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ABSTRACT

Incontrovertible evidence has now made clear that much of what has been perceived publicly about the story of SARS-CoV-2 and the pharmaceutical remedies offered (then mandated) was/is part of a sophisticated international fabrication of unprecedented proportion, depth, and deception. The origins of the virus, the approved testing regime, the flawed predictive models of spread and mortality, associated social-distancing mandates, and so-called vaccines and their claimed efficacy and safety, all point to a coordinated effort to manufacture public fear and hysteria so as to propagate and normalize transhumanist interventions in healthcare and human biology. This article begins with the simple question of how adjuvants in traditional vaccines are theorized to work and proceeds to analyze how the new injectable mRNA platforms deploy nanomaterials as delivery vehicles for genetic interventions with a range of other potential actions inside the human body, both intended and unintended. The authors draw upon the chronological and logical development of adjuvants and their use across disciplines in materials science, genetic engineering, and programming. The authors aim to disentangle the known, unknown, possible and likely contents and objectives of COVID-19 injections, in the context of the surrounding corporate, political, and ideological landscape. They conclude that the social disruptions created by COVID-19 have served as a means of instigating rapid transition to what unelected policymakers have called a Bio-Nano Age.
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1. Introduction

Like the blitzkrieg bombing of Iraqi forces along the Kuwaiti border in 1990, the story of a “novel” coronavirus exploded on the international media scene in late 2019. Who can forget the sounds and images coming out of Wuhan of pedestrians suddenly collapsing in the streets, men in powder blue HAZMAT suits armed with high-tech thermometers and disinfectants for public spaces, the general mayhem of citizens cursing from their balconies in crowded sections of the city? In hindsight, just over a year and a half later, it has become much easier to see how the manufactured fear and hysteria (Bagus, 2021) in mainstream media fed the false urgencies of unquestioning mass compliance around the world with calls for lockdowns of...
undisclosed duration (Miltimore, 2020), social-distancing mandates (Alexander, 2021; Gant, 2020), mandatory masks (bin-Reza et al., 2012), continued use of the inappropriate PCR technique (Engelbrecht & Demeter, 2020; Mahese, 2020; Surkova, et al., 2020, Cassels, 2020; Jaafar et al., 2020; Chossudovsky, 2021), and the introduction of contact tracing apps and so-called green (vaccine) passports that would make the leading social engineers of the Chinese Communist Party flush with pride (Kobie, 2019).

As documented by Richard M. Fleming (2021), SARS-CoV-2 is a bioweapon designed with us in mind. Furthermore, as Li-Meng Yan et al. (2020a, 2020b, 2020c; also see her transcribed conversation with Fleming and Karladine Graves in Fleming, 2021, pp. 105-131) have reported, the virus created by the Chinese Government and others to produce COVID-19, was meticulously designed over a period, not of months, nor years, but decades in a series of “gain of function” research projects published in prestigious journals, paid for mostly with US dollars, and leading to a stream of lucrative patents enriching certain individuals including Tony Fauci, Director of the National Institutes of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) and Bill Gates. In his best-selling book Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. points out that the “CDC owns 57 vaccine patents” (p. xv) and in 2019 was spending “$4.9 of its $12.0 billion-dollar annual budget” promoting their distribution. He notes that

Figure 1. As cited by Kennedy (2021, p. 371) credited to Conor Skelding (June 5, 2021), “Fauci email dump includes ‘sick’ March Madness-style virus bracket.” New York Post. https://nypost.com/2021/06/05/fauci-files-include-sick-march-madness-style-virus-bracket/
NIH owns hundreds of vaccine patents and often profits from the sale of products it supposedly regulates. High level officials, including Dr. Fauci, receive yearly emoluments of up to $150,000 in royalty payments on products that they help develop and then usher through the approval process. The FDA receives 45 percent of its budget from the pharmaceutical industry, through what are euphemistically called “user fees” (p. xv).

Each of the key facts in the material quoted from Kennedy (2021, p. xv) is extensively documented (see Endnotes 1-5, p. xxiv). Leading up to his final chapter, entitled “Germ Games” (2021, pp. 378-445), Kennedy writes:

... putting aside Dr. Fauci’s involvement with Wuhan [the site of the main Chinese bioweapons laboratory where SARS-CoV-2 was tweaked before its release to the public] and his decades of fashioning flop contagions, we must acknowledge that in 2020, he finally hit the jackpot with COVID-19. Among the more revealing documents in Dr. Fauci’s June 2021 email dump is a rough schematic ... [shown here as Figure 1] that Dr. Fauci signed ‘Tony F.’ depicting a March Madness-style tournament bracket scoring the pestilential contestants during two decades of mostly phony contagions. COVID-19 [SARS-CoV-2] finally emerges as champion (p. 372).

Fauci’s list of contestants contains a litany of ‘gain-of-function’ potential pandemic pathogens (PPPs; as documented by Oller, 2021a) along with several vaccine targeted disease agents. The undisputable published record shows that the notorious Event 201 (Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health et al., 2019) was merely the most recent in a series of meetings taking place over several decades where planning for the manufactured world-wide pandemic now known as COVID-19 took place. That “champion” of pandemic plans (Skelding, 2021) has enabled “sock puppet” agencies of the pharmaceutical industry, such as the FDA and WHO (Kennedy, 2021), to procure billions for their backers. News of the Omicron variant alone generated $10 billion for the eight top shareholders in Pfizer and Moderna (Global Justice Now, 2021).

