

The Psyop is the Dismissal: A Rebuttal to the Kaufman Panel on Nanotechnology

David Nixon, M.B., Ch.B.
Independent Scholar and Physician
Brisbane, Australia

Email: david@drdavidnixon.com | Website: www.drdavidnixon.com | ORCID: 0009-0007-9817-5421

Contents

Introduction.....	494
Who Spoke for the Panel?.....	495
Nanotechnology Has a History — and It's Visible	496
Dental Anaesthetics: Parallel Patterns of Assembly	497
Blood and Serum: The Fracturing of Coherence.....	497
Reframing Psyop: Who Benefits from the Dismissal?	498
The Limits of Expertise.....	499
Coherence as the Hidden Lens.....	499
Conclusion: The Real Psyop	499
References	503

Introduction

In September 2025, Dr Andrew Kaufman convened a panel discussion aimed at dismantling claims about nanotechnology in blood, vaccines, and environmental samples. The panellists — Marisol Arce, Anna Maria Oliva, and Adam and Josh Biggelson — argued that these claims were not only unproven but part of a psychological operation: a "psyop" designed to incite fear, discredit legitimate research, and confuse the public. In their view, the nanotech narrative functions primarily as a tactic, not a truth.

This rebuttal takes a different position. Nanotechnology is not a fantasy. It is not a meme, a narrative virus, or a distraction. It is a well-documented, deeply invested field — with extensive military, industrial, and biomedical applications — and it now stands confirmed by direct observational evidence across multiple product categories and biological contexts.

The panel opened with the assertion that nanotechnology claims are a psyop. This framing does more than mislead. It preloads the discussion with ridicule, shuts down investigation, and positions anyone engaging seriously with the subject as a fool or a liar. As someone who has spent three years documenting these patterns in real-world samples, I feel compelled to respond.

What follows is a point-by-point response to the panel's claims, a naming of its participants, and a methodical placement of their statements against the broader scientific, historical, and empirical record.

This essay counters the panel's claim by presenting photographic and historical evidence of visible nanostructures in biological samples and pharmaceutical products.

Who Spoke for the Panel?

The panel convened by Dr Andrew Kaufman included Marisol Arce, Anna Maria Oliva, and Adam and Josh Biggelson. These participants were presented as credible, authoritative voices capable of dismantling claims related to nanotechnology in vaccines, blood, and environmental samples. Yet their expertise, backgrounds, and prior statements merit closer scrutiny.

Marisol Arce, a Spanish-speaking commentator active in natural health circles, has made prior claims aligned with emotional healing and intuitive medicine. Her dismissal of microscopy findings appears to rest not on technical counter-evidence, but on rhetorical posture and appeals to ridicule.

Anna Maria Oliva, an engineer and theologian, has written on bio-photonics and morphogenetic fields, but has simultaneously rejected claims of visible nanostructures in blood or vaccines as “spiritual distraction.” This contradiction — acknowledging subtle bioenergetic fields while denying direct structural observations — weakens her position as an objective evaluator.

Adam and Josh Biggelson, widely known for promoting the “blood dot” theory and image pattern recognition from live blood microscopy, have increasingly distanced themselves from emerging structural observations that do not conform to their own prior models. Their flat dismissal of synthetic architectures — especially without reviewing full image sequences, SDE time-lapses, or controls — places ideology over evidence.

None of the four panellists has published a peer-reviewed paper addressing the structural observations now emerging from dark field microscopy (DFM), nor have they reviewed key image sets or publicly engaged with researchers presenting them.

This critique does not dismiss personal experience or expertise but highlights the mismatch between scientific standards and rhetorical dismissal.

Pfizer’s Crystals: The Evidence Under the Microscope

These structures are not artefacts of imaging, air bubbles, or salt crystallization. They demonstrate:

- **Rectilinear geometry**, strongly indicative of engineered patterning rather than random aggregation.
- **Coupling behaviour** between components — suggestive of assembly logic or energetic interplay.
- **Staged evolution** — the rectangular plate appears first, followed by fibre interaction, then final fusion.

These dynamics are documented in *Nixon (2025a)* and supported by sequential time-lapse images, multi-modal illumination, and reproducibility across samples.

Importantly, this is not a singular anomaly. In *Paper G*, similar structures are observed in multiple samples from different batches and manufacturers. The same logic of geometry, coupling, and staged formation recurs in dental anaesthetics and even biological fluids such as blood and urine.

