


From 9/11 to 'Covid-19': Fakery & the War waged on Mankind

How the simple checking of
primary sources reveals the
official stories of the two
defining events of our time
have been faked as a pretext
to wage war on the people

Feb
2022



David Shayler +

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Summary of Evidence and Key Points	7
3. The Criminal Investigation	30
4. My Experience.....	39
5. The Fake PCR Test and the Pandemic.....	71
6. The Proof that Viruses do not exist	79
7. Lockdowns and the Excessive Deaths	109
8. The Death Toll in Context	118
9. Economic Impact of Lockdowns.....	129
10. Covid, 5G and Wireless Radiation	142
11. The Shadowy Conspiracy.....	155
12. Fact Checking the Fact Checkers	182

1. Introduction: Time to Choose a Side

By deception, thou shalt wage war

Motto attributed to Mossad

Know thy enemy

Ancient wisdom

The Doomsday Clock

On 23 January 2020 – around the very time the 'Covid-19 pandemic' began -- the Doomsday Clock was moved to 100 seconds or 1min40secs to midnight, the closest it has been since it was conceived in 1947 by US scientists who had worked on the atomic bomb in the Manhattan project. The clock is used as a barometer of mankind's closeness to global catastrophe due to technical and scientific threats.

Since then, we have seen a novel, experimental technology, the mRNA injection, being administered to billions of people across the planet without regard for its effects on human health. Although this has been hailed as an enormous success, it was rolled out -- as we shall see in this report -- to deal with a non-existent disease caused by a non-existent virus. In reality, a conspiracy of power has subjected humanity to the kind of scientific experiment that would put Auschwitz concentration camp doctor, Joseph Mengele, to shame.

These leaders -- who present themselves as caring and well-meaning -- have also used the threat of a pandemic as an excuse to test or push frightening technological methods of control, like 'the Test and Trace' app and implanted microchips – which will in effect turn people into part-human, part-cyborg hybrids, as part of the transhumanist agenda.

The scientists who dictate the positions of the hands on the Doomsday Clock have not taken these technologies into account in their reckoning of the Doomsday hour -- as a result of the disinformation disseminated by governments, health bodies, pharmaceutical companies and corporate media across the world. Nor have they considered deleterious effect radio and electro-magnetic waves have been proven to have on physical and mental health.

Since the hands of the Doomsday Clock were moved closer to midnight, Nato has used propaganda to stoke up the false idea that Russia wants to invade its neighbour

Ukraine, in the same way it used the disinformation surrounding 9/11 to justify its failed invasion and occupation of Afghanistan. This puts the people of the world at risk that spill-over from this will start World War Three in the same way the assassination of Arch Duke Ferdinand began events that led to World War One and the deaths of tens of millions of human beings.

If that fails, the shadow powers might try to stage a faked alien invasion or even a staged 'Second Coming' -- to justify finally removing the rights and liberties of the people of the world and cement their draconian rule – using holograms and mind control technology.

The power of the shadowy forces

These shadowy forces are so powerful they have succeeded in keeping all mention that the mRNA 'vaccine' cannot stop the spread of 'Covid-19' out of the mainstream media and demonised the men and women who reasonably point out the futility and idiocy of this.

Given that level of control, these corporate and political powers would never allow exposure of the jab's role as a bioweapon, for which we present evidence here.

To those coming to this for the first time, the idea of a fake and orchestrated pandemic; manufactured war, mind control technology and bioweapon will sound like 'conspiracy theory'. To those of us who have been involved in exposing difficult truths for nearly 25 years, it is business as usual on the part of the powers-that-be.

That is why I have prepared this report: to show that simple and reasoned analysis of primary source evidence incontrovertibly demonstrates that what is branded 'conspiracy theory' is in fact true.

The power of truth

For at least 15 years, I have known that the official account of the events of 11 September 2001 -- put forward by the US Congressional 9/11 Commission – is a physical impossibility. In fact, virtually no part of its account of the defining event of our age – which was used to set back the cause of the rights and liberties of Man -- is true, once the evidence is subjected to informed, reasoned and objective scrutiny.

Given this knowledge, I was sceptical to say the least about government claims that mankind faced a highly contagious, super-deadly disease at the beginning of the 'Covid-19 pandemic' in 2020, the other defining event of our age. That is why I demonstrate in this report that once you disprove the co-ordinated disinformation

and gather and set in context the primary source evidence, you will realise that there is absolutely no evidence of a deadly disease or a pandemic.

In the same way that 9/11 was used to inflate the largely imaginary threat from Islamic terrorists to curtail human rights, the powers-that-be have used the staged pandemic to further restrict those fundamental liberties. This is not happening by accident. Shadowy -- but not secret -- forces are waging a war on mankind, using Psy Ops -- psychological operations -- in combination with advanced technology, which was once the preserve of science fiction. In military circles, this is known as 'Psy War'.

Part of it is obviously propaganda, bombarding the people with false information. In the modern age, this consists of using popular or 'authority figures' to insist that any view which deviates from the official line is instantly attacked, along with the character and reputation of anyone advancing it. If these individuals persist in arguing against the official narrative, they are deprived of any means of support or making a living.

There is also a difference between 'disinformation' and 'misinformation'. Many assume that 'misinformation' involves inadvertently disseminating false information as opposed to 'disinformation', which applies to its deliberate dissemination. However, the strict dictionary difference between the two makes disinformation synonymous with co-ordinated government or corporate propaganda disseminated through a compliant media. Misinformation comes from any individual or institution outside government and media. Neither equate to simple error.

Strictly speaking therefore, it is wrong to describe false information put out by 'anti-vaxers' as 'disinformation'. It can though be correctly applied to false data and analysis disseminated by governments, like the propaganda asserting there is a deadly pandemic which can only be countered by lockdowns and the mRNA 'vaccine'. But the mainstream media have failed to make this distinction.

