International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research
IJVTPR

A GMO Experiment on Two-Thirds of the World's Population: Reaction to Ulrich's Commentary on Lee and Broudy (2024)

Tamara Tuuminen, MD, PhD

Adjunct Professor in Medical Microbiology, Medical Centre Kruunuhaka Oy, Helsinki, Finland
email: tuuminen@gmail.com

Summary

While Professor A. Ulrich (2024) raised justifiable questions about the interpretation of microscopic images from incubated COVID-19 injectables from Pfizer and Moderna, her message treats the world-wide genetic modification experiment with COVID-19 injectables on humans — an experiment on us without our consent — as normal. I will not discuss the physico-chemistry of the 10 trillion lipid nanoparticles she claims are in every dose of the injectables. She acknowledges that "many of the lipid constituents . . . tend to induce inflammation" (p. 1244.3) but says they account for all the self-assembling structures documented in what she describes as the "reliable" and "fully consistent" findings (Ulrich, p. 1244.7) of Lee and Broudy (2024). Though I believe the self-assembling structures also merit in-depth study, the technology underlying them, must be contained in the concoctions injected into the arms of two-thirds of the world's population without proper preclinical testing and without the informed consent required by the Nuremberg Code. My focus is on that violation of medical ethics turning humans into genetically modified organisms. Here I illustrate in her words that such a genetic experiment on humans is underway. Instead of refuting any of the evidence in Lee and Broudy (2024) —that whatever the injectables may actually contain they are harming the human population of the world — she actually admits in closing that those "risks will be exacerbated with the next generation of self-amplifying or self-replicating RNA vectors for vaccines" (1244.8).

Keywords: *COVID-19 modified mRNA transfection, genetic experimentation on humans, human GMOs, human gut biota, lipid nanoparticles*, *Moderna*, *Pfizer*, *self-assembling structures*

My Analysis

Ulrich asserts that the lipid nanoparticles used for **transfection** are the source of the self-assembling structures found in the experiments reported by Lee and Broudy (2024). In other words,

xenogenomic (foreign, active genetic) material is reportedly encoded in the Pfizer and Moderna modified RNAs supposedly packed into each lipid nanoparticle that is intended to transfect the cells of recipients. According to Ulrich's own words, all the cells in an individual's body could potentially be "transfected". She said that the number of nanoparticles in each injection loaded with an untested novel cargo is approximately equal to the number of all the somatic cells of the body.

> After all, a fresh dose of vaccine contains around 10^{13} modRNA molecules, which corresponds to 10 trillion nanoparticles administered. Just for comparison, this order of magnitude matches roughly the number of cells in a human body, so the organism is literally flooded with nanoparticles [p. 1244.8].

In noting that the aim is to "transfect" cells with genetic material, she admits that an experiment on the world's population has been and is still being performed. Here she describes the theory behind the ongoing experimental "transfection" of billions of humans:

> The task of the special lipid mixtures, also known as transfection agents, is to stabilize the sensitive RNA strands and to enable their delivery in the form of nanoparticles (Gote et al., 2023). Inside the body, the transfection agents serve as door openers when encountering any cell into which the modRNA is to be transported. Every cell membrane has special gates, which allow only certain substances to pass through, as are required by the cell or to be secreted. The uptake of mRNA is generally not intended, and free RNA gets rapidly degraded outside the cells. However, due to their amphiphilic nature [their tendency to adhere universally to surfaces that usually repel or hold on to water, or that repel or hold on to an oily surface] the lipid nanoparticles function like Trojan horses. By perturbing and fusing with the cellular membrane . . . , they can smuggle their cargo into the cell, where the modRNA will then be able to initiate the production of spike proteins. Voila [p. 1244.4-1244.5]!

Such experiments to transfect tissue cultures are normally done in a laboratory requiring conformity to strict ethical requirements and under authoritative supervision. Moreover, transfection with xenogenomic (foreign, synthetic, humanly manufactured, unnatural) materials can be interpreted as turning humans into genetically manipulated or modified organisms, popularly referred to as GMOs. The interpretation of the ongoing experiment as genetic modification of humans cannot be ruled out because neither Ulrich nor the manufacturers of the "Trojan horses" being "smuggled" into human cells can guarantee that the integration of xenogenomic material will be limited to the somatic cells of individuals. If they can invade human germ cells, there are potentially devastating consequences for future generations. Ulrich writes:

> In our opinion, further research and public discussion should focus on these critical aspects, rather than stirring up excessive fear of futuristic, transhumanist manipulation through nanotechnology [p. 1244.8].

