






The background is a solid teal color with a subtle gradient. In the four corners, there are decorative white line-art elements resembling circuit traces or neural network connections. These elements consist of straight lines of varying lengths and angles, ending in small white circles. The top-left and bottom-left corners have more complex, branching structures, while the top-right and bottom-right corners have simpler, more linear structures.


MY REPLY TO THE RETIRED MICROBIOLOGIST



Source: van Welbergen



Source: van Welbergen



Source: van Welbergen

The retired microbiologist: these are “synthetic fibers,” “air bubbles,” and “crenated red cells” – “an effect of hypertonicity as the preparation dries out.” Probably correct



Philippe van Welbergen D.Hom.Med MSc DPh CLS MASLMS MHMA(UK)

As a Certified Laser Specialist, Philippe's area of specialty is aesthetics and health improvement utilising homeopathy and homotoxicology


- Homeopath and laser specialist, not haematologist
- His very specific claims about “reduced graphene oxide” suggest he is parroting Campra
- Not all studies are of adequate quality – it is important to determine which are not, and for adequately powered studies now to take place
- Some of the evidence can be dismissed, but not all of it

Retired microbiologist: “The following interpreted as graphene oxide in blood is not credible – plant fibre IMHO”:



Source: van Welbergen


- Why did these structures start showing up *en masse* in patients’ blood in the summer of 2021, as reported by experienced clinicians?
- Why were they not prevalent in blood before the rollout of the COVID-19 “vaccines”?
- Why do they appear predominantly in “vaccinated” rather than “unvaccinated” blood?
- Spectroscopic analysis of the structures is inconsistent with plant fibres
- Why so many studies show these structures, from across the world?




“Andy Vie” (US)




van Welbergen (UK)



Austrian researchers



Young (US)



Lee et al. (South Korea)



Hall (UK)



Australian Scientists




VEWG (Germany)




Monteverde et al. (Argentina)

Retired microbiologist: “more bubbles, different lighting”




Source: Botha

- Opinion only, no evidence
- Other scientists I have spoken to say these are too dark to be air bubbles
- Could also be contaminants from bad manufacturing processes
- Could also be artificial structures inserted nefariously into the “vaccines”
- We cannot say with confidence at this stage what these are




Source: Campra




Pollen grains under the microscope

- Retired microbiologist: “nothing synthetic about these – pollen grains!”
- Maybe, but no evidence/imagery of pollen grains is provided
- Compared to microscopic imagery of pollen grains, they don’t appear “spiky” enough – could be to do with microscopy type & magnification
- Persuasive *evidence* is needed to support the microbiologist’ claim





Source: Life of the Blood

- Retired microbiologist: “Life of the Blood takes the cake with this pic of ‘buffy coat’ (blood white cell concentrate) with some source (urine?) of phosphate? crystals... i.e could only be deliberate deception.”
- A very strong claim to make – but how reliable is it?



Source: Life of the Blood

- The retired microbiologist provides no imagery of buffy coat or phosphate crystals to substantiate their comparison. More assertion without evidence
- A vastly experienced haematologist: “I believe they are stressed neutrophils and some type of crystal which is probably a constituent of the plasma”
- Could just be from blood left out to dry on the slide, viewed by a non-specialist, but not evidence of “deliberate deception”
- Someone who knows LOTB: “LOTB was absolutely not faking. I can vouch 100%”




The retired microbiologist is silent on other images from Life of the Blood – is this all “deception”? Or can the microbiologist not make sense of what they are seeing?

NOACK




“Tricks of lighting” (retired microbiologist)?
Possibly – but how can we know? Caution must be exercised when accusing researchers of “trickery”

Noack died days after his “graphene hydroxide” video. Maybe a coincidence, maybe not. We cannot dismiss his work out of hand, however, just because it shows surprising findings




SOURCES NOT CONSIDERED

- The retired microbiologist is selective in the evidence they engage with
- Peer-reviewed research by teams of doctors in Italy and South Korea is not mentioned, presumably because it is harder to cast aspersion on
- The work of the Australian scientists, some of whom have decades of experience, is not mentioned
- Nor is the Vaccines Education Working Group (Germany), which has produced a careful and detailed 81-page study
- Spectroscopic analysis from at least four different sources, all compatible with the presence of graphene oxide, showing an array of exotic elements that should not be present (including caesium and antimony), is ignored



Giovannini et al. – same patient one month after injection



Lee et al. – 2.5 months after second Pfizer shot

- The Italian and South Korean doctors, in their peer-reviewed studies, report foreign structures found in blood sent into Rouleaux formation
- In 948 of 1,006 cases (94%), there was “aggregation of erythrocytes [red blood cells] and the presence of particles of various shapes and sizes of unclear origin” within a month of injection (Giovannini et al. 2022, p. 385). Never before in their clinical experience had the doctors witnessed such effects post-vaccination

ROULEAUX: NOT A PROBLEM?