The Domesday Scenario

To many millions of people, this is unequivocal evidence that we live in the End Times or final apocalypse when evil will flourish and the good will be oppressed, when every individual man and woman will be judged under karma -- also known as 'The Principle' or 'Love your neighbour as you love yourself'. It is the source of the word 'Domesday' -- pronounced 'Doomsday' -- based on 'dome'. the Old English word for 'law'.

That simple 'Do as you would be done by' precept applies here. If you were innocent but were put on trial, would you want to be judged by a society of ignorant individuals who rely upon hearsay, a form of rumour, and demonstrate bigoted attitudes by attacking your status or their view of your character, as they have done to critics of

their Covid-19 counter-measures? Or would you feel more confident being judged by reasonable human beings who have gathered evidence and objectively scrutinised it without regard for status, creed or colour?

Karma will therefore judge you on the truth you have established; the justice you have done and the compassion you have shown your fellow men and women.

Even if you do not believe that the extraordinary events of our time represent the End of Days, you are not immortal. No one can know for certain what happens when we die so it would make sense to prepare for karmic judgement in case of that eventuality. If you cannot do it for yourself, at least do it for your children who will be affected by your ignorance and selfishness, as beneficiaries of it.

Choose a side in the Final Battle

Because in law you consent to a conspiracy by your silence, there is no neutrality in this final battle in the War of Oppressor and Oppressed. If you do not do everything within your power to oppose it, you will be judged alongside those who have either by intent or by negligence promulgated this assault, often on the most vulnerable people in the world.

In other words, it is time to check the evidence out for yourself, then choose a side. This decision will require self-sacrifice, in the same way people sacrificed their lives – the vast majority of them young working-class men -- so that others could live in freedom from totalitarian regimes like the Nazis. And you will make that choice not for the reward of being on the side of eternal peace but because it is the right thing to do.

Dave Shayler+

Wargrave

17 February 2022

www.thelifeofdave.org

[Spies, Lies and Whistle-blowers](#), Annie Machon, 2005

[The Truth Manifesto](#), David Shayler, May 2010 (Ghost-writer, not author)

[Unrebutted affidavit of Law](#), sworn by me and served on the Queen, 2015

2. Summary of Evidence and Key Points

The good news is the elites across the world trust each other more and more, so we can come together and design and do beautiful things together. The bad news is that in every single country they were polling, the majority of people trusted their elite less. So, we can lead, but if people aren't following, we're not going to get to where we want to go

[Ngaire Woods](#), Professor of Global Economic Governance, University of Oxford

The Principles of Interpretation

(Clicking on the material in blue below will take you to where the detail is presented in this document).

Without truth, there can be no justice.

Truth is determined by the reasoned analysis of primary source evidence.

The very fact this is lost on academics whose bread and butter ought to be the objective gathering of data and its informed and rational analysis shows the extraordinary levels of ignorance we now live under.

The very fact I have to state this shows how unquestioning humanity – and the political class, in particular -- has become in an age of centralised, state education.

In this day and age of the internet, there can be no excuse for failing to check the primary evidence.

There is no defence of ignorance under the Law.

Simple reference to secondary sources -- like academic papers and official reports and their conclusions -- does not in itself advance the cause of truth.

This distinction was not made clear in the Cabinet Office's 'Don't Feed the Beast' (of Misinformation) publicity campaign, launched shortly before the 'pandemic':

- **Source:** make sure information comes from a trusted source.
- **Headline:** always read beyond the headline.
- **Analyse:** check the facts.
- **Retouched:** does the image or video look as though it has been doctored?
- **Error:** look out for bad grammar and spelling.

The Cabinet Office Rapid Response Unit

It does not distinguish between the type of sources, which determine how successfully you 'check the facts':

- **Primary source:** raw data, a recording of an event, an eye witness statement, among others;
- **Secondary source:** an academic paper, a news article, a book, a documentary, among others;
- **Tertiary source:** a publisher, a broadcaster, a social media site, a website, among others.

This distinction appears to be lost on those currently running the mainstream media.

Suppression of the Truth about the 'Pandemic'

Truth is not determined simply by listening to the opinions of individuals with letters after their names.

Their expert knowledge of the evidence can though lead to more reasoned analysis but this can only be fully established by cross-examination.

Self-styled experts belong to knowledge groups, access to which is determined by accepting received ideas, often not based on sound evidence or analysis.

They have made their reputation and living in these circumstances.

They are therefore less likely to agree with assessments which undermine these, no matter how well-based the evidence and how well-reasoned the analysis.

Qualified scientific researchers have shown they are prey to blindly accepting misinformation second-hand, which they then repeat in 'echo chambers' in the way that the powers-that-be ascribe to 'conspiracy theorists' and 'fake news'.

They also seem to have no problem skewing the design of their experiments and their findings to garner more research grants, rendering their findings unreliable.

The ad hominem attack – on the man or woman presenting the evidence and analysis – in no way advances the cause of truth.

It is highly irresponsible because it is more often than not employed to dismiss examination of primary source evidence which proves that the official version of the truth is actually causing harm, loss or injury.

The selective use of evidence can be used to prove anything.

Scientific study is meaningless without a control, with which to compare the findings of any enquiry.

That virologists have presented their findings and been taken seriously without ever adopting this basic tenet of scientific research is most likely explained by the fact Big Pharma funds them and makes so much money developing treatments, based on the resulting germ theory of disease.

Just because a research paper has been peer-reviewed doesn't make its findings reliable because science has become highly politicised.

At the same time, academic publishing is big business with all the financial and commercial pressures that brings to bear on the truth.