In this present article, however, we address not the profit motives behind COVID-19, but one of the more puzzling aspects of the COVID-19 narrative — namely, the apparent magnetic properties of the vaccines pushed, without ceasing, on populations around the globe. We will not address the surprising 99.86% (Joffe, 2021; Merrick, 2021) survival rate of the illness; its probable origins in the laboratory (Hilton, 2021; Schorr, 2021; Yan et al., 2020a; Yan et al., 2020b; Palmer, 2020; Latham & Wilson, 2020); the deceptive data collection and analysis practices and the systematic marginalization of already existing, inexpensive and efficacious treatments (Ealy et al., 2020; Santin et al., 2021; Bryant et al., 2021; Popp et al., 2021; Pfeiffer & Bonvie, 2021); nor the mountains of evidence of widespread harms and deaths attributed to the injections (Open, 2021; Yellow, 2021). We will, instead, focus closely on what appears to be the apparent transhumanist features of the vaccine contents.

Transhumanism, as a concept, has an ancient history rooted in the universal desire to live forever — to transcend the physical limitations of mortality. It is believed that in order to achieve this goal, the human body must be “upgraded” (Sahota, 2018) using science and technology. Transhumanism can be understood today as a global scientific and social movement devoted to research and development of technologies claiming to enhance the human condition. Advocates around the world cooperate and work to integrate new technologies into human beings to “upgrade” sensory perception, emotive ability, cognitive capacity, and to increase constant connectivity to the internet, the “global central nervous system” (Broudy & Arakaki, 2020). Transhuman interventions seek not merely to remediate biological impairment but to achieve artificially what would remain biologically impossible without the enhancements provided (or aimed at) by the interventions. Also understood as the Fourth Industrial Revolution, among the primary objectives is to realize the permanent convergence of biological life, synthetic technologies, and digital currencies, in order to achieve a post-human condition in which intelligent life has evolved beyond its natural human form.
In this essay, the authors use a syllogistic form of reasoning to build the case that the injections meet at least one transhumanist aim and do more harm to the human body than advertised (Seneff & Nigh, 2021). To help readers see more easily the flow of the discussion, the logic in our paper can be reduced to the following premises.

**Major Premise:** Developments in new tools, techniques, and technologies will advance in spite of the problems they can create for people.

**Minor Premise:** Technological advances in genetic engineering and materials science have invaded medical research and the development of new vaccines.

**Conclusion:** People are, thus, exhibiting serious problems arising from the technology of COVID-19 vaccines.

The central goal is to uncover, document, and bring clarity to the convoluted details in the story of transhumanism buried in a convergence of the cross-disciplinary areas of materials science, nanotechnology, and human genomics (2045). It is, in part, an effort to contextualize and make sense of the bizarre sentiments expressed by Klaus Schwab, head of the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, who observed in 2015 that the so-called Fourth Industrial Revolution, “doesn’t change what you are doing, it changes you. If you take genetic editing … it’s you [emphasis added] who are changed, and of course this will have a big impact on your identity” (Schwab, 2015). Indeed, Schwab has recently clarified what he had meant by pointing out that the present pandemic represents a key moment in human history when, “our physical, … digital … and biological identities can merge” (2020). Who knew human beings were born with a digital identity? Schwab’s declarations may sound suspiciously sinister, even sci-fi or too fantastic to be taken seriously.

**Adjuvants: the Major Premise**

Nevertheless, incremental steps often prove to be the mothers of invention bearing the eventual basic changes that appear over time in organisms. So, how are we supposed to see ourselves if our identities are being changed before our very eyes? Willing accomplices? Willfully blind? Or, unassuming victims of an elite predator class of “giants” (Phillips, 2018) obsessively focused on marketizing all bodies and bodily movements (Abramson, 2020; Oller, 2021b)? A brief survey of colonialism in history will show that the most tyrannical impositions (e.g. unjust laws, serfdom, slavery) were pushed onto people. Today, they are being pushed into people confronting the demands of an emerging bio-secure global medical apartheid.

In light of Schwab’s contention about the new bio-secure global economy, we begin with the fallacious belief that the human immune system needs routine intervention and tampering with — an artificial shock intended to trigger the system to mount an effective cellular and molecular defense against invading microbes. The dominant media narrative today seeks to normalize the total systematic erasure of all memories of the power of natural immunity to protect the body. Traditionally, the shock has been provided by adjuvants, the technological development of which has progressed immensely beyond the use of aluminum salts in vaccine manufacturing (Shaw, 2021 p. xv; p. 15). Originally conceived as a “helper” (Shaw, 2021 p. xv; p. 15) or “aid,” adjuvants were first used to produce an immune response that would offer, “specific protection from infection or disease, and where the risk of acquiring the disease from vaccination has either been reduced or removed” (di Pasquale et al., 2015). However, there is nothing traditional about the COVID-19 “vaccines” (Shaw, 2021, p. 430). These platforms, as they are called,
belong, in fact, to an entirely new category of therapy: “they are not protein antigens but the genetic blueprint for the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein antigen” (Doctors, 2021; Fleming, 2021, p. 4).

Gene-based vaccine technology has attracted keen interest for decades based on its ability to deliver “continued growth in the vaccine business” by “shortening time to licensure, and responding quicker [sic] to disease outbreaks. … Within weeks, clinical batches can be generated after the availability of a sequence encoding the immunogen. The process is cell-free and scalable” (Jackson et al., 2020). According to government officials and representatives at Moderna, “COVID vaccines reprogrammed to aim at emerging new strains of the virus could reach the market quickly, without going through large clinical trials” (Regalado, 2021). Besides the obvious implications in flouting the ethical necessity of clinical trials (i.e. human beings as lab rats), the statement presupposes that the so-called vaccine is a molecular software program packaged in a glass vial and uploaded by syringe to the biological system, the guinea pigs, via hypodermic needle, all of which can be understood, ultimately, in terms of huge short-term profits.

This view of the injection as both a product and agent of change makes perfect sense in light of Moderna’s own public relations messaging.