- The retired microbiologist: “The presence of rouleaux is a highly circumstance-dependent phenomenon but that increased intensity of rouleaux following vaccination (possibly of any sort) is believable due to the provocation of an inflammatory response and associated plasma proteins”
- An attempt to downplay/minimize damage to the blood?

THE DANGERS OF ROULEAUX

- Rouleaux formation of red blood cells is normally associated with chronically ill patients, 'results in impaired perfusion and tissue oxygenation, and can lead to potentially fatal blood clots' (Kibria et al. 2014; Wagner et al. 2013)
- The effects witnessed in the bloodwork are "likely [...] if not certain" to be responsible for the coagulation disorders commonly reported following a COVID-19 "vaccine" (Giovannini et al. 2022, p. 402)
- "The presence of rouleaux is a cause of disease because it will restrict the flow of blood throughout the body because capillaries can only accept free-flowing singular and independent red blood cells" (Wikipedia)

AUSTRALIAN SCIENTISTS



Source: Australian Scientists – “definitely not salt crystals”


Complex, motile structures that light up in the presence of a cell phone signal – found both in COVID-19 “vaccine” vials and in patients’ blood




400x magnification; Pfizer patient

The neutrophils make a beeline for the artefact and burst upon contact

VACCINES EDUCATION WORKING GROUP




- Claims that A.I. can distinguish between “vaccinated” and “unvaccinated” blood with 98-100% accuracy?
- Doubtful, since foreign structures also appear in some “unvaccinated” blood



Why do similar strange artefacts appear both in the vials and in the blood of “vaccinated patients”?

SPECTROSCOPY/CHEMICAL COMPOSITION




Source: Nagase

The retired microbiologist: these are “biological/organic ‘house dust’ contamination. I am not familiar with x-ray photoelectron spectroscopy and whether dried vaccine would be suitable. The usual method to determine elemental composition is atomic absorption spectroscopy”

- Why comment on something without the necessary expertise?
- “X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) is a surface-sensitive quantitative spectroscopic technique based on the photoelectric effect that can **identify the elements that exist within a material** (elemental composition) [...]” (Wikipedia)
- Nagase, who does have XPS expertise, explicitly rules out organic matter – a very important finding if verified, because implies synthetic structures

SYNTHETIC BIOLOGY?



“These Injectable Nanobots Can Walk Around Inside A Human Body”

Each discovered in a single drop of “vaccine”/blood – how many must be circulating in “vaccinated” bodies?

Not mentioned by the retired microbiologist


Sources: Vaccines Education Working Group; Austrian researchers; Giovannini et al.; Ghitalla; and a study from Chile

LABORATORY CONTAMINATION?

- The retired microbiologist: “Most of the images of microscopic objects allegedly contained in the vaccines resemble contaminants often seen in laboratory wet preparations – clothing fibres, skin flakes, microbubbles and glass shards and shavings”
- Alternative explanations options to explain some of our findings doesn't mean they are correct

LABORATORY CONTAMINATION?

What about “pods” that “hatch” and proliferate under the microscope cover?





Moderna, room temperature, between 20 and 30 mins.

Source: Yanowitz

Ignored by the retired microbiologist

SELF-ASSEMBLING STRUCTURES UNDER 4G



Reassembles after **router** turned back on (5-6 second intervals, all within 17 seconds), i.e. EMF-responsive [[1h8m54s](#) – 1h9m11s]

Repeated more than once (replication)

“Each time it regrows it reassembles into a different format”

Salt crystals, dust, etc. are not EMF-responsive

Cannot be explained by accidental contamination

Source: Matt Taylor

CREDENTIALS

- If nanotech is in the shots, the microbiologist would not have a clue what he/she is looking at, i.e. would be unqualified to comment
- What microscopic examination of the COVID-19 “vaccines” has the microbiologist done? What have they seen first-hand in the “vaccine” contents? If nothing, they are not qualified to comment
- Matt Taylor: “Simply put, it’s easy to cast doubt without having to prove anything by means of having done nothing”
- Another scientist: “Until one has spent several days and many hours looking at vial samples under a microscope, with/without the influences of thermal and electromagnetic energies, one should keep [their] mouth shut and be humbled [...] especially when referring to other’s images and videos of said contents”

QUESTIONS POSED BY THE MICROBIOLOGIST

1. Has anyone ever asked vaccine manufacturers for the elemental composition of their vaccines or to supply micrographs of their products?