While the panel dismissed structural claims as delusional or deceptive, the evidence says otherwise. The image below is not speculative, symbolic, or interpretive. It is a direct observation from a Pfizer Comirnaty vial under dark field and bright field microscopy. This sample, untreated and unstained, was imaged 4 months after the sample was first placed on the slide and kept in the dark subject to moderate ambient EMF fields. This triptych captures a now-recurring motif — one that fits squarely within the design logics of published nanoscale systems.




Figure 1. The “Plugged-In Phenomenon” observed in Pfizer Comirnaty. The first two frames show a rectilinear crystalline motif under dark field, with circuitry-like features evolving before (left) and after (centre) apparent coupling to a fibre. The third frame is a bright field image of the second stage, confirming the same rectilinear architecture. Magnification 200x.

Nanotechnology Has a History — and It’s Visible

The claim that nanotech is a psyop collapses under the weight of published history. The U.S. Department of Defense has invested heavily in nanotechnology since the early 2000s, including projects under DARPA and BARDA that explore self-assembling materials, nanoscale biosensors, and injectable monitoring platforms.

Pioneering work by Ian Akyildiz, Josep Jornet, and their colleagues (2010–2015) laid the theoretical foundations for **electromagnetic nanonetworks**, describing architectures where nanoscale nodes could communicate via terahertz-band emissions. These papers introduced concepts such as **the Internet of Bio-Nano Things (IoBNT)** — which has since matured into a formal research domain encompassing communications, medical surveillance, and synthetic biology.

Corporate involvement is extensive. Moderna’s use of lipid nanoparticles is now standard in mRNA delivery. IBM, Samsung, Huawei, and other industry players hold patents for graphene-integrated circuitry, nanoscale switching mechanisms, and bio-responsive smart materials. Academic journals such as *Nanomedicine*, *ACS Nano*, and *Nature Nanotechnology* publish thousands of papers on programmable materials, quantum dots, hydrogel behaviour, and electromagnetic activation.

To argue that nanotech is “just a story” is to erase a literature that spans decades and a funding stream that exceeds billions. This is not speculation. It is infrastructure.

Dental Anaesthetics: Parallel Patterns of Assembly

Independent microscopy of dental anaesthetics — including lignocaine and articaine — has revealed identical structural motifs. Sessile Droplet Evaporation (SDE) of these solutions produces:

- CRMs and CFAs, consistent with those seen in Pfizer samples.¹
- Vesicle–colloid interactions indicative of a programmable system.
- Large, high-fidelity crystals sometimes visible to the naked eye.

These results are not limited to one sample or location. The assemblies are consistent across products and brands, suggesting that the mechanism of self-assembly is embedded within the excipients — the supposedly inert additives that serve as carriers or stabilisers.

When these excipients respond to energy gradients or coherence fields, synthetic architecture emerges. These behaviours cannot be explained by contamination, drying artefacts, or observer bias. They are systemic, persistent, and dynamic. SDE (sessile droplet evaporation), a technique used to analyse evaporative crystallization behaviour, reveals structured formation in multiple anaesthetic formulations

Blood and Serum: The Fracturing of Coherence

The most alarming evidence appears in live blood microscopy. Here, we see:

- **Fibrous, polymer-like structures** interwoven with erythrocytes.
- **Hydrogel vesicles and spherocyte-like forms.**
- **Assembly of synthetic fibres post-fluorescein exposure** in serum.

Blue, strand-like fibres have now been identified in vaccine vials, blood samples, food products, and even rainwater. Their morphology and response to light, heat, and electromagnetic fields align with hydrogel-based nanomaterials developed in academic and defence research.

¹ **Circle-Rectangle Motifs (CRM's)** - Recurring geometric features characterised by precise circular and rectangular arrangements, exhibiting hierarchical and fractal-like organisation.

Crystal-Fibre Assemblies (CFA's) - Unique fibre-crystal structures observed within pharmaceutical preparations, demonstrating integrated organisation of microstructures across compositional and spatial domains.

These findings are no longer isolated. Dozens of microscopists, working independently across continents, are documenting the same structural signatures. To claim they are artefacts is to deny a global convergence of observation. These findings suggest not contamination, but systemic modulation of biological structure — potentially coherence collapse under EMF burden.