Recognizing the broad potential of mRNA science, we set out to create an mRNA technology platform that functions very much like an operating system on a computer. It is designed so that it can plug and play interchangeably with different programs. In our case, the “program” or “app” is our mRNA drug — the unique mRNA sequence that codes for a protein. (Moderna, 2020)

It is easy enough to see that the leading software engineers perceive the human genome to be little more than computer code that can and should be manipulated (re-written) when the right economic conditions are present in the social world. What isn’t so easy to see is the erroneous logic over-simplifying the complex biological system itself whose cellular functions, according to biophysicist Mae-Wan Ho, “carry out millions of catalytic reactions at the rate of thousands to hundreds of thousands of cycles per second” (Ho, 2003, p. 158). Infused in the arrogant belief that man can predict and control all aspects of genetic manipulation and their effects on future generations defies at least one tenet of physics: the Second Law of Thermodynamics (Trevors & Saier, 2011). At the microscopic level, for example, any natural process in that system moves toward disorder, or entropy, of the system. So, the question remains, what is the unnatural adjuvant intended to trigger the natural immune system?

Foreign Bodies: Minor Premise A

Concerned about safety and suspicious of the potential presence of foreign bodies in vaccines, Gatti and Montanari tested childhood vaccines under electron microscopy. In their article “New Quality-Control Investigations on Vaccines: Micro- and Nanocontamination” (2017), the researchers found a wide range of toxic contaminants, among which were lead, stainless steel, tungsten, iron, and chromium. Their findings, incidentally, reflect more recent studies of popular brands of pre-packaged baby foods found to contain dangerous levels of arsenic, lead, cadmium, and mercury (House, 2021). Gatti and Montanari submit that discovery of these inorganic particles in vaccines was baffling, that their substance was neither biocompatible nor biodegradable, which suggests that they persist in the body and are able to “induce effects that can become evident either immediately close to injection time or after a certain time from administration” (2017). Should metallic adjuvants be present in COVID-19 vaccines as anecdotal observations have suggested, this detail, in particular, may explain the behavior of magnets reported to
adhere immediately, and sometimes fail to adhere, to people injected with the experimental mRNA platforms.

It is important to note that adjuvants are themselves foreign bodies, and while they can produce an immune response, they also induce inflammatory reactions whose secondary and remote effects are not always understood or predictable. In particular, Gatti and Montanari point out that the toxicity of the foreign bodies they found is in some respects different from that of the chemical elements composing them, enhancing that toxicity. Since these particles do not degrade, they produce chronic inflammation. “Furthermore,” they observe that, “the protein-corona effect (due to a nano-bio-interaction) can produce organic/inorganic composite particles capable of stimulating the immune system in an undesirable way” (2017). That is to say, the interaction of organic systems with foreign bodies composed of synthetic material can create hybrid materials that precipitate harmful immune responses. Significantly, Gatti and Montanari stress that the size of the nanoparticles appearing in vaccines allows them to breach the walls of a cell, to enter the nucleus, and to interact with the cell’s DNA (2017).

Curious about the integrity and durability of nanoparticles, such as graphene and carbon nanotubes, Ganz et al. (2017) sought to discover the melting point of free standing graphene and found that, “the system appears to be in a quasi-2D liquid state when subjected to temperatures approaching 4,500 degrees Kelvin” (7,640 degrees Fahrenheit or 4,226 Centigrade). While these tests help researchers in materials science to determine the suitability of nanomaterials in applications designed for space exploration, the appearance of these indestructible structures in biological systems gives us pause. Why are synthetic nanomaterials — capable of surviving close encounters with the Sun — seen as useful components in vaccine development?

**Electrical-Electronic Conductivity: Minor Premise B**

Vastly stronger than titanium and virtually indestructible, consisting of a single layer of carbon atoms and possessing unusual electrical properties, graphene was characterized and isolated in 2004 and is the thinnest compound known to exist (Vranic, 2016). This astonishing substance has triggered both fascination among scientists and remarkable growth in new industries. In its oxidized form, graphene oxide (GO) has been described as, “the most studied 2D nanomaterial in biomedical applications” (Unal et al., 2021, p. 1). According to Cordaro et al. (2020), “although nanotechnology based on graphene has been poorly applied for the rapid diagnosis of viral diseases, the extraordinary properties of graphene (i.e. high electronic conductivity, large specific area, and surface functionalization) can be also exploited for the diagnosis of emerging viral diseases, such as the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)”. The negative charge of graphene oxide, for instance, has attracted research interest for its ability to drive an affinity for positively charged viruses (Raghav & Mohanty, 2020).

The latest research suggests that graphene is some sort of miraculous material, appearing not just in applications for the development of diagnostic tools, but also in therapeutics. For example, much like gene-based mRNA technology touted by big pharmaceutical manufacturers, graphene oxide began attracting the interest of the biotech industry as a potential vaccine innovation. Despite its “poor bio-solubility and biocompatibility”, given surface modifications, Cao et al. noted in August 2020 that graphene oxide was “expected to be introduced into vaccine research to improve the efficacy of vaccines” (2020). Similarly, Raghav and Mohanty (2020) argue that, owing to its electroconductive properties, graphene oxide should be incorporated into a gamut of COVID-19 products, from wipes, PPE and filtration devices to nanomedicines, including vaccines. Injectable graphene-based magnetic nanoparticle formulations are also
being proposed as “theranostics”, or diagnosis and treatment combined, with the functionality of MRI, CT, radio-chemotherapy, SPECT, and more (Lage et al., 2021).