Ulrich downplays the "impurities" in the modified mRNA concoctions by suggesting that they are a "minor" problem:

> This reasoning does not rule out the presence of minor impurities, as have been detected by highly sensitive analytical techniques, as also noted by Lee and Broudy [p. 1244.2].

How does the author know that the "impurities" are minor? By what logic is it reasonable to suppose that 10 trillion synthetically prepared nanoparticles — ones that involve something very

much like the sort of manipulative nanotechnology that Ulrich says cannot be inferred from the strange entities documented in the "reliable" and "fully consistent" research by Lee and Broudy (2024) — are "safe and effective"? How do we know they are not exceedingly harmful? Ulrich says she has not performed any experimental studies on the content of the injectables. Also, the explanation that she provides for how the 10 trillion "Trojan horses" being "smuggled" into bodily cells (all of which contain toxic nano materials) can remain harmless is far from reassuring.

Moreover, although neither Lee and Broudy (2024), nor Ulrich (2024) herself, mention the billions of circular plasmid DNA molecules that make the ongoing GMO experiment on humans potentially more dangerous than any of us have ever imagined. These plasmids may be taken up by our gut microbiota resulting in another GMO macro-organism. The role the plasmids may play is laid out in a professionally prepared video, hyperlinked here, that describes the reasons for a lawsuit underway in Australia.

All that being said, in what capacity can she "reassure" readers of the journal about the micro-sized structures found in the studies by Lee and Broudy (2024). We know from their research that those structures have been self-assembled within greatly diluted samples of the Pfizer and Moderna concoctions, well below the concentration of 2.5 grams per millileter that Ulrich reports (p. 1244.3):

> Here, we argue that the bizarre structures should not be considered alarming per se, as they are just made up of lipids. They clearly do not represent any allegedly "toxic protein secretions", "long-lasting silica", "graphene-coated polymers", "conductors or semiconductors" or any other "undisclosed additional engineered components" made up of "not-natural/foreign material" [p. 1244.3]?

On the same page, she continues to note that the synthetic lipids with their genetic payloads can cause inflammation and may have "immunogenic and allergic potential" which would preclude extensive application for human use:

> Nonetheless, it ought to be kept in mind that many of the lipid constituents used in the nanoparticles tend to induce inflammation (Chen & Blakney, 2024). They also have a high immunogenic and allergenic potential, which argues against an extensive application in humans [p. 1244.3].

Again, in the next sentence, Ulrich sidesteps the majority of the serious issues raised by Lee and Broudy (2024), those that spurred the years of research undertaken in Lee's laboratory, yet implies that at least some of the components in the COVID-19 concoctions are intrinsically dangerous:

> The intrinsic risks posed by the modRNA and its product, the spike protein, are yet another completely different matter that will not be addressed here [p. 1244.3].

She should be referred to the VAERS database (Rose & McCullough, 2021; Guetzkow, 2023) concerning the frequency of under-reported anaphylactic reactions and to research connecting such reactions to the COVID-19 concoctions (Cabanillas et al., 2021; Children's Health Defense, 2020; Shimabukuro et al., 2021; Smout, 2020; Sobczak & Pawliczak, 2022). "Allergic potential" can result in real anaphylaxis, real cases, which can end up as real dead cases. She admits, I am happy to say, that such a potential for harm "argues against an[y?] extensive application in humans" (p. 1244.3).

Ulrich does not mention that ALC-0315, SM-102 or ALC-0159 or PEG have never been approved for *in vivo* application in humans. And what of the insistence that such products are safe to inject into the shoulders of healthy children, not to mention healthy adolescents, and healthy adults within

the population at large? At least one other author in this journal has argued against such nonsense (Hughes, 2021, 2022, 2024).