The lack of peer-review is not a reason in itself to dismiss the findings of any research, but is a reason to check its data and findings for yourself and with other experts and their findings.

The Defining Events of Our Times

The two greatest events of this millennium are the 9/11 attacks on the US and the world-wide 'Covid-19 pandemic'. In both cases, the official accounts are not just slightly wrong. They are the exact opposite of the truth:

In both cases, the evidence simply never existed to support the official line supported by the political class, the legal system, the mainstream, corporate media, and non-governmental agencies, among others.

In both cases, evidence pointing to the uncomfortable truth did exist but the visible powers-that-be either ignored it or suppressed it, meaning millions of people have unnecessarily died or suffered other severe forms of harm, injury or loss.

This represents a conspiracy to wage war on the people of the world in concert with shadowy, vested interests. It is happening by design, not accident.

The 9/11 attacks

The events ventured by the 9/11 Commission's account of the attacks are physically impossible, particularly with regard to the alleged involvement of hijacked planes; the cause of the collapse of the Towers; and the damage done to the Pentagon.

[Expert analysis of the 9/11 official hypothesis](#)

Jet airliners cannot fly at the speeds which radar shows the objects went into the Twin Towers.

The immediate damage done to the Twin Towers or the Pentagon is not consistent with them being hit by planes.

There is no evidence the objects left a wake vortex – or hot vapour trail – behind them, which jet engines do, as the subsequent explosion did not distort in a way consistent with this.

The attacks were more likely carried out using missiles surrounded by holograms -- technology that is beyond the reach of Islamic terrorist groups but is within the capabilities of the US military.

Expert analysis of the 9/11 official hypothesis

The Evidence for Holograms

The real conspiracy theorists

Independent analysis by a variety of architects, engineers and relevantly qualified scientists has shown that the hypothesis that the Towers collapsed due to fire weakening the steel structures is a physical impossibility.

Examination of the evidence on the day proves that the Twin Towers were collapsed using Directed Energy Weapons.

The Use of Exotic Weapons

They were most likely fired from a satellite.

This is beyond the capabilities of Al Qaeda or any other terrorist or insurgent group.

If the objects going into the Towers and the Pentagon were missiles not planes, then there were no hijacked planes. If there were no hijacked planes, there were no hijackers — Muslims or otherwise.

The 9/11 Commission had no choice but to only include evidence and analysis which supported the hijacked planes hypothesis -- and exclude or ignore that which disproved it -- because the US had already invaded Afghanistan, as part of Nato, using the fake version of events as a pretext.

The UK government has known for years now that the 9/11 Congressional Commission's hypothetical accounts of the events that day are physically and scientifically impossible.

The technology and the execution of the 9/11 attacks – and the cover-up of the truth -- could only have been carried out by individuals who had penetrated the key agencies and departments of the US Federal Government, not loyal to the Constitution or the people.

The UK government knows that the Official Story of 9/11 is physically impossible but has done nothing about it.

The Government and Opposition know the Official Story of 9/11 is wrong

The UK government has failed to investigate with due diligence similar events to 9/11 -- like the 7/7 attacks in London in 2005 and the Manchester bombing in May 2017 -- the bloodiest attacks on British soil, because in both cases there is evidence linking the British intelligence services -- either MI5 or MI6 - - to the attacks.

[The 7/7 bombings](#)

[The Manchester Bombing](#)

The British state has a woeful record for ensuring that justice is done in a timely fashion in cases involving the intelligence services or police malpractice:

It has failed to hear my evidence of MI6 funding Islamic terrorists in Libya.

[My whistleblowing and the response](#)

[Documentary Confirmation of the MI6-backed Plot](#)

It hid the unreliable nature of intelligence presented to the Bloody Sunday enquiry indicating that Irish republican caused the events that day.

[Bloody Sunday](#)

Because I was able to blow the whistle, the relatives of those gunned down by then British army finally got justice – after nearly 40 years of campaigning.

In the cases of the deaths of Liverpool fans at Hillsborough and the murders of Stephen Lawrence and Daniel Morgan, it took decades for the relatives of the deceased to get justice.

In these cases -- which all involve either corrupt police or the involvement of the security services -- the media has conspired with the powers-that-be to undermine the campaigners seeking justice.

[Official Failures Delay Justice](#)

Waging War

Given the official account of 9/11 is scientifically impossible, there was never any justification in law for the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan to remove the Taliban government.

[Expert analysis of Tony Blair's cases for unlawful invasions](#)

The failure to find Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq means that there was never any justification in law for the invasion of that country.

[The Iraq War was unlawful](#)

Given that the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq were predicated on a false-flag operation and the deliberate misrepresentation of intelligence -- causing devastation to millions of civilians -- world leaders have to learn lessons from these unlawful invasions and not repeat them.

[The 45-minute claim](#)

[The lessons which must be learnt](#)

[The real conspiracy theorists](#)

There is no justification for Nato and the West to whip up a case for war on Russia, while Russian troops remain within its territorial borders.

According to official documents, the US army is well-aware of the techniques of Psy War, which uses holograms, blinding lights, mind control, directed heat energy and 'voices in the head' technology.

[The Evidence for Holograms](#)

[Rockefeller Mind Control via Wifi and Viruses](#)

[Voice in the Head Technology](#)

Exotic weapons were used to bring down the Twin Towers on 9/11

[The Use of Exotic Weapons](#)

It is also aware of how gene therapy – of which the mRNA 'vaccine' is an example' -- can be used in modern bio-warfare.

[Detailed Refutation of Existence of SARS-Cov2](#)

The Death Rate in the 'Covid-19 Pandemic'

There is no evidence of a deadly, world-wide pandemic because there is no evidence of a rise in the annual rate of death for 2020 or 2021.