Academic conferences feature experts keen to share experimental data on the observed behavior of graphene in its interactions with cells. At a 2016 conference hosted by the European Foundation for Clinical Nanomedicine, Sandra Vranic, Lecturer in Nano-Cell Biology, discussed the potential for GO to serve the purposes of new therapeutic applications, such as bio-devices, biosensors, tissue scaffolds, drug delivery, and gene therapy vectors. She admits that exposure to this material in vitro and in vivo as well as potential adverse health effects are unknown. Serving, also, as a principal investigator (PI) in the EU-funded Horizon 2020 project BIORIMA, Vranic notes that it is, nevertheless, important to “understand aspects of interactions of this material with cells in order to be able to exploit to the maximum the potential that these materials give” (2016). Interest in graphene’s applied potential, moreover, is not purely academic.

The public-private partnerships that have emerged in recent years are proof that the prospect of long-term profits electrify the pursuit of all things graphene. In 2018, for example, the European Union launched its “Horizon 2020 Graphene Flagship” project. The initiative integrates the expertise of 170 academic and industry partners and seeks to, “bring graphene innovation out of the lab and into commercial applications, … accelerating the timeline for industry acceptance of graphene technologies.” The project’s website notes that, “the Graphene Flagship is part of the European Union’s biggest scientific research initiative. With a budget of €1 billion, the project represents a new form of joint, coordinated research initiative on an unprecedented scale” (European Union, 2021).

Genetics & Nano-materials: Minor Premise C

Just over a year after the first human case of SARS-CoV-2, two nanomedicine-based mRNA platforms have been fast-tracked, developed, and have received emergency use authorization (EUA) throughout the globe with more vaccine approvals on the heels of these first two. Several SARS-CoV-2 vaccine compositions use nanotechnology-enabled formulations. A silver lining of the COVID-19 pandemic for industry is that the fast-tracked vaccine development for SARS-CoV-2 has advanced the clinical translation pathway for nanomedicine drug delivery systems. The laboratory science of lipid-based nanoparticles was evidently ready and rose to the clinical challenge of rapid vaccine development (Seneff & Nigh, 2021).

The successful development and fast-tracking of SARS-CoV-2 nanomedicine vaccines has exciting implications for the future of nanotechnology-enabled drug delivery and gene therapy, and, by many accounts, was ushered in right on time. The past two decades, however, have shown that development of this industry has been long in the making. In a July 2001 lecture and 2011 presentation, NASA Langley Chief Scientist Dennis Bushnell provided, somewhat prophetically, what he termed a “heads up” that 2020 would see the commencement of a “Bio-Nano” era. The Bio-Nano Age, he said, was to be marked by social disruption which would pave the way for the following: genetic modification of human beings, synthetic biology, brain chips, smart dust, human-level machine intelligence, designer life forms including “humanoids” and “surreptitious nano tagging of everything/everyone,” among other bio-nano and transhumanist innovations (Bushnell, 2001; 2011). Meanwhile, biophysicist and geneticist Mae-Wan Ho famously warned for many years about the dangers inherent in modifying the genetic codes of biological systems (2003, p. 24).
Perhaps the bewildering pronouncements that have appeared in the public discourse in the years that followed Bushnell’s claims did not strike many observers as significant enough to cause much concern, especially in terms of social and genetic disruption. After all, the ingenious devices created by Big Tech and Big Data tend to serve as objects of adoration for the masses. Public displays of exuberance for the latest tools testify to the social pathology driving obsessive desires in habits of mass consumption. The Business Edition of CNN, for instance, reported Ray Kurzweil’s audacious prediction that “humans will become hybrids in the 2030s” (Kurzweil, 2015a). For most people, Kurzweil’s observation likely sounded preposterous and unworthy of broader public attention. They were likely unaware that, according to NASA Langley’s Chief Scientist, Kurzweil is “right on it” (Bushnell, 2011).

From the stage of the Exponential Finance conference in New York City, his claims must have sounded somewhat outlandish too. Man and machine, he noted, will “gradually merge, and [we’ll] enhance ourselves” (2015b). Clearly, the ideology of transhumanism is baked into global finance. Klaus Schwab seemed to echo Kurzweil’s sentiments, pointing to the inevitable “fusion of technologies ... blurring the line between the physical, digital and biological spheres” (2016). Is the clever rhetoric simply code for a transhumanist future when people have their movements tracked and thoughts monitored by an implantable microchip? It is “the nature of being human,” as Kurzweil notes, “[to] transcend our limitations” (2015).

Such perspectives may seem reasonable, at first glance, given our many inventions to increase knowledge exponentially and, thus, our comfort and safety in a wild and unstable world. Their real-world implications found in the designs of the tech titans, however, may also appear rather ominous. Readers may wonder, are the mRNA platforms developed by Big Pharma and Big Tech serving multiple purposes? Graphene, for example, is particularly suited to genetic engineering in a bio-nano age. Lage et al. (2021) note that graphene derivatives “offer large room to load and deliver drugs, genes, and proteins towards specific cells, tissues, and organs,” given that they offer “higher drug/gene payloads and serve as super-efficient nanocarriers” (p. 3). It may be clear, by now, to the casual observer that speed and efficiency, at the cost of ethical imperatives, are central aims in the industry move to deliver profitable solutions, at all costs, to humankind’s most vexing problems.

**A New Nano-World Order: Minor Premise D**

If 2020 was to deliver on Bushnell’s prediction of social disruption enabling the dawn of the Bio-Nano Age, a viral pandemic has long been in the cards. Viral diseases nowadays offer vast fertile fields of possibility in financing, investing, and trading in the wares of an emergent bio-nano-based world. Deeper studies of the United Nations’ long obsession with mankind’s so-called carbon footprint, the cancerous scourge he is claimed to be (Hern, 1993), combined with the commodification of bodies (McDowell, 2020; Stem, 2021), increasing Big-Tech control over (f)cimal fertility (Dockterman, 2014; Feinberg, 2014), and the convoluted schemes of international carbon trading (Davies et al., 2019) may provide rich insights into the latest kinds of master-slave relationships now unfolding.

