. (2010). Asbestos, carbon nanotubes and the pleural mesothelium: A review of the hypothesis regarding the role of long fibre retention in the parietal pleura, inflammation and mesothelioma. *Particle and Fibre Toxicology*, 7(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-8977-7-5>
- Douglas, S. M., Bachelet, I., & Church, G. M. (2012). A logic-gated nanorobot for targeted transport of molecular payloads. *Science*, 335(6070), 831–834. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1214081>

- Douglas, S. M., Marblestone, A. H., Teerapittayanon, S., Vazquez, A., Church, G. M., & Shih, W. M. (2009). Rapid prototyping of 3D DNA-origami shapes with caDNAno. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 37(15), 5001–5006. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkp436>
- Dowd, E., Becker, G. de, & Kennedy, R. F., Jr. (2024). *“Cause Unknown”: The Epidemic of Sudden Deaths in 2021 & 2022 & 2023*. Children’s Health Defense Books. <https://www.skyhorsepublishing.com/9781648210730/cause-unknown/>
- Ellis, C. L. (2025). *Lockheed Martin’s U-2 “Dragon Lady” and SR-71 “Blackbird.”*
- European Forum for Vaccine Vigilance. (2021). *Project Bluetooth Experience X*. EFVV - European Forum for Vaccine Vigilance. <https://efvv.eu/news/project-bluetooth-experience-x>
- Feynman, R. P. (1963). *The Feynman Rule Explained by Feynman* [Video recording]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EYPapE-3FRw>
- Ferguson, N., Laydon, Daniel, Nedjati Gilani, Gemma, Imai, N., Ainslie, Kylie, Baguelin, Marc, Bhatia, Sangeeta, Boonyasiri, Adhiratha, Cucunuba Perez, Zulma, Cuomo-Dannenburg, Gina, Dighe, Amy, Dorigatti, Iaria, Fu, Han, Gaythorpe, Katy, Green, Will, Hamlet, Arran, Hinsley, Wes, Okell, Lucy, Van Elsland, S., ... Ghani, Azra. (2020). *Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand*. <https://doi.org/10.25561/77482>
- Fischer, T., Agarwal, A., & Hess, H. (2009). A smart dust biosensor powered by kinesin motors. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 4(3), 162-166. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nnano.2008.393>
- Giordano, J. (2018a). *Brain Science from Bench to Battlefield: The Realities - and Risks - of Neuroweapons* | CGSR Seminar [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N02SK9yd60s>
- Giordano, J. (2018b, September 25). *The Brain as the Battlefield of the Future: Modern War Speaker Institute Series at the US Military Academy at West Point*. <https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-1-d&channel=entpr&q=James+Giordano%2C+N%23#fpstate=ive&vld=cid:17be7141,vid:N02SK9yd60s,st:0>
- Giordano, J. (2022, October 6). *Militarized Neuroweapons Presentation by Dr. James Giordano* [Video recording]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Csjy9QTMd1s>
- Giordano, J. (Director). (2023, August 1). *The Battle for Your Mind: Neuroscience, Technology/ AI & the OODA Loop w/ James Giordano, PhD | Flow* [Video recording]. AGLX. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1cPWJfjXu7M>
- Giordano, J. (2024a, May 9). *Dr. Giordano named Senior Ethical Legal Societal and Social Issues Subject Matter Expert for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency’s Triage Challenge*. Institute for Biodefense Research. <https://biodefenseresearch.org/dr-giordano-named-senior-ethical-legal-societal-and-social-issues-subject-matter-expert-for-the-defense-advanced-research-projects-agencys-triage-challenge/>
- Giordano, J. (2024b, October 30). *DARPA’s N3: The Future of Non-Surgical Brain Interfaces*. Institute for Biodefense Research. <https://biodefenseresearch.org/darpas-n3-the-future-of-non-surgical-brain-interfaces/>
- Giordano, James, & Institute for National Strategic Studies National Defense University. (n. d., viewed 2026). *James Giordano—Senior Fellow, Disruptive Technology and Future Warfare* Giordano, James. Institute for National Strategic Studies. <https://inss.ndu.edu/Media/Biographies/Article-View/Article/4044640/james-giordano/>
- Goldman, S., Bron, D., Tousseyn, T., Vierasu, I., Dewispelaere, L., Heimann, P., Cogan, E., & Goldman, M. (2021). Rapid progression of angioimmunoblastic T cell lymphoma following BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine booster shot: A case report. *Frontiers in Medicine*, 8, 798095. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2021.798095>
- Ghebreyesus, T. A. (2020, March 11). *WHO Director-General’s opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19—11 March 2020*. <https://www.who.int/director-general/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020>

- Gregorio, N. E., Levine, M. Z., & Oza, J. P. (2019). A user's guide to cell-free protein synthesis. *Methods and Protocols*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/mps2010024>
- Grieves, M. W. (2023). Digital twins: past, present, and future. In N. Crespi, A. T. Drobot, & R. Minerva (Eds.), *The Digital Twin*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21343-4_4
- Han, D., Qi, X., Myhrvold, C., Wang, B., Dai, M., Jiang, S., Bates, M., Liu, Y., An, B., & Yin, P. (2017). Single-stranded DNA and RNA origami. *Science*, 358(6369), eaao2648. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao2648>
- Harari, Y. N. (2020). Commencement Speech 2020: Congratulations, You are Now Hackable Animals. Yuval Noah Harari. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rUIwIuyvu8w>
- He, X., Sha, R., Zhuo, R., Mi, Y., Chaikin, P. M., & Seeman, N. C. (2017). Exponential growth and selection in self-replicating materials from DNA origami rafts. *Nature Materials*, 16, 930–935. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmat4986>
- Holland, M. (2026, June 16). The CDC just proved COVID isn't over. *Children's Health Defense*. <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/support/the-cdc-just-proved-covid-isnt-over/>
- Hong, G., Yang, X., Zhou, T., & Lieber, C. M. (2018). Mesh electronics: a new paradigm for tissue-like brain probes. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 50, 33–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2017.11.007>
- Hottin, A., & Marx, A. (2016). Structural Insights into the Processing of Nucleobase-Modified Nucleotides by DNA Polymerases. *Accounts of Chemical Research*, 49(3), 418–427. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.accounts.5b00544>
- Hou, X., Zaks, T., Langer, R., & Dong, Y. (2021). Lipid nanoparticles for mRNA delivery. *Nature Reviews Materials*, 6(12), 1078–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41578-021-00358-0>
- Huang, Q., Ali, A., Celik, A., et al. (2025). *Human body communication transceivers*. *Nature Reviews Electrical Engineering*, 2, 374–389. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44287-025-00160-y>
- Hughes, D. (2022). What is in the so-called COVID-19 “vaccines”? Part 1: evidence of a global crime against humanity. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 2(2), 455–586. <https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v2i2.52>
- Hulscher, N. (2025). First peer-reviewed paper defines COVID-19 vaccine-induced “turbo cancer”. *Science, Public Health Policy and the Law*. <https://publichealthpolicyjournal.com/first-peer-reviewed-paper-defines-covid-19-vaccine-induced-turbo-cancer/>
- Hulscher, N. (2026, March 20). *BREAKING: Former President of the Pennsylvania Funeral Directors Association Says 30–40% of Corpses Contain WHITE FIBROUS CLOTS*. https://www.thefocalpoints.com/p/breaking-former-president-of-the?publication_id=1119676&utm_campaign=email-play-on-substack&r=k92dd&utm_medium=email
- Hundt, N., Cole, D., Hantke, M. F., Miller, J. J., Struwe, W. B., & Kukura, P. (2022). Direct observation of the molecular mechanism underlying protein polymerization. *Science Advances*, 8(35), eabm7935. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abm7935>
- I, C.-L., & Zheng, Z. (2023). The digital twin in human activities: the personal digital twin. In N. Crespi, A. T. Drobot, & R. Minerva (Eds.), *The Digital Twin*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21343-4_33
- Icke, D. (2020, August 18). Plandemic: Indoctrination World Premiere. *Digital Freedom Platform*. <https://freedomplatform.tv/plandemic-indoctrination-world-premiere/>
- IEEE Standard 802.15.6-2012. *IEEE Standard for Local and metropolitan area networks - Part 15.6: Wireless Body Area Networks*. [<https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6161600>]
- IEEE Standard 1906.1-2015. *IEEE Recommended Practice for Nanoscale and Molecular Communication Framework*. [<https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/1906.1/5171/>]