[No Long-Term or World-Wide Evidence of a Pandemic](#)

[Dr Denis Rancourt's findings proving there was no Covid-19 pandemic](#)

There is no evidence of an increase in the UK annual death rate for 2020 and 2021, when considered against the average annual death rate for the last twenty years.

[No Long-Term or World-Wide Evidence of a Pandemic](#)

The median age of death attributed to 'Covid-19' was 83 years old and the average or mean age was around 80 years six months, when the average age of death in the UK in 2019 was around 81 years, two months.

[The Death Toll in Context](#)

The illusion there was a pandemic was promoted by deaths being attributed to 'Covid-19' up to 28 days after a positive test and a failure to set the death toll in context. On average, around 13,500 people die every day in the UK.

The only periods when the UK recorded significant excess deaths in 2020 and 2021 were at the time of the three lockdowns.

[Accounting for the Raised Excessive Death Rate](#)

The failure of ministers and civil servants to obey their own lockdown rules proves they knew there was no deadly or contagious disease creating a pandemic.

[The Government's behaviour in the Lockdowns](#)

The Psy Op

During lockdowns, NHS nurses and doctors followed government directives to administer end-of-life drug, Midazolam, which euthanised otherwise healthy individuals in care homes without their consent.

The police have been slow to investigate this apparent mass murder genocide and the mainstream media have not reported it.

It has been left to a private organisation to institute a private prosecution.

Use of Midazolam on Care Home Residents

The real pandemic is the pandemic of crimes against humanity committed by government and media, among others.

The Crimes Cited

Private individuals have had to lobby police to investigate murder, terrorism, fraud and blackmail in connection with the conspiracy to coerce people into having the novel, experimental mRNA 'vaccine', which was never intended to prevent transmission of 'Covid-19'.

These reported crimes have been officially recorded with a crime number.

Report of Crime to the Metropolitan Police

Evidence gathered by UK Citizens 2021

Complaint to the ICC

I can find no record of the BBC reporting these matters or the fact that it is the subject of a recorded criminal complaint or, indeed any report in any other mainstream media.

The Discredited PCR Test used to Create the Illusion of a Pandemic

The figures used to create the idea of a pandemic were based on the wholly unreliable and discredited PCR test.

The original study which created the PCR test was not peer-reviewed and was subject to conflicts of interest on the part of the researchers who carried it out.

The Corman-Drosten Study

The PCR protocol developed to identify 'SARS-Cov2' in humans had no samples of the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' to work with and compare its findings to.

The study has since been informally peer-reviewed and found to have significant flaws, making its findings unreliable.

Formal refutation of the Corman-Drosten Study

The PCR protocol in general was never designed to diagnose a specific disease.

For SARS-Cov2, the protocol was carried at 40 times and more amplification, making any result meaningless.

The RT-PCR Test created the 'Pandemic'

The Non-Existent SARS Coronaviruses

Despite the claims of Nature magazine, the first SARS virus, 'SARS-Cov' was not 'isolated', according to Koch's or River's postulates of identification of a 'virus'.

Proof there was no isolated SARS-Cov virus

The research studies claiming to isolate and identify the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' did not use a control, making their findings meaningless.

Detailed Refutation of Existence of SARS-Cov2

The Lack of Controls

Virologists do not use the natural meaning of the word 'isolate', when they claim to have 'isolated' a virus.

Statement on Virus Isolation

The examples of the SARS-Cov2 virus held by researchers are a mishmash of RNA with material added from existing templates.

Genomic Sequencing

There is no scientific evidence to show it caused 'Covid-19'.

Because they are assembled by researchers, they are man-made and can therefore be patented, unlike naturally occurring sequences of DNA.

The proof of this is that the original 'SARS-Cov virus' has been patented.

In this sense, 'viruses' have a laboratory origin but do not fall with the definition of 'genetic engineering'.

They do not occur naturally.

Evidence of a man-made origin for 'SARS-Cov2'

If there is no virus – isolated and with a natural origin -- there can be no effective 'vaccination' to treat it.

There are therefore no naturally occurring variants, just similar particles of RNA identified in the genetic Vero cell soup.

Variants and 'vaccines'

This did not stop the powers-that-be using digitally doctored images of the 'SARS Cov-2 virus' to promote the pandemic. The failure to mention they were doctored and not real depictions constitutes the offence of fraud under the Law.

The fraud of the images of 'SARS-Cov2'

The Flu

The vast majority of cases attributed to 'Covid-19', sufferers only experienced flu-like symptoms, which went away within a week or so.

In the light of the proven unreliability of the PCR test and no evidence to support a naturally occurring virus called 'SARS-Cov2' – which causes disease

-- 'Covid-19' was simply the seasonal flu -- wrongly diagnosed – which was widely reported to have disappeared.

What 'Covid-19' actually is

Viruses and Exosomes

Where a control has been used in scientific research into the particles known as 'viruses', it has shown that the same findings are achieved using a non-infected specimen as from an infected specimen.

This means there is no 'science' to support the existence of any 'virus'.

The peer-review process should have meant that the flaw in this research prevented academic journals from publishing it.

The Lack of Controls

The unreliability of medical research

The particles identified under the electron microscope as 'viruses' are most likely exosomes, which are part of the body's natural defence mechanism.

What SARS-Cov2 actually appears to be

Scientists are therefore in ignorance using exosomes in bio-warfare research.

Research from the Rockefeller University shows that these exosomes have been genetically engineered to mind control mice in the lab.

Rockefeller Mind Control via Wifi and Viruses

There is no reason that this technology cannot be used on human beings.

Medical Publishing and Research

The academic publishing industry is a highly profitable business with a revenue of around £15billion a year in 2017, prey to the corruption which

inevitably comes with financial and other material incentives.

A peer-review study of published medical research applying statistical probability analysis found that the findings of medical research were more likely to be false than true.