According to Chakravarty and Vora, “nanotechnology has emerged as one of the most promising technologies on account of its ability to deal with viral diseases in an effective manner, addressing the limitations of traditional antiviral medicines. It has not only helped us to overcome problems related to solubility and toxicity of drugs, but also imparted unique properties to drugs, which in turn has increased their potency and selectivity toward viral cells against the host cells” (2021). While the authors initially focus on the key proteins of influenza, Ebola, HIV, herpes, Zika, dengue, and coronavirus, they follow with a...
discussion of various nanomaterials which have served as delivery vehicles for the antiviral drugs. These include lipid-based, polymer-based, lipid–polymer hybrid–based, carbon-based, inorganic metal–based, surface-modified, and stimuli-sensitive nanomaterials and their application in antiviral therapeutics. Chakravarty and Vora also highlight newer more promising treatment approaches such as nanotrails, nanorobots, nanobubbles, nanofibers, nanodiamonds, nanovaccines, and mathematical modeling for the future” (2021), not to mention “nanocubes” (Alkhayal, 2021).

The brave new nano-world now pushing its synthetic bots and assorted nano building materials into organic chemistry, into natural organisms, tissues, and bloodstreams needs a new lexicon to normalize the old ideals of transhumanism reconstituted in COVID-19 medicine. It is, of course, paramount that language must betray the objective reality of what is happening in the social world, as “biosensors,” “bioelectronics,” and other clever euphemisms serve to cover the apparent push for widespread “brain-chip implants” and “human-machine interfaces” all of which complete the lockstep march to a new technocratic global order (FIAN, 2019). In 1995, Pierre Gilbert, Professor of Theology, gave a lecture on biotechnology and what he foresaw as inevitable abuses on the horizon. Among the apparently preposterous claims made in the lecture, Gilbert observed that one day, “vaccines will have liquid crystals that will become hosted in the brain cells, which will become micro-receivers of electromagnetic fields where waves of very low frequencies will be sent” (1995). How bizarre his words must have sounded to an audience unaware of how far advanced the world would be in just a couple of decades.

COVID-19 Injections: Minor Premise E

COVID-19 has served not only to disrupt the social, economic, medical and political worlds, it has opened the door wide to bio-nano medicine. According to Contera et al.,

New powers to reach the nanoscale brought us the unprecedented possibility to directly target at the scale of biomolecular interactions, and the motivation to create smart nanostructures that could circumvent the hurdles hindering the success of traditional pharmacological approaches. With the increasingly likely prospect of ending the COVID-19 pandemic with the aid of a nanomedicine-based vaccine (both Moderna and BioNTech/Pfizer vaccines are based on lipid nanoparticle formulations), we are witnessing the coming of age of nanomedicine (2020).

Nanotoxicologist Antoinetta Gatti, Associate Professor of Science and Technology at the National Council of Research of Italy, notes that in addition to the lipid nanoparticles encasing the mRNA in COVID 19 vaccines, graphene and/or carbon are likely additions, as “nano-drivers”, to optimise vaccine entry into cells (Gatti, 2021). Indeed, relevant literatures have found the integration of graphene oxide into polyethylene-glycolated (PEG) carriers, such as those used in COVID-19 vaccines, to comprise effective drug delivery mechanisms (Shen et al., 2012; Tian et al., 2011; Xiong et al., 2014; Yang et al. 2013) and a “promising gene delivery tool” (Baek et al., 2018).

Sing et al. (2021) write that graphene and its derivatives, “have a lot to offer against COVID-19, attributing to their unique properties like thermomechanical durability, piezoelectricity, large-surface area, strong antiviral potency, and so on” (p. 3). Specifically, the application of graphene nanotechnology to COVID-19 has been investigated with respect to: magnetic extraction of SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid from infected patient samples (Sing, Batoo & Sing, 2021); disrupting the infectivity of SARS-Cov-2 by binding with surface structures on the virus and/or host cells (Unal et al., 2021); inhibiting virus replication by disrupting the viral envelope (Donskyi et al., 2021); and exerting antiviral effects through electromechanical and hydrophilic activity (Kumar Raghav & Mohanty, 2020) and effects on gene-production (Srivastava et al., 2020).
Gatti (2021), however, stresses that nanomaterials such as graphene pose particular dangers to human health by virtue of their nano-scale. Nanotoxicology, she explains, is a specialised field, with issues and implications outside traditional toxicologists’ areas of expertise. The same nano-graphene and PEG composites (PEG-nGO) that form “promising gene delivery tools” (Baek et al., 2018) have been found to cause elevated levels of reactive oxygen species, or free radicals (Ain et al., 2019). Capable of inducing tissue destruction and promoting atherosclerosis, rheumatoid arthritis, cancer and neurodegenerative disease, free radicals caused by PEG-nGO administration have been found to induce high oxidative stress to the brain, heart, and kidneys in animal models (Ain et al., 2019). Graphene oxide has also been found to cause cell death and damage through a variety of other mechanisms, and to perforate human lung cells (Duan et al., 2017).

COVID-19 Injections and Transhumanism: Minor Premise F

Nevertheless, given the intense research interest in graphene’s antiviral and gene-based applications, including for COVID-19, and given the €1 billion in EU “Horizon 2020” funding to “bring graphene innovation out of the lab,” it should come as no surprise if graphene were present in COVID-19 vaccines.