Ulrich says that synthetic lipids were used to stabilize "sensitive RNA" but no real RNA was used in these experiments. The RNA that she says is packed into the toxic lipid nanoparticles was modified so it would not be as fragile, short-lived, or sensitive as natural RNA. For discussion see (Nance & Meier, 2021) and also see the commentary by Santiago (2022) on the question put by Hughes (2022) about what is actually in the COVID-19 concoctions. The concept of natural RNA does not apply at all to the payload supposedly inside each of the 10 trillion nanoparticles Ulrich is defending as harmless "lipids". They are, however, products of biotechnology.

The author continues to downplay the pathophysiology these nanoparticles:

> It should be borne in mind that an injection of the highly concentrated vaccines into the deltoid muscle would initially cause only a local disruption of cells and inflammation, until some nanoparticles are taken up by the lymph or blood and become distributed throughout the rest of the body. Due to the resulting dilution, the primary toxicity issues should be less of a concern [p. 1244.8].

The end of Ulrich's commentary is of special interest to me, and I hope this will be considered by the 411,591 readers who, according to the Editor-in-Chief of this journal on September 14, 2024 at 4:52 PM, have already viewed Lee and Broudy (2024). On the one hand she wrote:

> It should nevertheless be clear that the new generation of modRNA products entails considerable risks, not so much due to the toxicity of the lipids, but rather due to the genetically active components they deliver [p. 1244.8].

But at the same time, she seems almost to contradict herself by writing:

> Even in the light of potentially harmful [inadequately studied] lipids, the amounts administered are essentially under control [1244.8].

But how can that be known without a single experiment to assure us that "Alles ist in Ordnung" — everything is fine? How does she know?

Also, on what empirical basis can she say

> . . . and their cytotoxic activity can be assessed, as is commonplace with other traditional pharmaceuticals [1244.8]?

No, here the author is wrong. It is well known that Pfizer and Moderna modified mRNA concoctions are not "traditional pharmaceuticals" by a long stretch. They are novel, never adequately tested, experimental products that were given the green light for emergency use first in the USA in March 2020 (Commissioner, 2024), then for "conditional" use in Europe by November 2020 (European Commission, 2024), and so forth throughout much of the rest of the world. The almost completely untested experimental products were presented to the public as necessary countermeasures to the March 11, 2020 pandemic announced by the World Health Organization (Ghebreyesus, 2020).

Pressuring hundreds of millions of people to accept the experimental injections was accomplished mainly by fear — first convincing the world's governments and authorities everywhere that the pandemic was real and might take many millions of lives — accompanied by intimidation (Tuuminen et al., 2023). Sometimes, as with the single photo of "a convoy in Bergamo" mentioned at the end of Ulrich's article, the mainstream press contributed a fictional legend of sorts, whether

by intention or not, to the creation of genuine terror. That photo taken one dark night showing, allegedly, thousands of dead bodies being transported to crematoria outside the Italian city of Bergamo, frightened people into a willingness to take the rushed-to-market COVID-19 injections. These were injected *en masse* into mostly healthy people, who, now that we know a good deal more from the research on the COVID-19 concoctions, would have been well-advised to say "no thanks" to the injections. As a pair of the contributors to this journal (Seneff & Nigh, 2021) feared and predicted, the remedy for the "pandemic" has indeed turned out to be worse than the pandemic itself as confirmed by Kirsch et al.(2024) and by Mead, et al. (2024a, 2024b).

Ulrich comes close to admitting the possibility that the complaints of Lee and Broudy (2024) against the Pfizer and Moderna products in particular are correct. She even includes an unmistakable warning in her concluding remarks:

> Expression of the spike protein, on the other hand, is fundamentally beyond control with regard to the distribution of the modRNA, the tissue type that gets transfected, the persistence of protein expression, the lifetime of active modRNA, its potential incorporation into DNA, and any long-term effects on the immune system. These risks will be exacerbated with the next generation of self-amplifying or self-replicating RNA vectors for vaccines [p. 1244.8].