Other peer-reviewed studies of medical trials concluded that they suffered from confirmation bias, the selective use of evidence and poor design.

The findings were also influenced by the funding of the studies.

We cannot know how much research which conflicts with scientific orthodoxy has not been published.

[The unreliability of medical research](#)

Germ theory

The germ theory of the transmission of disease has no basis in science with regard to viruses.

If there is no virus to treat, then there is no reason for -- and no benefit to -- using a vaccine to immunise against or otherwise treat any given disease.

This means that vaccines throughout history -- and the mRNA jab in particular -- have no health benefits and only adverse effects.

[Variants and 'vaccines'](#)

Germ theory and vaccines work in the interests of the highly profitable pharmaceutical industry, which spends large sums of money every year on lobbying politicians, doctors and health bodies and advertising in the mainstream media.

[Rebutting Germ Theory](#)

[Big Pharma, Big Profit, Big Influence](#)

It is far more likely that disease flourishes in already unhealthy individuals as

a result of toxic build up in the environment, which includes radio and electromagnetic waves, the 'terrain theory' of disease.

The focus on germ theory – which includes 'viruses' – works in the interests of the very corporate interests polluting the environment to detract from their role in undermining public health.

How far this atmospheric pollution can be attributed to 'chemtrails' or persistent contrails is another subject of study.

The mRNA Vaccine as Possible Bio-weapon

Independent analysis of the material in the mRNA 'vaccine' vials has shown they contain graphene and glass particles, among others, which have not been declared by the manufacturers.

[Evidence gathered by UK Citizens 2021](#)

Other relevantly qualified researchers have detected graphene oxide and graphene hydroxide nanotubes in the mRNA vials.

The peer-reviewed medical literature shows that graphene oxide can damage the internal organs and cells, cause cancer and ageing; interferes with the DNA; and adversely affects the reproductive system.

Peer-reviewed research has shown the contents of the graphene oxide nanotubes can be released into the body by boiling the water within them using radio waves.

There are also patents for the technology to perform this function.

[Evidence gathered by UK Citizens 2021](#)

[Rockefeller Mind Control via Wifi and Viruses](#)

It is reasonable to assess the vaccination programme was cover for a mind-control or depopulation programme, to work in conjunction with the 5G, given:

- there was never any evidence of a naturally occurring virus which caused 'Covid-19';

- laboratory analysis shows the mRNA 'vaccine' vial contains an undeclared substance, graphene which has been shown to cause severe harm to human beings'
- the fatal and otherwise adverse effects observed in individuals who've had the jab.
- the ready willingness of individuals to subject themselves to an experimental treatment.
- the existence of a mind control virus and the technology to hide it in graphene nanotubes to be later delivered by boiling the water inside by microwaves.

5G and Disease

There is no independent research to show the effects of 5G on human beings.

Peer-reviewed studies show that Wifi radiation is extremely bad for human health even at low levels

[5G set in context](#)

A peer-reviewed study of the scientific literature has shown that there is a clear correlation between the roll out of 5G and the case numbers and severity of 'Covid-19'.

[Large Scale Review of the Link](#)

A study of data relating to the roll-out of 5G and the spread of Covid-19 subjected to statistical probability analysis shows that the correlation between the two is unlikely to be random.

In the absence of a 'virus' causing 'Covid-19' it is highly likely that 5G is a contributory cause of the symptoms observed in certain individuals, although academics are loathe to declare this.

[The Evidence of a Link Before the Hit-Pieces](#)

[Havana Syndrome](#)

5G was rolled out in Wuhan, two months before the symptoms of 'Covid-19' were first observed there.

5G is an integral part of the 'Fourth Industrial Revolution' and the 'Internet of Things', a vital part of the control agenda of the shadowy forces.

[Havana Syndrome](#)

[Values and role of the WEF](#)

No Valid Health Reasons behind Government Restrictions

Although many deadly pandemics had been touted in the past, none of them had actually come to pass.

The restrictive measures were adopted in response to the case and death numbers forecast by a computer model, which was not subjected to peer review.

[The Run-Up to Lockdown](#)

They were not a proportionate response to the reported case numbers and fatality figures for 'Covid-19', even allowing for the failed PCR test and categorisation of deaths 'with Covid' up to 28 days after a positive PCR test.

Previous forecasts of the spread of a pandemic based on computer modelling had proved to be woefully wrong when tested against the real-world data subsequently gathered.

[Professor Neil Ferguson's Wild Projections](#)

In the absence of any pandemic, the restrictive measures adopted by government -- and uncritically promoted in most mainstream media -- were most likely put in place to stop rising social discontent over lowered living standards and quality of life in an economy finally on the brink of collapse.

The pandemic saw the transfer of wealth from the people in the form of the individual worker, the self-employed and small and medium sized businesses to vested corporate interests.

Impact on Households

Among them are:

- central banks like the Bank of England. The nation's liability to the Bank created by quantitative easing more than doubled in the first three months of the pandemic.

More Government Debt

- the most profitable corporations like the pharmaceutical industry, which has seen its margins rise to over an unprecedented 70% in the case of Modern and BioNTech;

Big Pharma, Big Profit, Big Influence

- corporations which profit from government outsourcing but do not appear to provide value for money.

£37billion Test and Trace

- other beneficiaries of corporatism, like billionaires; the 1%; and the upper middle classes in general.

Follow the Money: the Main Beneficiaries

Furlough and other government financial intervention have only staved off inevitable economic collapse, which will hit the less well-off the hardest.

The restrictions and state expenditure deigned to deal with the so-called 'Covid-19 pandemic' – combined with five decades of economic mismanagement -- have left Western economies facing the gravest crises in history.