In addition to its biomedical utility, graphene possesses remarkable potential to facilitate transhumanist interventions. The same structural and electromagnetic properties slated to revolutionize medicine are revolutionizing robotics, computing and electronics, and their potential interactions with human beings. In one example, Albert et al. began testing the peculiar aspects of graphene and discovered “superparamagnetism,” — a magnetic property appearing in ferrimagnetic nanoparticles that can randomly flip direction when exposed to certain temperatures. According to Albert et al., “Graphene oxide has ... excellent chemical and physical characteristics while magnetite nanoparticles have superparamagnetic properties which enable it to be controlled by external magnetic field” (2018). These observed phenomena are, perhaps, why so much speculation has surrounded the simultaneous push for 5G communications networks, the pulsed microwave radiation and its obvious and well-documented effects on biological systems.

Graphene can easily enter biological systems and interact with them physically and electromagnetically. Accordingly, it has attracted interest as a nanotag (Tian et al., 2019), with which NASA-Langley foresaw tagging “everything/everyone” by 2020 (Bushnell, 2001). Graphene nanostructures are also being developed as bioelectronic devices for use in “biosensing, electrophysiological recordings, and stimulation,” so as to “enable real-time monitoring or control of physiological processes” (San Roman et al., 2020). Graphene even lends itself to self-assembling semiconductors. Small enough to be injected, the nano-structures can “morph from conductor to semiconductor and back again” simply by changing shape, according to the Kavli Foundation, a leading endowment for nanoscience research institutes around the world (Brown & Crommie, 2021). Graphene’s versatility could foreseeably enable “high-performance computing and nanoscale quantum devices” able to “interact with electrons, light, and even magnetism” notes the Foundation.

Were self-assembling semiconductors what Zandre Bothe reported seeing under the microscope from COVID-19 vaccine vials? In an October 2021 interview, Bothe shared images of nano-scaled mechanical moving structures she had observed in vaccine samples, noting, “I’ve never seen this before … I don’t know what I’m looking at” (Bothe, 2021). Resemblances to diagrams of 2D nano-semiconductors in various states of self-assembly (Chui, 2021) raise serious questions about the possibility of a clandestine transhumanist intervention, at least to the untrained eye. As Dennis Bushnell, Chief Scientist at NASA-
Langley, told his audience of environmental technicians in the context of discussing brain chips, cyborgs and super-soldiers, “there’s a lot more out there on the frontiers than maybe you think about in your philosophies, people” (Bushnell, 2011).

Kavli, an investor in graphene innovations, wrote on its website in February 2021 that “mRNA vaccines are only the beginning for bionanoscience” (Brown 2021). The future, according to Kavli, holds advances in synthetic biology, genetic engineering and Artificial Intelligence, thanks to the nanoscience revolution led by COVID-19 vaccines. The Kavli Foundation has partnered with key agencies in the global network of “public private partnerships” pushing gene-based COVID-19 nanotechnology around the world, including the US Military’s Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) and the Rockefeller Foundation. In addition to their interest in COVID-19 vaccines, all three organizations are part of a White House funded “Brain Research through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies” (BRAIN) initiative, including projects in nanoscience, brain-machine interfaces, and bioengineering (Kavli Foundation, 2013; 2014).

DARPA, for instance, is investigating technology that can read and write to brain cells in 50 milliseconds, including the use of “technology that is swallowed, sniffed, injected or absorbed into the human body” (Scudellari, 2019). The BBC reported in July 2021 that a DARPA-funded laboratory at the UC Santa Cruz (Stephens 2020) has developed an injectable nanosensor the size of a single viral particle, able to travel “through the bloodstream and cross the blood-brain barrier… act[ing] like a kind of antenna, turning neural activity into optical signals that could be wirelessly sent to an external device” (Taylor, 2021). With its unusual electromagnetic, superparamagnetic and structural properties, graphene is a leading candidate as a bio-antenna of injectable scale. It has been found to successfully interface with neurons in research funded by the EU’s Horizon 2020 Graphene Flagship program (Fabro et al., 2016), leading one of the study’s authors to remark, “hopefully this will pave the way for better deep brain implants to both harness and control the brain” (University of Cambridge, 2016).

As a key driver and financier of such brain-machine innovations, DARPA is the premier research and development arm of the US Department of Defense. Its role is to act as a “catalyst” for “radical innovation” by bringing “revolutionary technology” to the civilian sector (Adler, 2021). With an Accelerated Manufacture of Pharmaceuticals (AMP) program and a Biological Technologies Office, DARPA was among the agencies listed by NASA Langley as working towards a 2020 Bio-Nano Age (Bushnell, 2001).

According to the journal American Affairs, in the lead-up to 2020, it was DARPA, not the pharmaceutical industry, that spearheaded the development of mRNA vaccines (Adler, 2021; Fleming, 2021; and Kennedy, 2021). By 2020, DARPA’s efforts had culminated in Operation Warp Speed, a clandestine $6 billion collaboration between the US military, intelligence contractors and pharmaceutical companies (Webb, 2020), aimed at bringing gene-based nanotech COVID vaccines to market within months, as opposed to the usual 10 years (Adler, 2021).

American Affairs Journal cites Dan Wattendorf, a colonel, MD and scientist who has cycled through revolving doors between the NIH, DARPA, and now the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, as saying that, “it took a Warp Speed — and COVID-19 — to lead to widespread deployment of the [mRNA] technology.” Now that that technology has been adopted thanks to the social disruption of COVID-19, the Kavli Foundation writes, “mRNA has the potential to do far more than protect against COVID-19 …. We want to understand the genetic code at its most fundamental level and then learn to use those mechanisms to make the cell do new and useful things.” The bionano science rising from the wreckage of coronavirus interventions will,
according to the Kavli Foundation, be marked by innovations such as “new methods for genetic engineering” and designer biology, including the fabrication of synthetic cells, whereby researchers can expect “to find themselves more involved with private companies” (Brown, 2021). All of which raises the specter of a technocratic, medico-military corporatized discipline in which eugenics and transhumanism coalesce.