If we ask what risks will be exacerbated, it is not difficult to find an empirically supported answer in Lee and Broudy (2024). Perhaps it is because she agrees with much of what they document with peer-reviewed research in the following quote from their sobering study:

> In the early days of the push to herd earth's population into the COVID-19 global "vaccine" experiment, a small number of medical doctors and independent researchers began raising concerns about the observed ineffectiveness, even negative impact, of the modified-RNA injectables (Beattie, 2021; Hughes, 2022; Santiago, 2022; Nyström and Hammarström, 2022). . . . Given the possibility that new variants of SARS-CoV-2 could be rapidly induced by billions of injections being promoted by authorities worldwide, increasing numbers of deaths were attributed to strains of SARS-CoV-2 and severe sequelae (Lyons-Weiler, 2020; Vojdani & Kharrazian, 2020; Vojdani et al., 2021) leading to many deaths in population centers around the world (Beattie, 2021) . . . . as early as March 2021 and over the following months, significant increases in excess deaths of "unknown" causes and severe sequelae — blood clots, inexplicable hemorrhaging, multiple organ damage (and failure), sudden spikes (cardiotoxins) in heart disease, blood cancers including leukemia and lymphoma, a range of other "turbo" cancers, miscarriages, neurological and autoimmune disorders, to name a few, have appeared in patients (Nyström and Hammarström, 2022; Santiago & Oller, 2023; Perez et al., 2023; Mead et al., 2024a [2024b, 2024c) [p. 1181].

Although Ulrich does not ask it, the obvious question in light of all the foregoing and all that she has said up to her own concluding statements, is, why do we need the "next generation of self-amplifying or self-replicating RNA vectors for vaccines" (Ulrich, p. 1244.8), and why are they misleadingly still being called "vaccines"?

We can agree that more discussion, consideration, even debate, and especially transparency are needed. The content of the vials called "COVID-19 vaccines" should be examined carefully. Also, the consequences of injecting those contents into the living bodies of the billions of people already dosed with them should be studied from every reasonable angle. In my opinion, nothing should be

done that might discourage the sort of bench science undertaken by Lee and Broudy (2024) to try to see what becomes of the injected materials in media ranging from distilled water to human tissues, especially blood, plasma, lymphatic fluids, etc. Until we know for sure that the strange entities found by Lee and Broudy (2024) can never cause anything like the legendary nighttime "convoy in Bergamo" (Ulrich, 2024, p. 1244.1), all of the COVID-19 injectables should be withdrawn from the market and a moratorium should be invoked barring any further modified mRNA technologies for human and animal use.

Acknowledgments

First, I want to thank Professor Anne Ulrich for her extremely intelligible commentary. Also, as I expect she will read my reactions to her excellent writing, I am authorized by Lee and Broudy to encourage her to respond positively to their invitation to collaborate with them in the future to help discover how it is that at least some of the strange self-assembling structures appear to be responsive to exposure to electromagnetic fields. In addition, I also thank the Editor-in-Chief (EiC) of the *IJVTPR* by whom I have been informed that no fewer than nine peer-reviewers voted for the publication of my commentary. Reservations and concerns, for instance, by Shimon Yanowitz and Daniel Santiago, that Professor Ulrich is too accepting about what she has read or been told by Pfizer and Moderna concerning their concoctions were passed along and led to modifications in my comments. I know there are components in those injectables that the manufacturers have not disclosed, such as the circular plasmid DNAs pointed out by Kevin McKernan in the video (linked here) that I referred to above in my text. Incidentally, I was not one of the editors involved in the decision to publish Lee and Broudy (2024), but I was one of the many who reviewed Ulrich (2024) and, who according to the EiC unanimously argued in favor of publishing it as soon as possible. With respect to my own "letter to the editor"/comment onUlrich (2024), I thank all of those who recommended in favor of its publication, and especially those who suggested the many edits that I accepted. Any remaining errors are my own. Comments are welcome at tuuminen@gmail.com.