- IEEE Standard 802.15.3d-2017. *Amendment 2: 100 Gb/s Wireless Switched Point-to-Point Physical Layer*.
<https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/802.15.3d/6648/>
- IEEE Standard 1906.1.1-2020. *IEEE Standard Data Model for Nanoscale Communication Systems*.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/IEEESTD.2020.9285373>
- IEEE Standard 802.15.3-2023. *IEEE Standard for Wireless Multimedia Networks*.
<https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/802.15.3/10801/>
- Ishida, H., Ito, T., & Kuzuya, A. (2025). Molecular origami: designing functional molecules of the future. *Molecules*, 30(2), 242. <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules30020242>
- ISO/IEC/IEEE Standard 8802-15-6:2017. *Information technology -- Part 15-6: Wireless body area network*.
<https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/8802-15-6/10017/>
- Jamshidi, M. B., Hoang, D. T., & Nguyen, D. N. (2024). CNN-FL for biotechnology industry empowered by Internet-of-BioNano Things and Digital Twins. *IEEE Internet of Things Magazine*, 7(5), 54-63.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/IOTM.001.2400081>
- Jamshidi, M., Thai Hoang, D., Nguyen, D. N., Niyato, D., & Ebrahimi Warkiani, M. (2025). Physics-informed neural networks for bio-nano digital twins: A multimodel framework with IoBNT integration. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 12(24), 53868–53884. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2025.3621421>
- Jamshidi, M. (Behdad), Hoang, D. T., Nguyen, D. N., Niyato, D., & Warkiani, M. E. (2025). Revolutionizing biological digital twins: Integrating internet of bio-nano things, convolutional neural networks, and federated learning. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 189, 109970.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.combiomed.2025.109970>
- Jeon, K.-Y., Park, S., Broudy, D., & Joo, H.-D. (2023). A presentation of analyses of COVID-19 vaccine samples, blood samples, urine samples, foot bath samples, sitz bath samples, and skin-extract samples. *Journal of Biomedical Research & Environmental Sciences*, 4(2), 188–216. <https://doi.org/10.37871/jbres1663>
- Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security. (2018). *Technologies to address global catastrophic biological risks*. Bloomberg School of Public Health. <https://centerforhealthsecurity.org/sites/default/files/2022-12/181009-gcbr-tech-report.pdf>
- Jornet, J. M., & Akyildiz, I. F. (2013). Graphene-based plasmonic nano-antenna for terahertz band communication. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 31(12), 685-694.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/JSAC.2013.SUP2.1213001>
- Jornet, J. M., et al. (2024). *Electromagnetic nanonetworks beyond 6G: From wearable and implantable networks to on-chip and quantum communication*. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 42(8), 1958–1981.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/JSAC.2024.3399253>
- Kabza, A. M., Kundu, N., Zhong, W., & Szczepanski, J. T. (2022). Integration of chemically modified nucleotides with DNA strand displacement reactions for applications in living systems. *WIREs Nanomedicine and Nanobiotechnology*, 14(2), e1743. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wnan.1743>
- Kahn, J. S., Redeker, D. C., Michelson, A., Tkachenko, A., Hong, S., Minevich, B., & Gang, O. (2025b). Arbitrary design of DNA-programmable 3D crystals through symmetry mapping. *ACS Nano*, 19(15), 14795–14807. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsnano.4c17408>
- Kaiser, S., Kaiser, S., Reis, J., & Marschalek, R. (2025). Quantification of objective concentrations of DNA impurities in mRNA vaccines. *Vaccine*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2025.127022>
- Karikó, K., Buckstein, M., Ni, H., & Weissman, D. (2005). Suppression of RNA recognition by toll-like receptors: the impact of nucleoside modification and the evolutionary origin of RNA. *Immunity*, 23(2), 165–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2005.06.008>
- Karvinen, S., Sievänen, T., Karppinen, J. E., et al. (2020). MicroRNAs in extracellular vesicles in sweat change in response to endurance exercise. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 11, 676.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2020.00676>

- Kasner, L. (2024, December 30). Results of the 2024 Worldwide Embalmer Blood Clot Survey [Substack newsletter]. *Clotastrophe*. https://laurakasner.substack.com/p/results-of-the-2024-worldwide-embalmer?utm_medium=web
- Kell, D. B., & Pretorius, E. (2024). Proteomic evidence for amyloidogenic cross-seeding in fibrinoid microclots. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 25(19). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms251910809>
- Kennedy, R. F. J. (2021). *The Real Anthony Fauci: Bill Gates, Big Pharma, and the Global War on Democracy and Public Health*. Skyhorse. <https://www.amazon.com/s?k=the+real+anthony+fauci+robert+f+kennedy+jr+book&crd=5ZXMN U0B59V>
- Kennedy, Jr., R. F. (2022). *A Letter to Liberals—Censorship and COVID: An Attack on Science and American Ideals*. ChildrensHealthDefense.org. <https://www.amazon.com/Letter-Liberals-Censorship-American-Childrens/dp/1510775587>
- Khan, I., Saeed, K., Zekker, I., Zhang, B., Hendi, A. H., Ahmad, A., Ahmad, S., Zada, N., Ahmad, H., Shah, L. A., Shah, T., & Khan, I. (2022). Review on Methylene Blue: Its properties, uses, toxicity and photodegradation. *Water*, 14(2), 242. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w14020242>
- Kikuchi, K., Anzai, T., & Takahashi, K. (2023). The unusual increase in suicides among women in Japan during the COVID-19 pandemic: a time-series analysis until October 2021. *Journal of Epidemiology*, 33(1), 45–51. <https://doi.org/10.2188/jea.JE20220186>
- Kim, D. N., Kilchherr, F., Dietz, H., & Bathe, M. (2012). Quantitative prediction of 3D solution shape and flexibility of nucleic acid nanostructures. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 40(7), 2862–2868. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkr1173>
- Kirsch, S. (2026, January 17). *CDC just gave Pfizer \$1.24 Billion in contracts for more doses of the COVID vaccine despite their own Medicare evidence that it makes people more likely to die from COVID*. <https://kirschsubstack.com/p/cdc-just-gave-pfizer-124-billion>
- Kuo, Y.-C., & Chen, H.-H. (2010). Effect of electromagnetic field on endocytosis of cationic solid lipid nanoparticles by human brain-microvascular endothelial cells. *Journal of Drug Targeting*, 18(6), 447–456. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10611860903494245>
- Kyriakopoulos, A. M., Nigh, G., McCullough, P. A., & Seneff, S. (2024). Autoimmune and neoplastic outcomes after the mRNA vaccination: The role of T regulatory cell responses. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(2), 1395–1433. <https://doi.org/10.56098/16j4nf05>
- Kyriakopoulos, A. M., & Seneff, S. (2024). Pathology deterioration in a pure β -zero thalassemia heterozygote after mRNA COVID-19 vaccination: A case report and literature review. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(2), 1245–1274. <https://doi.org/10.56098/y768gc33>
- Kyrie, V., & Broudy, D. (2022). Cyborgs R Us: The bio-nano panopticon of injected bodies? *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 2(2), 355–383. <https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtp.v2i2.49>
- Lal, S., Link, S., & Halas, N. (2007). Nano-optics from sensing to waveguiding. *Nature Photonics*, 1, 641–648. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nphoton.2007.223>
- Lataster, R. (2026). The causes of Australian excess deaths in 2021, and beyond: An ecological study considering COVID-19, the lockdowns, and the vaccines. *International Journal of Risk & Safety in Medicine*, 09246479261426743. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09246479261426743>
- Leake, J. (2025, May 23). *Pfizer Whistleblower Christine Cotton Takes Her Life After Year of Excruciating Idiopathic Pain*. <https://www.thefocalpoints.com/cp/200693959>
- Lee, D. S., Kim, J. W., Lee, K. L., Jung, Y. J., & Kang, H. W. (2022). Significance of digestive symptoms after COVID-19 vaccination: A retrospective single-center study. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 58, 154–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2022.05.044>
- Lee, M., Boudreaux, B., Chaturvedi, R., Romanosky, S., & Downing, B. (2020). *The Internet of Bodies: Opportunities, Risks, and Governance*. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR3226.html