Figure 2. Hydrogel nodal network in a contaminated blood sample, showing phase-aligned bright inclusions connected by filamentous strands. These photonic nodes appear evenly spaced and templated along the rightmost filament, suggesting directed propagation and coherence-dependent self-assembly. Fine colloidal strands connect the nodes into a coordinated lattice. Magnification 20x.

Reframing Psyop: Who Benefits from the Dismissal?

A psychological operation — psyop — is a tool used to shape public perception by distorting reality, not revealing it. Classic examples include Operation Mockingbird (media infiltration) and COINTELPRO (disruption of activist groups).

To suggest that nanotech is a psyop flips the definition. Nanotechnology is:

- Published in peer-reviewed journals.
- Filed in hundreds of patents.
- Integrated into commercial and military products.
- Observed through direct microscopy across multiple labs.

What the Kaufman panel has done is **deploy the concept of a psyop as a rhetorical tactic** — a manoeuvre that:

- Dismisses inconvenient evidence without investigation.
- Encourages self-censorship among researchers.
- Labels coherence as confusion.

That, in effect, **is the psyop**: not the evidence itself, but the pre-emptive discrediting of it.

The Limits of Expertise

Each panellist spoke beyond their expertise:

- Arce invoked terrain theory but failed to engage with synthetic materials evidence.
- Oliva, despite working in nano-bioengineering, downplayed the in vivo relevance of the very technologies her field develops.
- The Biggleson's maintained their focus on pleomorphism but did not address synthetic self-assembly or field-responsive structures.

Expertise is not transferrable by association. Authority in one domain does not confer dismissal rights in another. The result was a panel that substituted conviction for precision.

Coherence as the Hidden Lens

Across all contexts — vaccines, anaesthetics, blood, rainwater — one theme recurs: **coherence**.

Structures emerge, disassemble, and reassemble based on ambient field conditions. This aligns with theories of **coherence domains** proposed by Giuliano Preparata, Emilio Del Giudice, and others, which describe how ordered water and energy fields can drive self-organisation at biological and pre-biological scales.

Coherence explains:

- Why some samples crystallise differently under light exposure.
- Why orgonite or Trivortex exposure disrupts self-assembly.
- Why identical geometries emerge across product classes.

Dismissing these structures without addressing their coherence behaviours is not scientific scepticism — it is avoidance.

Conclusion: The Real Psyop

The Kaufman panel argued that nanotechnology is not real, but a distraction — a psyop engineered to undermine truth. Yet the evidence proves the opposite.

Nanotechnology is:

- Historically established.
- Industrially deployed.
- Observationally confirmed.
- Behaviourally coherent.

To claim it does not exist is to relieve oneself of the burden of engagement. But this abdication does not protect the public — it leaves them blind.

The real psyop is not the story of nanotech. It is the **strategic erasure of its evidence**, the **de-legitimisation of its observers**, and the **false assurance that nothing has changed**.

And everything has changed.

These findings are available for public review, and I invite open engagement from critics willing to address the full visual and structural evidence base

Postscript: The Evidence Base They Ignored

1. Pfizer: Self-Assembly Beyond Known Science

The microscopy findings documented in *Active Microscale Construction in Pfizer Comirnaty* provide high-resolution, reproducible evidence of structures incompatible with classical crystallisation. Sessile droplet evaporation (SDE) reveals Circle–Rectangle Motifs (CRMs), branching Crystal Fibre Assemblies (CFAs), and dynamic components such as “micro-engines” and “plugged-in” lattice formations — collectively indicating programmable self-assembly from colloidal precursors. These phenomena are not isolated curiosities; they recur across multiple vials, display geometric consistency, and appear influenced by environmental fields

Far from being optical artefacts, these formations behave in a way that aligns with nanonetwork architecture models proposed by Akyildiz, Jornet, and others. They are neither static contaminants nor incidental aggregates; they are structured, responsive, and in some cases appear to carry out *construction and deconstruction* tasks in real time — a characteristic well beyond the explanatory reach of conventional chemistry.

2. Dental Anaesthetics: A Hidden Architecture Repeats

Nano Makes Micro and *Coherence-Dependent Self-Assembly in Dental Anaesthetics* expand the scope beyond vaccines, showing that commercial dental anaesthetics (including lignocaine and articaine) also contain material that self-assembles under SDE into repeating crystalline and fibre structures. These include CRMs and CFAs almost identical to those

Even more compelling is the *field responsiveness* of these structures. Exposure to a passive orgonite disc disrupted their self-assembly, while exposure to a Theraphi plasma field *accelerated* it. These field-dependent outcomes support the hypothesis that the structures rely on coherence gradients, suggesting they are not merely inert chemical residues but signal-responsive architectures embedded in medical products

This degree of responsiveness has no precedent in excipient literature or regulatory documentation. It indicates design — not accident.