References

Benzi Cipelli, R., Giovannini, F., & Pisano, G. (2022). Dark-field microscopic analysis on the blood of 1,006 symptomatic persons after anti-COVID mRNA injections from Pfizer/BioNtech or Moderna. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, *2*(2), 385–444. https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v2i2.47

Cabanillas, B., Akdis, C. A., & Novak, N. (2021). COVID-19 vaccine anaphylaxis: IgE, complement or what else? A reply to: "COVID-19 vaccine anaphylaxis: PEG or not?" *Allergy*, *76*(6), 1938–1940. https://doi.org/10.1111/all.14725

Chen, S. P., & Blakney, A. K. (2024). Immune response to the components of lipid nanoparticles for ribonucleic acid therapeutics. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, *85*, 103049. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2023.103049

Children's Health Defense. (2020, December 14). *FDA Ignores RFK, Jr.'s Pleas for Vaccine Safety Oversight Concerning PEG, Suspected To Cause Anaphylaxis*. https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/fda-ignores-rfk-jrs-pleas-for-vaccine-safety-oversight-concerning-peg-suspected-to-cause-anaphylaxis-301192173.html

Commissioner, O. of the. (2024). Emergency Use Authorization. *FDA*. https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/mcm-legal-regulatory-and-policy-framework/emergency-use-authorization

European Commission. (2024). *Q&A: Conditional Marketing Authorisation of COVID-19 Vaccine* [Text]. European Commission - European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/qanda_20_2390

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

Gote, V., Bolla, P. K., Kommineni, N., Butreddy, A., Nukala, P. K., Palakurthi, S. S., & Khan, W. (2023). A comprehensive review of mRNA vaccines. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, *24*(3), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms24032700

Guetzkow, J. (2023, January 4). CDC Finally Released Its VAERS Safety Monitoring Analyses for COVID Vaccines via FOIA [Substack newsletter]. *Jackanapes Junction*. https://jackanapes.substack.com/p/cdc-finally-released-its-vaers-safety?publication_id=747747&isFreemail=true

Hughes, D. A. (2021). "COVID-19 vaccines" for children in the UK: A tale of establishment corruption. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, *2*(1), 209–247. https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v2i1.35

Hughes, D. A. (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

Hughes, D. A. (2024). *"COVID-19," Psychological Operations, and the War for Technocracy: Volume 1*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-41850-1

Kirsch, S., Marik, P., Rogers, C., Cosgrove, K., & Mead, M. N. (2024). *A Novel Practical Approach for Directly Assessing COVID-19 Vaccine Efficacy against Hospitalization* (2024080338). Preprints. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202408.0338.v1

Lee, Y. M., & Broudy, D. (2024). 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

Mead, M. N., Seneff, S., Rose, J., Wolfinger, R., McCullough, P. A., & Hulscher, N. (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), 1246–1315. https://doi.org/10.56098/w66wjg87

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

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

Rose, J., & McCullough, P. A. (2021). A report on myocarditis adverse events in the US Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System (VAERS) in association with COVID-19 injectable biological products. *Current Problems in Cardiology*, 101011. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpcardiol.2021.101011

Santiago, D. (2022). A partial answer to the question posed by David A. Hughes, PhD, in the article: "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), 587–594. https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v2i2.56

Seneff, S., & Nigh, G. (2021). Worse than the disease? Reviewing some possible unintended consequences of the mRNA vaccines against COVID-19. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, *2*(1), 38–79. https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v2i1.23

Shimabukuro, T. T., Cole, M., & Su, J. R. (2021). Reports of Anaphylaxis After Receipt of mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines in the US-December 14, 2020-January 18, 2021. *JAMA*. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.1967

Smout, A. (2020, December 10). *Britain issues anaphylaxis warning on Pfizer vaccine after adverse reactions*. Japan Today. https://japantoday.com/category/world/Britain-issues-anaphylaxis-warning-on-Pfizer-vaccine-after-adverse-reactions

Sobczak, M., & Pawliczak, R. (2022). The risk of anaphylaxis behind authorized COVID-19 vaccines: A meta-analysis. *Clinical and Molecular Allergy*, *20*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12948-022-00167-y

Tuuminen, T., Suominen, P. J., & Guldbrandsen, T. A. (2023). A Finnish Survey of Adverse Effects of COVID-19 Injectables and the Functionality of the Medical System. *International Journal of Vaccine Theory, Practice, and Research*, *3*(1), 1009–1025. https://doi.org/10.56098/ijvtpr.v3i1.87

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

Legal Disclaimer