- Lee, Y. M., Park, S., & Jeon, K.-Y. (2022). Foreign materials in blood samples of recipients of COVID-19 vaccines. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 2(1), 249–265. <https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v2i1.37>
- Lee, Y. M., & Broudy, D. (2024a). Real-time self-assembly of stereomicroscopically visible artificial constructions in incubated specimens of mRNA products mainly from Pfizer and Moderna: A comprehensive longitudinal study. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(2), 1180–1244. <https://doi.org/10.56098/586k0043>
- Lee, Y. M., & Broudy, D. (2024b). Response to critics of Lee and Broudy 2024 on the toxicity and self-assembling technology in incubated samples of injectable mRNA materials. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(2), 1244.20-1244.29. <https://doi.org/10.56098/aqgzye36>
- Lerner, A., Matthias, T., & Aminov, R. (2017). Potential effects of horizontal gene exchange in the human gut. *Frontiers in Immunology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2017.01630>
- Link, J. R., & Sailor, M. J. (2003). Smart dust: self-assembling, self-orienting photonic crystals of porous Si. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100(19), 10607-10610. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1233824100>
- Lyons-Weiler, J. (2023, January 7). Harvard study: Free spike protein - not bound by antibodies - detected in the blood of adolescents and young adults who developed post-mRNA vaccine myocarditis [Substack newsletter]. *Popular Rationalism*. https://popularrationalism.substack.com/p/harvard-study-free-spike-protein?publication_id=475124&isFreemail=true
- Madhanagopal, B. R., Wang, T., & Chandrasekaran, A. R. (2026). Light-responsive DNA nanostructures. *Nature Reviews Chemistry*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41570-026-00817-8>
- Manhattan Project. (2024). In *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Manhattan_Project&oldid=1198505554
- McCairn, K., Hirschman, R., & Zee, M. (Directors). (2025, May 5). *BREAKING: Scientist Confirms White Clots Caused by Shots Are Infectious Amyloid - Daily Pulse Ep 18* [Video recording]. <https://rumble.com/v6t058p-breaking-scientist-confirms-white-clots-caused-by-shots-are-infectious-amy.html>
- McMillan, J. R., Hayes, O. G., Remis, J. P., & Mirkin, C. A. (2018). Programming protein polymerization with DNA. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 140(46), 15950-15956. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jacs.8b10011>
- McMillan, P., Kell, D., & Vejon Health (Directors). (2025, May 24). *What If Clots Are the Missing Link?* [Video recording]. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PdGmfxfh-zdg>
- Mead, M. N., Seneff, S., Wolfinger, R., Rose, J., Denhaerynck, K., Kirsch, S., & McCullough, P. A. (2024). COVID-19 modified mRNA “vaccines”: Lessons learned from clinical trials, mass vaccination, and the bio-pharmaceutical complex, part 1. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(2), 1112–1178. <https://doi.org/10.56098/fdrasy50>
- Mead, M. N., Seneff, S., Rose, J., Wolfinger, R., Hulscher, N., & McCullough, P. A. (2024). COVID-19 modified mRNA “vaccines”: Lessons learned from clinical trials, mass vaccination, and the bio-pharmaceutical complex, part 2. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(2), 1275–1344. <https://doi.org/10.56098/w66wjg87>
- Michels, C., Perrier, D., Kunadhasan, J., Clark, E., Gehrett, J., Gehrett, B., Kwiatek, K., Adams, S., Chandler, R., Stagno, L., Damian, T., Delph, E., & Flowers, C. (2023). Forensic analysis of the 38 subject deaths in the 6-Month Interim Report of the Pfizer/BioNTech BNT162b2 mRNA Vaccine Clinical Trial. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(1), 973–1008. <https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v3i1.85>
- Mihai, S., et al. (2022). Digital twins: a survey on enabling technologies, challenges, trends and future prospects. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 24(4), 2255-2291.

<https://research.edgehill.ac.uk/en/publications/digital-twins-a-survey-on-enabling-technologies-challenges-trends/>

- Nance, K. D., & Meier, J. L. (2021). Modifications in an emergency: the role of N1-methylpseudouridine in COVID-19 vaccines. *ACS Central Science*, 7(5), 748–756. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acscentsci.1c00197>
- Non-genetic DNAs as programmable molecular baits. (2026). *Nature Chemistry*.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41557-026-02102-z>
- Ndeupen, S., Bouteau, A., Heron, S. R., Aboubacar, C., Moyer, C. T., ... & Igyártó, B. Z. (2021). The mRNA-LNP platform's lipid nanoparticle component used in preclinical vaccine studies is highly inflammatory. *iScience*, 24(12), 103479. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2021.103479>
- Nguyen, M.-K., Nguyen, V. H., Natarajan, A. K., Huang, Y., Ryssy, J., Shen, B., & Kuzyk, A. (2020). Ultrathin silica coating of DNA origami nanostructures. *Chemistry of Materials*, 32(15), 6657–6665. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemmater.0c02111>
- Nixon, D., Yanowitz, S. D., Taylor, M. (2022) [Video] Microscopy Observations of Self-Assembly of Chips Interconnected by Optical Fibers from a Pfizer Vial. <https://drdavidnixon.com/1/en/topic/david-shimon-yanowitz-and-mat-taylor>
- O’Looney, J., Hirschman, R., & Faithful, B. (2022, October 8). *Episode 74: Funeral Directors & Embalmers Unite to Expose A Day in the Death of Life - Listen Now on The Counterspin Media Podcast*. Zeno.FM. <https://zeno.fm/podcast/the-counterspin-media-podcast/episodes/episode-74-funeral-directors-embalmers-unite-to-expose-a-day-in-the-death-of-life/>
- O’Looney, J. (2025, February 27). *Interview with John O’Looney: Evidence In The Blood*. <https://www.youtube.com/shorts/xEtyfyCMktw>
- Oller, J. W. (2014). Biosemiotic entropy: concluding the series. *Entropy*, 16(7), 4060–4087. <https://doi.org/10.3390/e16074060>
- Oller, J. W., & Collins, S. (2000). The logic of true narrative representations. *Global Journal of Classical Theology*, 2(2), 1–26. <http://www.globaljournalct.com/the-logic-of-true-narrative-representations/>
- Oller, J. W., & Santiago, D. (2022). All-cause mortality and COVID-19 injections: Evidence from 28 weeks of Public Health England “COVID-19 Vaccine Surveillance Reports.” *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 2(2), 301–319. <https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v2i2.42>
- Oller, J. W., Santiago, D., & Broudy, D. (2025). The CDC denies magnetic elements in COVID injectables while DARPA promotes mind-control research with magnetic nanoparticles migrated to the brain. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Medical Science*, 10(07), 255–271. <https://doi.org/10.23958/ijirms/vol10-i07/2101>
- Ota, N., Itani, M., Aoki, T., Sakurai, A., Fujisawa, T., Okada, Y., Noda, K., Arakawa, Y., Tokuda, S., & Tanikawa, R. (2025). Expression of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein in cerebral arteries: implications for hemorrhagic stroke post-mRNA vaccination. *Journal of Clinical Neuroscience*, 136, 111223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocn.2025.111223>
- Patel, M. N., Tiwari, S., Wang, Y., et al. (2026). Safer non-viral DNA delivery using lipid nanoparticles loaded with endogenous anti-inflammatory lipids. *Nature Biotechnology*, 44, 79–89. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-025-02556-5>
- Perez, J.-C., Moret-Chalmin, C., & Montagnier, L. (2023). Emergence of a new Creutzfeldt-Jakob Disease: 26 cases of the human version of mad-cow disease, days after a COVID-19 injection. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(1), 727–770. <https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v3i1.66>
- Pfizer (with BIRAD & Bachelet). (2015). Bar Ilan University to work with Pfizer Inc. To evaluate drug delivery via DNA Nanorobots | *Pfizer*. Retrieved from <https://www.pfizer.com/news/press-release/press-release-detail/bar-ilan-university-work-pfizer-inc-evaluate-drug-delivery> On March 18, 2026.