Another entity with involvement in both transhumanism and gene-based COVID-19 vaccines is the Rockefeller Foundation. Rockefeller hosts the Kavli Neural Systems Institute at Rockefeller University, as an arm of the White House BRAIN initiative. One of the first projects to receive funding under BRAIN was a Rockefeller effort to remotely control brain cells with nanoparticle-based radiogenetics (Rockefeller University, 2014). The technology uses radio waves, or magnetic fields with nanoparticles, to turn neurons on and off. This development led to a protocol published in Nature, which the Rockefeller University described as “magnetic mind control” (Rockefeller University, 2016; Stanley et al., 2016). Around the same time a research group at the University of Virginia, which has received over $76 million from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, developed a technique that involves genetically engineering brain cells, such that brain activity can be remotely controlled by magnetic fields (Wheeler et al., 2016).

The researchers called the invention “magneto”, and published their findings in Nature Neuroscience. Magneto enabled stimulation of reward centers associated with drug and food intake in mice, and represented a new tool for “remotely controlling circuits associated with complex animal behaviors” (Wheeler et al., p. 756). As regards the broader implications of this research, one author foresaw a future in which gene therapy would introduce desired genes into neurons, enabling magnets to control specific neural circuits in the brain. He said, “There are many researchers who are fine-tuning these things so that one day we can use viral gene therapy safely in humans” (Choi, 2016).

As of this writing, five years later, with viral gene therapy underway worldwide, magnetic fields and magnetic nanoparticles are proposed as a source of brain-cloud interface, in which injectable neural-nanorobotics could enable connectivity between human brain activity and the web. In the journal Frontiers in Neuroscience, authors from universities across the United States, Russia and Australia write:

> Subsequent to navigating the human vasculature, three species of neural-nanorobots (endoneurobots, gliabots, and synaptobots) could traverse the blood–brain barrier (BBB) … [and] wirelessly transmit up to $\sim 6 \times 10^{16}$ bits per second … to a cloud-based supercomputer for real-time brain-state monitoring and data extraction (Martins et al., 2019).

While all eyes are on coronavirus, the rapid ascent of nanorobotic technology has taken place largely unimpeded by safety concerns. In a review of environmental and health risks of nanorobotics, Arvidsson and Hanson (2020) note that although “nanorobots are currently being extensively researched and developed, especially for medical applications”, research into potential dangers for human health is lacking, despite numerous grounds for concern. Moreover, the authors caution that no regulatory frameworks exist to govern the application of nanobots to human beings.

Inside this regulation-free environment, and having advanced the science of “magnetic mind control”, the Rockefeller Foundation, like DARPA, is working to push COVID-19 vaccines around the world. Rockefeller is a partner of GAVI The Vaccine Alliance, which is funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and aimed at creating and maintaining “vaccine markets” (GAVI, 2020). Rockefeller is also behind an action plan to increase COVID vaccine uptake (Rockefeller Foundation, 2021), and, along with the Gates Foundation, has funded the WHO guidelines on digital certification of COVID-19 vaccines.
The Rockefeller group also presaged much of the social disruption imposed in response to COVID-19 as part of their “Lockstep” scenario, in a 2010 pandemic planning report (Rockefeller Foundation, 2010). In short, entities with interests in transhumanist innovations hold key roles shaping responses to COVID-19.

The Rockefeller foundation also has a long history of collaboration with China, dating back over a century. From the establishment of the China Medical Board in 1914, “one of the first operating divisions of the Rockefeller Foundation” (Rockefeller Foundation), to orchestrating the Westernization of Chinese medicine, to financial investments and the establishment of the financial architecture that brought China into the world of global finance (Webb & Corbett, 2021), Rockefeller leads the transhumanist trail all the way through COVID-19 right back to the birthplace of SARS-CoV-2.

Conclusions and New Directions for Further Research

The most plausible conclusion to our extended syllogism would follow, therefore, that developments in nanoparticle adjuvants, such as graphene oxide, have been incorporated into innovative vaccine technology despite the problems they create for human beings. Our deductions trace the chronological and logical progression of technological innovations imposed on people and the various dangers these new tools can pose. Our conclusion, we argue, should engender critical questions that motivate further studies of the effects these injections have on human health, especially over the long-term because nanobots do not decay or evidently go away. A couple of hypotheses that can be tested empirically, and promptly, are the following: Why do members of the public who have already submitted to the experiment exhibit magnetic properties typical of heavy metals? What other signs or symptoms, besides magnetism, point to synthetic vaccine materials meant to generate unnatural electrical fields and/or conductivity at the cellular level?

Furthermore, while it is now common knowledge that lipid nanoparticle technology has served as the primary vehicle to deliver the mRNA payload into recipients, our analysis of the larger government-funded technological landscape within which vaccine rollouts and mandates proceed reveals ambitious transhumanist plans presently unfolding. The direct involvement of public-private partnerships, philanthropies, the WEF, UN, EU, and various government agencies tasked to research and develop cutting-edge tools and techniques for the Bio-Nano Age testifies to the global scale and effort involved in fusing man and machine (Goetrzel, 2012) and integrating human beings, without their awareness or consent, into the global neural network. The story of the new injectable mRNA platforms can be understood — only partially — if public attention remains tightly focused on vaccine harms done to human health. Other research questions about the larger societal picture will likely generate fruitful results: To what extent does transhumanist ideology inform and guide official government policies ostensibly crafted for medical care and economic development? To what extent do tax-paying citizens fund violations of their own human rights and sovereignty? Why? All of which begs the disquieting question: to what extent are the harmful ingredients in COVID-19 vaccines a design feature rather than a bug?