Why bother? The manufacturers are demonstrably untrustworthy and secretive, viz. Pfizer's attempts to hide documents for 75 years. They would refuse, as per all their commercial agreements

Good question though: did the regulators ask? Did the European Parliament?

Why is this information not in the public domain?

QUESTIONS POSED BY THE MICROBIOLOGIST

2. Have appropriate biomedical scientists been asked their opinion of the alleged components of concern?

Appropriate biomedical scientists *are* doing the work. The microbiologist disingenuously ignores all the ones in the paper. Others are coming on board, sometimes anonymously for fear of reprisal

Or is “appropriate” here code for “willing toe the official line”? If so, such scientists are highly *inappropriate*, because compromised

QUESTIONS POSED BY THE MICROBIOLOGIST

3. Has a bioscience laboratory been engaged to analyse the contents of a vaccine vial?

Yes. **LQC. UNIT. GERMAN LAB.**

Others (e.g. in New Zealand) have been approached but have refused

- At a bare minimum, the evidence is strong enough to indicate that adequately powered scientific investigations of the COVID-19 “vaccines” must now be carried out
- But who will do it, given fear of reputational damage, in a context where the Establishment is going to great lengths to cover up “vaccine” damage?
- How will the vials be acquired?
- Where will the funding come from? This a multi-million dollar undertaking. (If anyone has ideas how to raise/coordinate funding, please get in touch)

USE OF AD HOMINEM

- Use of inverted commas/scare quotes to cast aspersion: “The remaining ‘studies’...”; “the ‘researchers’...”
- “assuming that any of these ‘researchers’ are actually about ‘finding the truth’ (rather than “muddying the waters” while gathering dirt on pharma?) then it appears to me the only explanation is ignorance and shoddy technique”
- This rhetorical device seeks to call into character the experience, professionalism, and integrity of the scientists, doctors, and researchers involved, some of whom have decades of experience in the relevant areas. It is a malicious, unscientific tactic that reflects poorly on the retired microbiologist
- Incidentally, why so keen to defend pharma?

ALLEGATIONS OF FRAUD

- “deliberately misrepresenting the artefact as a vaccine component”
 - “Tricks of lighting”
 - “could only be deliberate deception”
-
- These allegations are made on the basis of no evidence, i.e. they constitute **slander**
 - They are also ridiculous given the vast experience and professionalism of some of the scientists now engaged in this work
 - Had these allegations been made publicly, an apology would be in order

SCIENTIFIC RESPONSIBILITY

- It is the responsibility of scientists and clinicians to look for the causes of novel disease patterns and deaths
- There are now large numbers of sick and dead patients who have received 1+ COVID-19 injections, as reflected in reporting systems for serious adverse reactions, support groups for the “vaccine”-injured, countless videos and testimonials, and the fact that excess mortality is running well above average in many countries (though other factors also play a role, e.g. “lockdowns,” reduction of health services, stress)
- Abnormal blood clots are being pulled out of the dead bodies of the “vaccinated”
- Previously published literature on vaccine contaminants before COVID-19 does not feature structures of the kind shown above
- Experienced scientists and clinicians claim never to seen such abnormalities before
- Yet most doctors and scientists, many eminent, remain silent. Others attack those questioning the “vaccine” contents. An abnegation of scientific responsibility

CONCLUSION

- 26+ studies *have* examined the COVID-19 “vaccines” under the microscope and have converged on similar, disturbing findings
- Yet, for some reason, those who have not done the primary empirical research themselves feel entitled to denigrate those who have
- Often they come from a position of complete ignorance regarding bionanotechnology and the “IT/Bio/Nano era”
- As COVID-19 “vaccine” damage and evidence of malfeasance pile up, there is an urgent need for further, adequately powered studies
- Those who will not do the necessary work themselves, or who slander those who *are* doing it, must step aside and let responsible scientists get on with it