- Pharmaceutical Technology. (2024, April 8). COVID-19 Vaccination Tracker: Daily Rates, Statistics & Updates. *Pharmaceutical Technology*. <https://www.pharmaceutical-technology.com/covid-19-vaccination-tracker/>
- Post, E. A. J., & Fletcher, S. P. (2020). Dissipative self-assembly, competition and inhibition in a self-reproducing protocell model. *Chemical Science*, 11, 9434–9442. <https://doi.org/10.1039/D0SC02768E>
- Pressler, M. P., Yaras, R., Kohan, L. R., & Singla, P. (2025). Diffuse myalgia and neuropathic pain after COVID vaccine. *Pain Medicine*, 26(1), 43–44. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pm/pnae096>
- Reis, G., Silva, E. A. S. M., Silva, D. C. M., Thabane, L., Milagres, A. C., Ferreira, T. S., dos Santos, C. V. Q., Campos, V. H. S., Nogueira, A. M. R., de Almeida, A. P. F. G., Callegari, E. D., Neto, A. D. F., Savassi, L. C. M., Simplicio, M. I. C., Ribeiro, L. B., Oliveira, R., Harari, O., Forrest, J. I., Ruton, H., Sprague, S., McKay, P., Guo, C. M., Rowland-Yeo, K., Guyatt, G. H., Boulware, D. R., Rayner, C. R., & Mills, E. J. (2022). Effect of early treatment with ivermectin among patients with COVID-19. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 386(18), 1721–1731. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2115869>
- Roberts, T. C., Langer, R., & Wood, M. J. A. (2020). Advances in oligonucleotide drug delivery. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 19(10), 673–694. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41573-020-0075-7>
- Saeki, D., Sugiura, S., Kanamori, T., Sato, S., & Ichikawa, S. (2014). Microcompartmentalized cell-free protein synthesis in semipermeable microcapsules composed of polyethyleneimine-coated alginate. *Journal of Bioscience and Bioengineering*, 118(2), 199–204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiosc.2014.01.014>
- Santiago, D. (2024). A closer look at N1-methylpseudouridine in the modified mRNA injectables. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(2), 1345–1366. <https://doi.org/10.56098/5azda593>
- Santiago, D., & Oller, J. W. (2023). Abnormal clots and all-cause mortality during the pandemic experiment: Five doses of COVID-19 vaccine are evidently lethal to nearly all Medicare participants. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(1), 847–890. <https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v3i1.73>
- Sarlangue, G., Devilleger, J., Trillaud, P., Fouchet, S., Taillasson, L., Catteau, G., & Zeneca, A. (2021). *Projet Bluetooth Expérience X*. <http://fpoinsot.free.fr/Doc/Experience.pdf>
- Schwab, K. (2016). The fourth industrial revolution what it means and how to respond. *Japan SPOTLIGHT*, July/August 2016. https://www.jef.or.jp/journal/pdf/208th_Cover_01.pdf
- Seeman, N. C. (1982). Nucleic acid junctions and lattices. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 99(2), 237–247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193\(82\)90002-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193(82)90002-9)
- Seeman, N. C., & Sleiman, H. F. (2017). DNA nanotechnology. *Nature Reviews Materials*, 3, 17068. <https://doi.org/10.1038/natrevmats.2017.68>
- Segalla, G. (2023a). Apparent cytotoxicity and intrinsic cytotoxicity of lipid nanomaterials contained in a COVID-19 mRNA vaccine. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(1), 957–972. <https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v3i1.84>
- Segalla, G. (2023b). Chemical-physical criticality and toxicological potential of lipid nanomaterials contained in a COVID-19 mRNA vaccine. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(1), 787–817. <https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v3i1.68>
- Segalla, G. (2024). Adjuvant activity and toxicological risks of lipid nanoparticles contained in the COVID-19 “mRNA vaccines.” *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(2), 1085–1102. <https://doi.org/10.56098/z1ydjm29>
- Segalla, G. (2026). ALC-0315 toxic metabolites: pharmacokinetic and regulatory criticalities in a COVID-19 “mRNA vaccine.” *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 4(2), 1673–1699. <https://doi.org/10.56098/q9fgvp96>
- Seneff, S., Nigh, G., Kyriakopoulos, A. M., & McCullough, P. A. (2022). Innate immune suppression by SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccinations: The role of G-quadruplexes, exosomes, and MicroRNAs. *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, 164, 113008. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2022.113008>

- Seyfried, T. N., Flores, R. E., Poff, A. M., & D'Agostino, D. P. (2014). Cancer as a metabolic disease: implications for novel therapeutics. *Carcinogenesis*, 35(3), 515–527. <https://doi.org/10.1093/carcin/bgt480>
- Silverman, A. D., Karim, A. S., & Jewett, M. C. (2020). Cell-free gene expression: An expanded repertoire of applications. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 21(3), 151–170. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41576-019-0186-3>
- Sohn, W. Y., Goody, S. M. G., Reid, D. W., Edwards, D. K., Urdaneta, V., Doyle, B. P., Straus, W. L., Henry, C., & Rizkalla, B. (2026). Evidence-based assessment of safety and mechanistic questions Related to mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines. *Vaccine*, 77, 128394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2026.128394>
- Speicher, D. J., Rose, J., & McKernan, K. (2025). Quantification of residual plasmid DNA and SV40 promoter-enhancer sequences in Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna modRNA COVID-19 vaccines from Ontario, Canada. *Autoimmunity*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08916934.2025.2551517>
- Springer Nature. (2026, June 11). *Nature Reviews Methods Primers*. Nature. <https://www.nature.com/nrmp/>
- Su, L. J., Wang, N. N., Luo, R., et al. (2026). Artificial intelligence-guided design of LNPs for in vivo targeted mRNA delivery via analysis of the spatial conformation of ionizable lipids. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-026-01640-8>
- Tang, C., Yi, W., Occhipinti, E., Dai, Y., Gao, S., & Occhipinti, L. G. (2024). A roadmap for the development of human body digital twins. *Nature Reviews Electrical Engineering*, 1(3), 199–207. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44287-024-00025-w>
- Tao, F., & Qi, Q. (2019). Make more digital twins. *Nature*, 573, 490–491. <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-02849-1>
- Tao, F., Zhang, H., & Zhang, C. (2024). Advancements and challenges of digital twins in industry. *Nature Computational Science*, 4, 169–177. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-024-00603-w>
- Tian, G., Huang, L., Pan, X., et al. (2026). Meta-topological hydrogel enables multisource and frequency-tailored artefact mitigation for bioelectronics. *Nature Sensors*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44460-026-00055-x>
- Trigoso, E. (2022, September 4). *Embalmers Have Been Finding Numerous Long, Fibrous Clots That Lack Post-Mortem Characteristics* | USNN World News. <https://www.usnn.news/embalmers-have-been-finding-numerous-long-fibrous-clots-that-lack-post-mortem-characteristics/>
- Ulrich, A. S. (2024). No Nanobots in Vaccines — Just lipids on the loose: commentary on Lee and Broudy (2024), “Real-time self-assembly of stereomicroscopically visible artificial constructs in incubated specimens of mRNA products mainly from Pfizer and Moderna: a comprehensive longitudinal study.” *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, 3(2), 1244.1–1244.10. <https://doi.org/10.56098/7hsjff81>
- US Government Accountability Office. (2021). *COVID-19 Contracting: Actions Needed to Enhance Transparency and Oversight of Selected Awards*. US GAO. Retrieved from <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-21-501> On March 18, 2026.
- Valdes, Angues R, & Perea, Bustos Y (December 17, 2023) SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination and the Multi-Hit Hypothesis of Oncogenesis. *Cureus* 15(12): e50703. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.50703>
- Vizziello, A., Magarini, M., Savazzi, P., & Galluccio, L. (2023). *Intra-body communications for nervous system applications: Current technologies and future directions*. *Computer Networks*, 227, 109718. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2023.109718>
- Wang, Z. L., & Wu, W. (2012). Nanotechnology-enabled energy harvesting for self-powered micro-/nanosystems. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 51(44), 11700–11721. <https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201201656>
- Weinstein, E. N., Gollub, M. G., Slabodkin, A., et al. (2026). Manufacturing-aware generative models enable petascale synthesis of designed DNA. *Nature Biotechnology*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-026-03020-8>