3. Blood and Urine: Synthetic Structures Inside the Body

In *Self-Assembling Nanostructures in Blood and Urine*, synthetic motifs previously observed in pharmaceutical products were found again — this time in the blood and urine of exposed individuals. These include:

- Vesicle–colloid–crystal triads (Triphasic or Tetraphasic Signatures)
- Fibrous or filamentous lattices
- Hydrogel-like sheets and vesicular anchors
- Structures that mirror CRMs and CFAs from the Pfizer and dental studies

Some of these structures were excreted through urine, suggesting active clearance pathways. Others persisted in live blood under coverslip, interacting with erythrocytes and displaying apparent coherence collapse. Most concerningly, signal analysis captured near these individuals

revealed **low-entropy, fixed-interval, pseudo-MAC emissions**, suggesting the activation of a **synthetic nanonetwork layer** within the human body — a direct link between material structure and digital signal output

This is not theory. It is confirmed microscopy, documented signal analysis, and cross-domain patterning.

Final Note: Disengagement is Not Disproof

To declare these structures a psyop while refusing to examine the published images, papers, and field tests is an act of disengagement masquerading as discernment. The dismissal is not empirical. It is epistemic — a pre-emptive strike against pattern recognition.

These structures exist. They behave. They repeat. They respond.

The real psyop is not the evidence of nanotechnology.

It is the collaborative effort — witting or unwitting — to pretend it isn't there.

References

- Akyildiz, I. F., Pierobon, M., Balasubramaniam, S., & Koucheryavy, Y. (2015).** The Internet of Bio-Nano Things. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 53(3), 32–40.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/MCOM.2015.7060516>
→ Introduces IoBNT—bridging nano-communication theory with biological integration; conceptually parallels structures seen in SDE studies.
- Nixon, D. (2025a).** Active Microscale Construction in Pfizer Comirnaty: Evidence of Dynamic Self-Assembly and Structured Behaviour in Pharmaceutical Products. *Journal of Bionanotechnocracy: Countdown to 2030*, 1 (1) 1-112.
<https://www.journalbnt.org>
→ Foundational Pfizer paper documenting structural motifs (CRMs/CFAs), critical for framing this broader investigation into crystallization and design.
- Nixon, D. (2025b).** Nano Makes Micro: Emergent Structural Logic Across Pharmaceutical and Biological Systems. *Journal of Bionanotechnocracy: Countdown to 2030*, 1(1), 113–197.
<https://www.journalbnt.org>
→ Documents the emergence of Circle-Rectangle Motifs (CRMs), Crystal Fibre Assemblies (CFAs), and vesicle dynamics in sessile droplet evaporation (SDE) of dental anaesthetics.
- Nixon, D. (2025c).** The MAC Address Phenomenon: Coordinated Bluetooth Emissions and the Architecture of a Synthetic Nano-network Layer. *Journal of Bionanotechnocracy: Countdown to 2030*, 1(1), 198–247.
<https://www.journalbnt.org>
→ Proposes the existence of a Synthetic Nanonetwork Layer (SNL) inferred from non-random Bluetooth MAC emissions; complements physical self-assembly observations with signal-based architecture analysis.
- Nixon, D. (2025e).** Self-Assembling Nanostructures in Blood and Urine: Implications for Bioaccumulation and Detoxification. *Journal of Bionanotechnocracy: Countdown to 2030*, 1(1), 279-312.
<https://www.journalbnt.org>
→ Demonstrates that self-assembling structures are present in biological fluids; explores implications for internal contamination and the role of excretory pathways in clearance.
- Nixon, D. (2025f).** Coherence-Dependent Self-Assembly in Dental Anaesthetics: Structural Modulation through Passive Field Exposure. *Journal of Bionanotechnocracy: Countdown to 2030*, 1(1), 313-396.
<https://www.journalbnt.org>
→ Reveals that passive field-based tools (e.g. Orgonite) can disrupt structural fidelity and assembly pathways; introduces the concept of Coherence Residual Domains (CRDs) as morphogenic memory zones.