Economic Impact of Lockdowns

There is also a ticking timebomb of health problems -- like cancer, heart disease and mental health issues -- which became more severe and more prevalent as a result of not being treated during lockdowns while NHS resources were diverted to the unneeded mRNA jab.

Treating these conditions will require massive increases in public health

spending.

The fake pandemic has also been used to promote 'vaccine passports' -- designed to control the non-compliant elements of the population -- with a view to the introduction of other control measures like social credit systems.

Suppression of the Truth about the 'Pandemic'

Rather than expose the obvious truth, once-trusted institutions like the BBC, the army, the NHS and the civil service, among others in the public sector, have conspired with government ministers, in conjunction with corporate media, NGOs and Big Tech.

[BBC Panorama's Dangerous Disinformation](#)

[The Cabinet Office Rapid Response Unit](#)

[77th Brigade's role in disinformation](#)

Government formulating policy in conjunction with the Behavioural Insights Team -- a global concern partly private and partly public-funded -- may explain how 'Covid-19' policy has been fairly uniform across the world.

[The Behavioural Insights Team](#)

This uniformity and conformity is also likely explained by the influence of the The Trusted News Initiative, set up shortly before the beginning of the 'pandemic'. It includes:

- **Broadcasters:** the BBC and the European Broadcasting Union;
- **Tech giants:** Google, Facebook, Twitter, Microsoft;
- **The financial press:** the Financial Times, and The Wall Street Journal;
- **News agencies:** the Associated Press, Agence France-Presse and Reuters;
- **Media research institution:** the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.

The Trusted News Initiative

Led by a coalition of the BBC, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and Radio-Canada, Microsoft and The New York Times, Project Origin technology likely explains why the truth has not emerged given its mission to identify and suppress 'non-authorized' news stories.

The Inception and Design of Project Origin

Although Project Origin aims to identify 'disinformation' by its 'provenance', this appears to relate to the tertiary source.

The Project gives higher ranking to a piece of information simply because it is published in media belonging to the Trusted News Initiative network.

The Flaw in the Project

The Consequences of Project Origin

The members of the TNI network have conspired to present a unified view of the 'pandemic' -- not based on primary source evidence:

The pandemic induced by Covid-19 threatens the survival of all humanity.

There has never been any effective alternative treatment to treat Covid-19 other than the mRNA jab.

The PCR test was an accurate way of diagnosing 'Covid-19'.

The whole population has to be locked down to contain the pandemic.

Freedom from the 'Covid' restrictions can only come from uptake of the 'vaccine'.

The mRNA jab is perfectly safe.

Anyone questioning the four fallacies above is a dangerous 'conspiracy theorist' and/or an 'anti-vaxer' who must be stopped immediately -- even where they are leaders in their field of science and bring compelling evidence.

Any analysis which differs from the mainstream orthodoxy is dangerous

'disinformation' which will cause people severe harm and will cost lives.

Regarding the penultimate point above, the individuals working in mainstream media outlets actually do the very thing they are accusing others of.

After branding the Wuhan lab-origin of 'SARS-Cov2' a 'conspiracy', much of the media then did an about-turn and started to present the laboratory origin claim as credible (although this version is still uniformly wrong).

[A 'Conspiracy Theory' the Mainstream Media did an About-turn on](#)

The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has donated a total of £240 million to various different types of media organisations with half going to individual media outlets and half split between:

- investigative journalism centres across the world;
- press and journalism associations;
- journalism training institutions;
- specific media campaigns (a third of the total grants to media, £74million).

[The Influence of the Gates Foundation](#)

The BBC, the Guardian, the Telegraph and the Financial Times have been beneficiaries of Gates Foundation largesse.

Although there is no specific evidence, this must in practice exert an enormous influence over media output.

The Gates Foundation is intricately linked to the World Economic Forum, which has promoted the 'pandemic', 'vaccines' and elitism to achieve its 'Great Reset' of the world economy; bring about the technocratic Fourth Industrial Revolution; and advance the cause of transhumanism.

[Values and role of the WEF](#)

The WEF network is ubiquitous and provides another likely mechanism for ensuring that the truth does not emerge, given that its 'partners' include:

- BlackRock, the world's largest assets manager, worth £5.5trillion;
- the vaccine manufactures;
- the Commons Project Foundation and the Common Trust Network;
- the CEOs of Google and Facebook and the CEO of Wikipedia, Katherine Maher;
- world leaders who have most promoted lockdowns, mandatory jabs and 'vaccine' passports in the face of often vehement opposition.
- the Archbishop of Canterbury with his influence over the Anglican Communion of 80million people;
- many future leaders, identified under its Young Global Leaders initiative;
- vast number of academics.

The WEF's worldwide network

Just two months before the pandemic begin in Wuhan, the WEF and the Bill Gates Foundation hosted a real-time role-play exercise called Event 201. It envisaged a world-wide pandemic called Coronavirus Associated Pulmonary Syndrome.

The mock-up media coverage within the exercise referred to 'asymptomatic transmission', which was used to support the restrictive measures in the actual 'pandemic'. There is no science to support its reported role in transmission.

Event 201

Fact checkers

In the past, fact checking meant trying to independently verify the facts in an article and no more.

Now, it consists of a kind of Orwellian overview, making assessments of the

thrust of an article, deciding whether the article itself is broadly true or false.

This process is open to enormous abuse in the best of circumstances, let alone in the world of falsehood, which this report demonstrates we now inhabit.