- Westman, H., Hammarström, P., & Nyström, S. (2025). SARS-CoV-2 Spike Protein Amyloid Fibrils Impair Fibrin Formation and Fibrinolysis. *Biochemistry*, 64(24), 4818–4829. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.biochem.5c00550>
- Wikipedia. (2026a). 5G. In *Wikipedia*. <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=5G&oldid=1358628742>
- Wikipedia. (2026b). Global Positioning System. In *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Global_Positioning_System&oldid=1356894306
- Willis, M. (Director). (2020, June 4). *Plandemic Part 1* [Video recording]. https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=LL8qoMcUqKWLdc3YC6s5Ov_g
- Yadav, S., Lee, R. X., Kajale, S. N., et al. (2025). A nonsurgical brain implant enabled through a cell–electronics hybrid for focal neuromodulation. *Nature Biotechnology*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-025-02809-3>
- Yanowitz, S. D. (2023a, February 17). *LIVE #8 UNCENSORED: Shimon Yanowitz - New nanotech in injected people is spread* [Video]. Rumble. <https://rumble.com/v29xlsq-live-8-uncensored-shimon-yanowitz-new-nanotech-in-injected-people-is-spread.html>
- Yanowitz, S. D. (2023b, May 12). *LIVE UNCENSORED: Shimon Yanowitz - Globalist synthetic biology to eradicate hu...* [Video]. Rumble. <https://rumble.com/v2nhbn4-live-uncensored-shimon-yanowitz-globalist-synthetic-biology-to-eradicate-hu.html>
- Yanowitz, S., & Bruckstein, A. (1989). A new method for image segmentation. *Computer Vision Graphics and Image Processing*, 46(1), 82–95. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0734-189X\(89\)80017-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0734-189X(89)80017-9)
- Yao, G., Zhang, F., Wang, F., et al. (2020). Meta-DNA structures. *Nature Chemistry*, 12, 1067–1075. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41557-020-0539-8>
- Yokel, R. A. (2021). Direct nose to the brain nanomedicine delivery presents a formidable challenge. *WIREs Nanomedicine and Nanobiotechnology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wnan.1767>
- Zadeh, J. N., Steenberg, C. D., Bois, J. S., Wolfe, B. R., Pierce, M. B., Khan, A. R., Dirks, R. M., & Pierce, N. A. (2011). NUPACK: Analysis and design of nucleic acid systems. *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, 32(1), 170–173. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcc.21596>
- Zafar, S., et al. (2021). *A systematic review of bio-cyber interface technologies and security issues for Internet of Bio-Nano Things*. *IEEE Access*, 9, 93529–93566. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3093442>
- Zee, M., Santiago, D., Harrison, G., Zywiec, A., Crouch, W., Hirschman, R., & Triantos, P. (Directors). (2024, December 11). *Jab White Clot Mystery Solved?* [Video recording]. <https://rumble.com/v5yd7lz-breaking-jab-white-clot-mystery-solved.html>
- Zhan, P., Peil, A., Jiang, Q., Wang, D., Mousavi, S., Xiong, Q., Shen, Q., Shang, Y., Ding, B., Lin, C., Ke, Y., & Liu, N. (2023). Recent advances in DNA origami-engineered nanomaterials and applications. *Chemical Reviews*, 123(7), 3976–4050. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.3c00028>
- Zhang, D. Y., & Seelig, G. (2011). Dynamic DNA nanotechnology using strand-displacement reactions. *Nature Chemistry*, 3(2), 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nchem.957>

Glossary of Terms

AI — artificial intelligence is the name applied loosely to huge buildings filled with supercomputers operating now at an unprecedented scale and performing calculations that greatly surpass in speed and scope the powers of any human being or collective of them; they can “learn” and add to their “knowledge base” as limited only by the size of the data centers, the electrical power they require, and the water resources necessary to dissipate the enormous heat they generate.

BAN — a body area network consisting of computing devices located on, in, or around the human body that enable sending and receiving messages undetected by the persons in the network; first conceived circa

2010-2015 by Akyildiz, Jornet and others, as one of the layers comprising the **IOB**, the **IoNT** and the **IoBNT**.

biphasic quasi-static signaling — a type of current signal in electrical engineering that uses alternating current (AC) rather than a direct current (DC), where the AC has a negative phase and a positive phase that attempt to achieve a net zero charge transfer/accumulation, since charge transfer/accumulation induces a dangerous inflammatory process in any living body.

CAD/CAM — computer-aided design and computer-aided manufacturing, replacing manual-labor engineering and machine-operation.

CFPS — cell-free protein synthesis is a nanotechnology for building any protein imaginable, even ones that are completely foreign to the body, from synthetic DNA or RNA molecules.

the cloud — a term referring in a general way to the data-centers that provide the hardware and software to perform complex tasks (often involving AI) and to store vast amounts of data accessible to some primary node of a network as contrasted with any local computer that might be used for similar tasks and data storage, but with far less computational and storage capacity; akin to an electrical power station generating electricity and delivering it to users everywhere in a networked grid.

CPU — central processing unit, the main electronic component in computers, capable of processing stored data for logical or arithmetic operations and managing communications.

DARPA — an acronym for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, a subagency of the Department of Defense in the US that has appeared under other names in the past.

FBR — foreign body response, a medical term for an inflammatory response and scarring formed as a result of penetration by a non-inert foreign body that cannot be cleared by the body's normal defense systems.

FET — Field Effect Transistor, a fundamental electronic component widely used in the semiconductor microchip industry; particularly suited for use in bio-electronics in self-assembling nanotechnology.

GUV — giant unilamellar vesicle.

HCR — hybridization chain reaction, a process that can amplify (make multiple copies of) synthetic DNA structures, akin to PCR that amplifies regular DNA.

hydrogel — a “soft” three-dimensional, water swollen network of crosslinked polymer vesicles used often in nanotechnology for delivery of a payload, and possibly for encapsulation, and adhesion to tissues for various purposes.

ICP-MS — Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry is a form of mass spectrometry (**MS**) used to analyze the chemical composition of unknown materials.

IEEE — Institute for Electrical and Electronic Engineers.