In his 2011 speech, NASA Langley Chief scientist Dennis Bushnell foresaw “population control” alongside synthetic biology, intelligent robots, and designer humanoids in coming years (Bushnell, 2011). Global COVID Czar Bill Gates’ fellow member of the so-called Good Club, Ted Turner, is reported to have called for a 95% population reduction in the magazine Audubon in 1996, and has since said on camera that a global population of around 2 billion, or a 75% reduction in today’s terms, is “about right” (Barclay, 2015; Frank, 2009; Harris, 2009; Harlow & Chossudovsky, 2021). If designer humanoids and intelligent robots are
to be the jewels in the crown of the Bio-Nano Age, will survival of the human fittest be the order of the Bio-Nano day?

When it isn’t undermined by corporate interests oriented toward the acquisition of monetary profit at all costs, pure scholarly activity, whose only aim is disinterested truth, can verify some of the most vital claims made about the world, about human activity, or about the most serious threats facing humankind. In claiming the unquestionable pre-eminence of the global EUA vaccine experiment, governments around the world continue pushing these platforms on their populations, when countless questions about the efficacy and ethics of the “jabs” aimed at addressing COVID-19 remain unanswered. As we have noted throughout this essay, the scholarly literature suggests that the new gene-based platforms likely make use of graphene oxide. Nanomaterials such as GO, however, are not listed as ingredients in vaccine inserts, and so evidence, questions, and whistleblowers are “fact-checked” away. Additional research questions can tease out vitally important answers. What does the apparent misrepresentation of ingredients say about international laws of informed consent? What does it mean that so many governments are now openly ignoring laws of informed consent? What are the long-term implications for human health from these experiments? Once inside the human body, to what other ends might nanomaterials and nanotechnologies such as graphene oxide be deployed?

Over the past two decades, the incredible technological breakthroughs made in materials science, genetic engineering, and human genomics have motivated, understandably, much excitement and boasting on the part of developers and investors. The media buzz over these new nano-medicine platforms, however, must be tempered by the many troubling reports from industry insiders and whistleblowers who understand not just the business of vaccine research and development, but also the often hidden hazards of their products. We close with brief references to just a few among a growing body of evidence.

Significantly, in late May of 2021 when news broke in Canada that the spike protein appeared to be damaging vital organs in vaccine recipients (Bridle, 2021), a team of researchers in Spain in early July began reporting on their own studies of the contents of a Pfizer vial that had been delivered to their laboratory in Madrid. La Quinta Columna researchers Ricardo Delgado Martin and José Louis Sevillano (2021a) published their tentative discoveries which, when observed under TEM electron microscopy, appeared to be graphene oxide (2021b). Since publication of the results, numerous other laboratories have conducted similar studies to replicate the work of Delgado and Sevillano. Pablo Campra, in studies not yet peer-reviewed, conducted micro-RAMAN infrared spectroscopy on graphene-like nanoparticles that were visible in COVID mRNA vaccines under optical microscopy, finding that 8 out of 28 could be conclusively identified as graphene, while 20 showed spectroscopy signals compatible with the presence of graphene (Campra, 2021a). Campra has subsequently reported findings of crystalline formations containing markings that appeared to be circuits, viewed under optic microscopy, in Pfizer and Janssen vials (Campra, 2021b; Playne, 2021). He hypothesizes the structures to be elements of a wireless nanosensors network, whether nano-sensors, nano-routers, or nano-antennae.

In the wake of La Quinta Columna study, Karen Kingston, a former analyst with Pfizer, notes in an interview with Stew Peters that many disciplines in the hard sciences publish so-called rags that serve as propaganda for bragging about exciting advances. Kingston discussed the propaganda and noted that, “Graphene can be a conductor of electricity. If it has a positive charge, it annihilates anything it comes into contact with” (2021). She further pointed out that the nanoparticles in the vaccines presently have a neutral
charge, but should they encounter an “electromagnetic field that activates a positive charge, there will potentially be damage ... and death wherever these nanoparticles end up in the body” (2021).

In September, 2021, Carrie Madej reported the results of her own study of the contents of Moderna and Johnson & Johnson vaccine vials. She admitted that she was shocked to discover compounds she had never seen before: the appearance of luminescent materials that responded to light with the expression of blue, purple, green, and bright yellow, which became increasingly luminous. Genetic and Nanotech engineers later confirmed for her that the luminous responses were typical of “superconducting materials ... an injectable computing system” (Madej, 2021). She further observed that when the material was exposed to white light “morgellon-like fibers” (Middleveen et al., 2018) appeared as well as a “tentacle-like spider” that seemed “self-aware” (Madej, 2021). She and her colleague conducting the study later learned that the material resembled “Hydra Vulgaris” — an apparently immortal organism coveted in transhumanist circles and currently the subject of study in human genomics (Altincicek, 2009; Evangelista et al., 2016; Pan et al., 2014; Davis, 2021; White, 2021).

As of this writing, Zandre Botha reported in early October, 2021 the results of her own study of blood samples taken from her patients who had been recently vaccinated. To her horror, she described malformed red blood cells so distorted they were no longer capable of carrying oxygen to tissues through capillaries (2021). Botha's analysis suggests an apparent cause-and-effect relationship between exposure to vaccine ingredients and cellular damage, but as with the La Quinta Columna study, her work should motivate many more researchers seeking to understand these interactions.

In their 2006 editorial, “Mass Media and Medicine: When the Most Trusted Media Mislead,” Jessica Fishman and David Casarett point out that for the sake of public health “it is important to raise awareness of actual risks [of medicines] and make them salient enough to potentially influence individual behavior and community policy decision making.” Because mainstream media is pervasive and so easily accessible, beholden to its corporate owners, shareholders, and sponsors, and driven foremost by market demands, it fails consistently — apparently deliberately — to address the very serious issues we have broached throughout this essay. We are, at this point, unsure whether the hazardous ingredients in the new mRNA-nano-platforms — represented to the public as “vaccines” — are as dangerous as the mainstream narratives that push them.
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