Fact Checking the Fact Checkers

How the media has played its role in the fraud is neatly illustrated by a Reuters 'fact check', which when fact checked with reference to primary sources was proved to be wholly wrong. Its article:

- accepts the findings of secondary sources like discredited academic papers rather examining the primary evidence the findings are based on;
- deliberately selects evidence designed to support the official account of 'SARS-Cov2' but neglects to mention the failures of scientists to apply the basis of the scientific method, like controls;
- quotes the opinions of an associate professor of virology as an 'authority' without checking her evidence or quizzing her about her claims;
- uses the 'straw man' technique of attributing a false claim to a critic of the official line -- which the individual has not in fact made -- to then disprove it to discredit all that they subsequently have to say;
- fraudulently publishes a link to so-called 'images' of the virus without mentioning they have been doctored.

Summary of the Reuters 'fact check'

Reuters is also implicated in the 9/11 attacks, along with the BBC, as it had prior knowledge of the collapse of WTC7, a collapse which is not mentioned in the 9/11 Commission report.

Expert analysis of the 9/11 official hypothesis

Facebook has admitted that it funds Full Fact Check and partners with Lead Stories 'fact-checkers', meaning that these organisations are not independent and impartial verifiers of information shared on the social media site.

Emails released under FoI show that Mark Zuckerberg, Facebook's CEO, allied himself with Dr Tony Fauci, the director responsible for the US response to 'Covid-19' from the outset, compromising any independence and impartiality on Zuckerberg's part.

[Facebook Censorship and Big Pharma Propaganda](#)

Facebook has also stated in a submission to a court of law that its 'fact-checks' are opinions. The failure to openly state this constitutes fraud.

Another Facebook 'fact-checker', Climate Feedback, has admitted that it does not verify all the facts in any article it assesses but instead gives a general judgement of the truth of the article.

[Facebook admits its 'fact checks' are 'opinion', not fact](#)

Facebook censored a peer-reviewed article by The British Medical Journal, which used supporting documentary evidence to reveal flaws in the Pfizer trials to assess the safety of the mRNA jab.

[Facebook 'Fact-Checking' Scrutinised](#)

[Background](#)

The social media site did not issue a correction or an apology, even after the flaws in the 'fact-check' were pointed out to it.

[BMJ's response and Lead Stories' failure to correct](#)

Instead of examining primary sources to establish whether 'conspiracy theorists' are telling the truth, academics ignorantly accept propaganda, acting as an echo chamber of official disinformation.

[Academic Ignorance](#)

3. The Criminal Investigation

Far, far more harm has been done by those obeying orders and legislation than by those disobeying them

A number of people have made criminal complaints to the police about the so-called 'Covid-19' pandemic and the reaction of the powers-that-be to it, including the so-called mass 'vaccination programme'. This has come about as a result of the catastrophic death and injury figures to both adults and children across the UK.

Report of Crime to the Metropolitan Police

On the 20th December 2021, ex-constable Mark Sexton along with Lawyer Lois Bayliss, among others, reported a number of crimes in connection with the reported pandemic to Hammersmith police, a division of the Metropolitan Police. It acknowledged the suspected criminal nature of the complaint under case number: 6029679/21. Sexton was also part of a group which lodged a formal crime report to the International Criminal Court (ICC) in the Hague on 6 December 2021 ([see Complaint to the ICC](#) below).

According to [Sexton's website](#), the following have happened, as a result:

- The Superintendent assistant to then Met Commissioner Cressida Dick, who recently resigned from the post, acknowledged in an email that Dick was aware of the complaint.
- The Metropolitan Police have also been provided details of the ICC application. The Met Police have a duty to carry out a full and competent criminal investigation as detailed in the ICC's guidelines.
- All 43 Chief Constables in England and Wales have been contacted by email to advise them of the Metropolitan Police's criminal investigation and the ICC application;
- Scotland and Northern Ireland police chiefs have also been informed and formally requested to intervene in the mRNA jab program.


By 13 January 2022, 103 statements had been gathered by Bayliss from those reporting severe mRNA 'vaccine' injuries and from relatives of those who died after having it, which have been submitted to the police as part of the case. Twelve statements are from identified NHS whistle-blowers, who've provided 'deeply

disturbing' evidence. The complaints have been directed against government ministers, the NHS and other bodies responsible for health, civil servants and media organisations, among others.

The BBC and Sky have been informed that they are the subject of a criminal complaint, although I can find no record they have reported on it or admitted that they are likely to be the subject of a criminal investigation.

Complaint to the ICC

In December 2021, Sexton was among a group of UK-based scientists and activists who lodged a case at the International Criminal Court in The Hague, Netherlands, represented by solicitor Hannah Rose. The filing was acknowledged on [6 December 2021 under application reference: OTP-CR-473/21](#), claiming violations of the Nuremberg Code and violations of the Statute of Rome, articles 6,7 and 8, which cover genocide, crimes against humanity and waging war.



Although the fact checkers have tried to undermine this [by stating neither the police nor the ICC are actually investigating](#), the recording of a crime number to these complaints means there is a case to answer. Given that the UK police are now investigating, any enquiry on the part of the ICC is automatically stayed until domestic routes of investigation are exhausted.

According to official Home Office policy for recording crimes which came into effect into April 2021:

1. An incident will be recorded as a crime (notifiable offence) for 'victim related offences' if, on the balance of probability:

- a. the circumstances of the victims' report amount to a crime defined by law (the police will determine this, based on their knowledge of the law and counting rules); and
- b. there is no credible evidence to the contrary immediately available.

[Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime](#), effective April 2020

The balance of probabilities is the standard of proof in civil cases in the legal system. A victim does not have to prove the crime they are alleging beyond reasonable doubt, the standard of proof in a criminal trial. Once a crime is reported, the police have a duty to investigate. Given the compelling evidence independent investigators have gathered and the gravity of the crimes reported, any decent journalist would be asking why the investigations haven't been expedited to the highest priority and accorded all the necessary resources.