IoB — stands for the Internet of Bodies — the “human” part of the Internet of Things (**IoT**) — a global communications network intended to achieve bidirectional connectivity from “**the cloud**” to human bodies; conceived circa 2010-2012 by Akyildiz, Jornet and others.

IoBNT — Internet of Bio/Nano Things, a sub-network of the **IoB** and **BAN**, establishing bidirectional connectivity from “**the cloud**” to the nano-scale levels of molecules and cells in the human body through nano-scale bio-electronics, as envisioned by Akyildiz, Jornet and others, circa 2010-2015.

IoNT — Internet of Nano Things, the upper relay-layer of the **IoBNT**, routing and aggregating nodes of the **IoBNT** into nano-hubs for transmission through the **BAN** into a central bodily hub that can communicate with out-of-the body networks, such as smartphones and eventually 5G/6G cellular towers.

IoT — Internet of Things, a global communication network aiming to achieve bidirectional connectivity from “**the cloud**” to anything “electrical” or “electronic”, ranging from street-lights to domestic refrigerators, officially conceived in 1999.

ISM bands — frequency bands approved by national medical and/or regulatory authorities.

lanthanides — a group of 15 metallic “rare-earth” elements in the Periodic Table that are toxic and possess some exotic physical properties such as the power to “up-convert” low frequency (such as infrared) light into higher frequency (such as visible or UV) light photons. Of these, gadolinium is also the most paramagnetic of all elements at room temperature, which makes it a favorite injected “contrasting agent” during MRI scans, despite its dangers; although injected in a “chelated” form designed to sequester it from the body, some of it inevitably and can cause adverse reactions in people undergoing MRI; additionally, in the context of this paper, lanthanides are described as participating in the described nefarious (weaponized) aspects of nanotechnologies.

LNPs — lipid nanoparticles.

MAC — media access control, an address that serves as a hardware identifier for recognizing that hardware by a network interface controller; typically shown as six pairs of hexadecimal digits separated by colons, such as 00:1A:2B:3C:4D:5E used for delivery of data within a particular broadcast domain on the internet or in a **WiFi** or **Bluetooth** networks.

PEG — polyethylene glycol used to encapsulate injected entities in order to sequester them from the body’s defense systems.

phosphoramidite — a highly reactive chemical used in the industry during the solid-state production of synthetic DNA and RNA molecules

PHY — the physical hardware-layer in a network consisting of electrical, optical, and material means to transmit streams of data

prototissue — a term applied especially to immature synthetically constructed bodily tissues that are in the process of being scaled up from a nano-level to the scale of some natural bodily tissue.

meta-DNA — a molecule of deoxyribonucleic acid that rises above other such molecules in rank and controls them.

nanopore — a nanometer-scale opening or gate ~1 to 100 nanometers across permitting molecules of the right size, nucleic acids, or proteins to pass through possibly after displaying required credentials if the pore is in a native membrane of the body.

nanoscale — applies to entities with dimensions of 1 nanometer (nm) to 100 nm defined in IEEE Std 1906.1-2015.

nanotechnology — the science of employing nanoscale entities and larger entities that assemble out of them for obtaining structures of varying sizes for different engineering purposes.

node — an entity that contains a medium access control (MAC) sublayer and a physical (PHY) layer, and that optionally provides security services.

paramagnetic — the name for a quality of certain materials that makes them become attracted to magnetic fields, with varying levels of force, dependent on the material and the intensity of the magnetic field.

PDT — personal digital twin, a digital model of a person’s body, created in “**the cloud**” by constantly monitoring and aggregating data from the multilayer network created in that person, down to the basic molecular and cellular level (see **IoBNT**); powerful AI data-center computers can analyze and model the person based on surveillance, and can even calculate manipulations to achieve some desirable outcome in or behavior of that person, or even whole groups of persons, up to the global societal level; AI can, in theory, gain the power to transmit data back to the body, or a whole network of bodies, reducing them to peripheral, programmable endpoints and thus threatening or removing any autonomy or free-will.

photon — a quantum of electromagnetic energy and momentum without mass or electrical charge that when introduced into time and space as an event takes on what appears to be either a particle, or a wave function; contrasted with **plasmon**.

quantum dot — a nanoscale particle of semiconductor material, capable of converting electricity to light and vice versa; are used, for example, in modern TV screens to display color images; when introduced into living bodies their problem is toxicity, which requires special care during the manufacturing and disposal.

QoS — Quality of Service, a this term referring to the power of wireless networks to work (and provide “service” as intended or promised) in environments where multiple signals from multiple sources exist.

plasmon — a quantum of electromagnetic energy expressed in many excited electrons oscillating coherently in response to an external electromagnetic field; contrasted with **photon**.

SARS-CoV-2 — Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2.

self-assembly — the power of a cluster of basic synthetic-DNA or protein building blocks to autonomously assemble themselves into larger, more complex structures, either without intervention, or with the assistance of energy from some ambient electromagnetic field or deep-penetrating infrared light that can supply energy to the construction processes.

self-replication — the power of individual synthetic DNA-based structures to produce copies of themselves through a process of **HCR** (see above), using the required building blocks that they find or scavenge in their vicinity, and possibly also using ambient energy and temperature cycling.

shedding — in the context of the COVID-19 injectable products, or any other nanotechnology, the process of passing to other persons through nearby breathing, sharing of bodily fluids, skin contact, or by any means transmitting components to persons who previously did not have them in their bodies; see **synthetic contagion**.

smart dust — a technology that allows small particles to be manufactured so as to contain technologies such as self-assembling synthetic-DNA and other materials required for nano electronic devices; such devices and undisclosed atomic and molecular materials can be sprayed from the air, embedded in the food chain, added to drinking water, or to any consumer product; the contents of smart dust can be used to replenish (or add new materials or new nanotechnology) to be absorbed by the bodies of people that may have expunged prior nanotechnology payloads.

SPION — super-paramagnetic iron-oxide nanoparticles.

Surface Plasmon Polaritons — abbreviated as SPPs are a specific type of hybrid electromagnetic waves that depend on the surfaces of special materials that they flow across.

synthetic contagion — the passing of any self-assembling component of nanotechnology already present in person A to person B who may pass it to person C, and so on.

synthetic parasites — robotic microbes, worms, or any self-replicating nanotechnology that can invade a host’s body and replicate itself which using the host’s resources and energy to do so.

turbo cancer — a fast-developing metastasizing malignancy that may suddenly recur after the patient was in remission, or a completely new malignancy that may seem to appear suddenly *de novo* not merely in one location and not necessarily of a singular or known type, e.g., the sort that are appearing in children that were hardly, if ever seen by physicians, before COVID-19.

WIFI — a family of wireless technologies based on the IEEE 802.11 standards concerning devices that communicate using radio frequencies to form local area networks.

SAR — abbreviation for the specific absorption rate is a measure of how much of a wireless, electromagnetic transmission is absorbed by the body, for example, from a smartphone, (instead of reaching its intended destination).

Appendix by the Outgoing Editor-in-Chief

Beginning June 20, 2026, just one day after the publication date which appears on this paper, this journal will have a triumvirate of Editors-in-Chief (EiCs) led by my esteemed colleague, the now Senior Associate Editor, Christopher A. Shaw, PhD. Working alongside him will be the extremely capable Associate Editors, Daniel Broudy, PhD, and Daniel Santiago, PharmD, who will serve also as Editors-in-Chief. We all met about this change just two days ago and they have agreed to collaborate in determining just how the submissions and day-to-day handling of the journal will proceed from June 20, 2026, when I, John W. Oller, Jr., will have officially resigned from the EiC position and from the Editorial Board (EB) to make way for the new leadership. The journal will also have a new owner and publisher which on tomorrow's date will be the Brownstone Institute.

With the changes underway, having been committed to some months ago, we have run up against a time-crunch on this paper which is the last one that will be published under my tenure as EiC.

Almost eight years have passed since Chris Shaw and I started talking about creating such a journal in the summer of 2019. At the beginning we were promised \$30,000 to help fund such a project, but the would-be donor withdrew after we made it clear that we intended to examine critically the whole scope of vaccine theory, practice, and research rather than to focus more or less exclusively on certain targeted components and/or particular multivalent products that seemed to be of special interest to the promised donor that he represented. Regardless, we soldiered on alone and edited and co-authored the papers of the first issue of the *IJVT* which were published about one full year after we first began to develop the infrastructure. The first issue of the *IJVT* was published on July 15, 2020. Coincidentally, the launching of the journal occurred just a few months after the onset of what, in my view, came appropriately to be called the COVID-19 “plandemic” (Willis, 2020; Icke, 2020).

The lockdowns were already fully underway with the masks, social distancing, and the promise of a “vaccine” hopefully to mitigate the predicted 510,000 deaths in Great Britain and 2.2 million in the US (Ferguson, et al., 2020). A few months later Fauci and other talking heads (see RFK, Jr.'s 2021 book) were promising that the COVID-19 vaccines being rolled out from about December 14, 2020 in the US would prevent infections and deaths in all those socially responsible persons who took the shots. Much of what we were being told, however, in the mainstream narrative would turn out to be a grand deception. The 5.2 billion people who reportedly received one or more doses of the COVID-19 injectables were motivated by fear ginned up through the medical/pharmaceutical influenced (and in most cases owned) academic and popular media, captured oversight agencies, whole governments, and ever so many institutions that encouraged or even coerced their employees to stigmatize and perhaps, in extreme cases, even do violence to whomever in their circle of acquaintances did not believe what the talking heads in the media, the government officials, and their employers in most instances were telling them. The remedial measures being pressed upon all of us, in many cases were being urged by the same authorities, many of them medical personnel who were, in the end, were either taken in themselves, or willingly complied with what, it now seems clear, was a worldwide propaganda campaign with objectives that still remain obscure. Nonetheless, in my judgment, the propaganda efforts have been well described by Broudy and his colleagues in numerous publications, quite a few of which are cited in this paper, which, as I have said, is the last one I will be shepherding through the publication process from start to finish in this journal.

I am writing this **Appendix** as a “Letter to the New Editors” (though time hardly permits them to review it before its publication) as agreed in an online meeting with them just day before yesterday. Except for their authorization to write such an editorial without having it reviewed by the EB I would not have agreed to do so. In my role as EiC, I did not publish any such letters because I wanted to be able to say that everything published in this journal was peer-reviewed. That was true right up to this very last piece that I am writing now. All the other comments and papers were always peer-reviewed and approved by at least two or more editors prior to publication. It was in keeping with that intention that after certain false claims by critics were made in the aftermath of the Diblasi et al. (2024) findings — critics who claimed to doubt that this journal is peer-reviewed — that I initiated the practice of listing the peer-reviewers who approved each piece in the **Acknowledgments** section where those doing were listed and thanked for their input beginning with Davidson et al. (2024). When any of my own works were published, I called on Chris Shaw to take over the role of EiC during the peer-review process. In keeping with that policy, in this last paper to be edited by me, the **Acknowledgments** section above here contains the list of peer-reviewers who approved and in some cases insisted I go ahead with the publication of this paper.

All of this paper, in fact, with the exception of this “Letter to the New Editors”, and, of course, any minor corrections of keystroke errors, infelicities, or minor additions by one or both co-authors, were scrutinized by about 10 pairs of eyes (perhaps more, given that some of our EB members who reviewed the work may have chosen not to participate in the vigorous on-line discussion of it). It has indeed been severely peer-reviewed before its publication here and was approved by the people named above in the **Acknowledgments** section.

That having been said, my purpose in writing this **Appendix** (which has been reviewed by Yanowitz and Broudy) is to explain my decision to go ahead with this publication even though in doing so, for the first time in the history of the journal, I am making an executive decision to over-rule the official recommendation not to publish coming from my revered colleague Christopher A. Shaw. He is joined in a dissenting “minority report” as it were by the distinguished Morris Chair in State and Local Government Finance and Policy at Michigan State University, Mark Skidmore. My decision to go ahead now in spite of their urging to reject this version and to ask for additional research and less speculation (to which I will return) prior to a possible resubmission is not taken lightly. However, I am not making an unpopular decision as many EiCs are known to do according to the extant literature. In this instance, the greater weight of the EB favored going ahead with the publication by a majority of six to two — this, after a major recasting of the work shortening it from 65 pages, into its present length of 49 pages not counting this “Letter to the New Editors”.

Granted that it still, nonetheless, falls short of where Shaw, Skidmore, and I suppose, all the rest of us, in a perfect world, would like to see it arrive, if only the needed funds, equipment, personnel, and time permitted. But, even if such desirable resources were available — and they are ***decidedly not available nor ever likely to become available even with the changes Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. has been seeking to bring about in the many stodgy subagencies and multi-billion dollar funding entities theoretically under his direction as the present Secretary of Health and Human Services*** — I would feel compelled to go ahead with this particular publication because of what I believe is its truthful and urgent timeliness. Also, I must note here that all the persons voting

in favor of publication, as I understood them, shared my belief that this work may be the most important we have ever published in this journal — and that it must not be delayed.

Laying my cards down face up, I believe it is better to risk the possibility of being wrong about the nanotechnology in the COVID-19 products by going ahead with this publication than to risk being right about the nanotechnology and failing to sound the alarm by publishing this paper. As the saying goes, it is better to have a gun and not need one than to need one and not have any. The importance of publishing the Yanowitz and Broudy paper now is accentuated, by the letter sent out yesterday by one of our co-editors, Mary Holland, Esq., to supporters of the Children’s Health Defense decrying the fact that on June 1, 2026, the CDC granted to Pfizer an additional \$1.24 billion dollars, of which \$735.7 million is earmarked for COVID shots to be injected into infants and children (Kirsch, 2026). Can there possibly be some righteous but secret military objective against a foreign enemy, or some non-state player, or an evil consortium of them, that will be served by putting such toxic nanotechnologies as those experimented with during COVID-19 into our own infants and children? As one of our non-voting editors put it: “. . . disengagement is not the answer. Courage, vigilance, and principled conviction remain essential. The moment to uphold these values is not some distant future — it is now.”

We are going ahead with this publication while bearing in mind that every publication in any peer-reviewed academic journal that may be produced by any author or team of them seeking to find out and represent material facts faithfully and truthfully is never more than a progress report. Even mathematical proofs which seek to discover and represent propositions that are true for all possible contexts in some well-defined and determinate domain are always subject to critical scrutiny by subsequent scholars, and many that were long regarded as incontrovertible, e.g., Euclid’s planar postulate that parallel lines never meet nor diverge was greatly amplified and improved upon by later geometries of Lobachevsky and Riemann. With respect to the material implications of any theoretical propositions that may be examined in material experimental contexts, personally, I subscribe to Feynman’s rule in his 1963 lectures at Cal Poly. Putting his rule in my own words, if a theory does not fit the material facts it purports to be about, then it is wrong. Or, in keeping with my own published proofs concerning the absolutely unique properties of true narrative representations (TNRs) — of which I think the simplest and most elegant proofs are the ones published in *Entropy* (2014), though a less technical series can be found in Oller and Collins (2000) — effective lies and any forms of propaganda must always be cloaked in a deceptive manner so that their falseness is concealed and they are made to resemble TNRs. Otherwise, the deception would fail to serve the purposes of its progenitors. Undisguised propaganda would not resemble any TNR. Given that, however, I perceive a difficulty for anyone trying to suggest that the argument presented in the paper we are publishing herewith today is “speculative”. In the draft that was 65 pages long, that criticism certainly applied to parts of it, but in the current version that we are going ahead with publishing, it seems to me that the speculation has been purged.

I personally know a lot of people who took the shots before they saw their friends and relatives getting sick or suddenly dying after some new batch of horrors fell upon them. The cancer may have returned with a vengeance and quickly ended the life of a regretful recipient of one or more doses of the shots, or the person who took even one dose, may not have been able to take the pain and terror any longer and resorted to suicide — announcing in advance to several people including yours truly,

what she had in mind. My closest sibling took three doses of the COVID-19 shots and was never released from the hospital after the first dose. My youngest sibling took three doses and succumbed to what was diagnosed as COVID-19 disease at least five times before he died. A beloved cousin died some while after the third dose on the same day that a second large “white clot” was extracted from her leg. She said that she never felt right again after the third shot. There were others personally known to me who died and some who experienced heart attacks, very close to me, or unexplained disease conditions that remain undiagnosed to this day and without any known remedy. Most of the people in my life-space took the shots but I don’t know any who have not come to regret doing so.

With all that in mind, here, as I understood them, I have been asked by Chris Shaw and Mark Skidmore to include a kind of “minority report” — a summary of the objections they raised against publishing this paper. Because all of the members of our EB have agreed that peer-reviews are about helping researcher/authors to improve their work, the objections are, I believe, tempered by suggestions about ways the work could be improved. Most, if not all, of the editors who were in favor of going ahead with publishing the work, also agree with at least some of the suggestions for improving or amplifying the underlying research, especially, the microscopy. Here is my summary of the comments mainly featuring those of Shaw, and Skidmore, as I understood them: (1) There was some general consensus that the whole, though shortened from the original 65 pages of a draft sent back for revision, could still benefit from additional cutting, e.g., Shaw saw no need to show pictures of the darkfield/brightfield microscope, though I, for one, had never seen either a picture or a detailed explanation coming from an expert in microscopy and image processing (see Yanowitz & Bruckstein, 1989; cited 660 times according to Google Scholar and 257 times according to the prestigious Web of Science) and I decided in the end to keep those pictures together with the expert but highly intelligible explanation of how such a microscope works; (2) Shaw and some of the other peer-reviewers would have liked to see more definitive side-by-side comparisons of laboratory cultures in pure saline of entities cultured from the fluids in the COVID-19 vials (carefully labeled and differentiated by manufacturers and batches) paired up with bodily fluids showing similar self-assembling entities in samples of persons of sufficient numbers to sustain the statistical power needed to stand up under intense numerical analysis — to which my response is “in a perfect world” all that would be desirable; (3) both Shaw and Skidmore expressed sympathy for the argument of Anne Ulrich (2024) that all of the supposed electronic entities, ribbons, crystals, strings, etc., are probably nothing more than chemical constructs from lipid nanoparticles, or debris from dying cells, dust or unclean slides, spike protein fragments, etc. — although Ulrich’s argument in my view was already demolished by some of us, namely Davidson et al. (2024); (4) Skidmore rejected “the evidence connecting these technologies [the IEEE standards, their associated nanotechnologies, the COVID-19 cell towers for 5G, published statements that the technologies in question have already been weaponized according to the N3 DARPA plan using electromagnetic energy on the authority of someone at the level of James Giordano — all of that must be disbelieved with respect] to the COVID shots” while we limit our understanding exclusively to “reprogramming cells to produce spike protein” because Skidmore suggests all the former links are “speculative” while what we were told about “spike protein” is supposedly trustworthy. Here, my answer is a question: how can anyone possibly discern what statements about the COVID-19 products to believe as contrasted with ones we know have turned up false?

Yes there is plenty of room for speculation about the future of AI and the nanotechnologies it is spawning in great profusion, but, it seems to me, there is no need at all for inferential reasoning much less speculation about Giordano's proposed military uses of injectable, inhalable, or otherwise bodily implanted nanotechnologies that can, according to him, be manipulated with electromagnetic radiation generated by the cell towers that are now visible practically everywhere we look on the landscape. As we speak they are becoming an ever denser forest of technological structures that began to appear here, there, and everywhere in 2019. There is no reasonable doubt that these are a very real and material part of DARPA's N3 program of militarizing nanotechnology per Giordano's talk at West Point (2018) and as forecast in the 2026 DARPA statement also attributed to Giordano himself by himself. Together with Broudy and Santiago, I wrote about all this and we published our findings, at the suggestion of Chris and Stephanie as I recall outside our own journal. In fact, we went to the *International Journal of Innovative Research in Medical Science* where our paper appeared in 2025. Magnetic migration of nanotechnology through the bloodstream and lymph vessels is a reality already to hand. Giordano is not just whistlin' Dixie.

There were other suggestions for improving the laboratory investigations and the imagery, but my conclusion, with much consideration for the reservations held by my esteemed colleagues Chris and Mark, is that we have enough evidence in hand to make the connections suggested by Yanowitz and Broudy without a need for anything more. There is nothing speculative about saying we were lied to again and again during the COVID era about what actually happened and is still happening in injected persons. There is nothing speculative about the IEEE standards for extant nanotechnologies, nor about the claims of Giordano for militarizing such nanotechnologies, nor concerning actual findings of the forensic analyses of the COVID-19 products, some of them coming directly from Pfizer's own published data as examined critically by Michels et al. (2023) and by Segalla (2023a, 2023b, 2024, 2026), not to mention all the research on all-cause-mortality, the abnormal clots, the correlation between the number of shots received and the diminution of days-left-to-live as reported by multiple papers in this journal and in related peer-reviewed works.

On the contrary, what I see as speculative is picking and choosing which parts of the mainstream marketing narrative, e.g., the claims about "spike protein", or about what is actually in the nanoparticles that have never been detected, nor can they be seen now, never mind the known falsehoods still being propagated that the shots did only what they were advertised to do, that they saved lives and prevented illness, were always and only "safe and effective", etc. Doesn't it ring any bells that nearly all of these bits of propaganda are coming from "researchers" who are being compensated by the medical/pharmaceutical complex? Is it not relevant that the manufacturers of the COVID-19 injectables have cost ordinary taxpayers trillions while enriching themselves to the tune of hundreds of billions? Are they really aiming only to promote the "common good" while they line their pockets with money taken from the people they are supposedly saving from disease and death with the shots that are maiming and killing? Many of those who were deceived are dying off. We are witnesses to this fact. Nevertheless, we hope and fully expect, that others who observe what is happening will be less easily deceived in the future. Would to God my siblings, children, grandchildren, loved ones, in-laws, out-laws, friends, and enemies alike will have the sense to say no thanks to the still coming next generation of shots and other devices containing the

nanotechnologies discussed in this Yanowitz and Broudy paper. It is in culminating my tenure as EiC something like [The Last of the Mohicans](#) — though the story told in this journal is non-fiction.

Yours Truly,
John W. Oller, Jr., PhD

Legal Disclaimer

The information on the website and in the *IJVTPR* is not intended as a diagnosis, recommended treatment, prevention, or cure for any human condition or medical procedure that may be referred to in any way. Users and readers who may be parents, guardians, caregivers, clinicians, or relatives of individuals impacted by any of the morbid conditions, procedures, or protocols that may be referred to, must use their own judgment concerning specific applications. The contributing authors, editors, and persons associated in any capacity with the website and/or with the journal disclaim any liability or responsibility to any person or entity for any harm, financial loss, physical injury, or other penalty that may stem from any use or application in any context of information, conclusions, research findings, opinions, errors, or any statements found on the website or in the *IJVTPR*. The material presented is freely offered to all users who may take an interest in examining it, but how they may choose to apply any part of it, is the sole responsibility of the viewer/user. If material is quoted or reprinted, users are asked to give credit to the source/author, and to conform to the non-commercial, no derivatives, requirements of the [Creative Commons License 4.0 NC ND](#) or to any other license that takes precedence over it.