The Crimes Cited

Sexton's [website](#) cites the following criminal offences that can arise from the complaints:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. misfeasance in public office | 12. terrorism |
| 2. misconduct in public office | 13. genocide |
| 3. conspiracy to commit grievous bodily harm | 14. torture |
| 4. conspiracy to administer a poisonous and noxious substance to cause serious harm and death | 15. crimes against humanity |
| 5. gross negligence manslaughter | 16. false imprisonment |
| 6. corporate manslaughter | 17. multiple breaches of our human rights |
| 7. corruption, | 18. war crimes |
| 8. fraud | 19. multiple breaches of The Nuremberg Code 1947 |
| 9. blackmail | 20. multiple breaches of The Human Rights Act 1998 |
| 10. murder | (Treason will also be |
| 11. conspiracy to commit murder | added). |

Given the current and serious threat posed to men, women and children – and the apparent inaction of police forces across the country – some campaigners are calling on members of the public to approach any location administering the jab in accordance with Section 3(1) of [The Criminal Law Act 1967](#):

A person may use such force as is reasonable in the circumstances in

the prevention of crime, or in effecting or assisting in the lawful arrest of offenders or suspected offenders, or of persons unlawfully at large.

This gives anyone the right to seize evidence used in a crime, in this case the novel, experimental 'vaccine' vials, which have been proven to contain unlisted ingredients likely to cause harm to the health of those to whom it is administered. The most serious aspect of the complaint about the jab is that it contains graphene oxide and/or graphene hydroxide, which has been shown to cause severe, adverse health effects, as set out immediately below.

Evidence gathered by UK Citizens 2021

According to [a briefing document published by Ian Clayton in February 2021](#) – who is now coordinating the response to 'Covid-19' by legal practitioners as UK Citizens 2021 -- a British medical practitioner seized an injection vial from the surgery where she worked and gave it to an independent investigator examining injuries sustained after the injection. Further vials have since been obtained which cover the three main manufacturers supplying the 'vaccine' in the UK: Pfizer, Moderna and AstraZeneca.

The commissioned spectroscopy report -- which is quality assured -- discovered the following particles:

- Graphene
- SP3 Carbon
- Iron Oxide
- Carbon derivatives
- Glass shards

The police have a duty to forensically examine the material handed to them as part of a criminal complaint for evidential use. Graphene is [produced by the chemical reduction of graphene oxide](#) using mechanical or thermal exfoliation, chemical vapour deposition and epitaxial growth, a type of crystal formation. The graphene family [cause the same adverse symptoms](#) so the terms 'graphene' and 'graphene oxide' appear to be used interchangeably. Because graphene oxide is slow to degrade, it can [get into the water supply and can spread into humans, animals, soil and vegetation](#).

[The peer-reviewed medical literature has established that](#) graphene nanomaterials or GFNs can penetrate the body's natural barriers and damage the central nervous system. Graphene oxide:

- can damage internal organs;
- damages the reproduction and development system;
- destroys blood health;
- damages and destroys cells;
- can trigger cancer and accelerate ageing;
- damages mitochondria and DNA;
- triggers an inflammatory response and three different kinds of cell death;
- causes changes in gene function.

Given the clear and present danger to human life and health, the UK Citizen 2021 briefing document calls for an immediate halting of the jab programme until the safety of the jabs can be established.

Although the 'fact checkers' have tried to dismiss this as 'conspiracy theory', they have not considered the laboratory analysis of the contents of the 'vaccine' vial, nor have they included the following evidence in their coverage of the graphene oxide/hydroxide issue:

- The 'vaccines' developed to counter 'Covid-19' were rushed out without being properly subjected to scientific trials. The totality of their contents is not actually known.
- The financial news agency Bloomberg has reported [that Pfizer has fought to control the secret behind its \\$36 billion 'vaccine'](#):

Yet there is one point on which the Pfizer CEO won't budge:
his vaccine's secret formula.

- There is further [academic research to show that the jab does contain undeclared graphene oxide and/or graphene hydroxide](#), which can form nano-particles when injected into the body.
- Researchers into mRNA have declared in the past [they were exploring the use of graphene oxide in jabs for cancer](#) and there [papers in the medical literature discussing its use, including in gene therapy](#), of which the jabs are a form:

Gene Delivery

GBNs can interact not only with the drugs, but also with other biomolecules like nucleic acids, DNA and RNA.

See also Pablo Campra, [Detection of Graphene in Covid-19 Vaccines](#), ResearchGate, November 2021

Shortly after making a video in November 2021 about the graphene hydroxide he had found in the mRNA treatment, researcher Dr Andreas Noack died after suffering breathing difficulties. His partner has alleged he may have been subject to an attack by Directed Energy Weapons (see The Use of Exotic Weapons below).

The UK police investigation will also need to co-ordinate their activities with [the German Corona Investigative Committee](#), chaired by Dr Reiner Fuellmich, a lawyer and one of four members of the committee.

Since July 2020, this Committee has been hearing the testimony of a wide range of abundantly qualified scientists and doctors -- many of them recognised experts in their field, like Mike Yeadon, a former research scientist with 'vaccine' producer, Pfizer - to establish the truth about the 'pandemic'.

Fuellmich has done [a presentation summarising the findings of the enquiry](#).

Official Failures Delay Justice

The British powers-that-be have an appalling record for doing justice when their failures are implicated in major events. In the following examples, justice was finally done but only after several decades of failed enquiries. In all these examples, the powers-that-be have relied on a compliant media to cover up facts and smear campaigners on behalf of the individuals -- usually part of the state or law enforcement -- who perpetrate these crimes.

At least the relatives of the victims in the following examples did eventually find some closure through justice being done, although only after having to sacrifice their lives to decades of campaigning. We cannot know on how many occasions the powers-that-be have got away with injustices because -- in the absence of resources and the strength to carry on -- campaigners had to give up and allow an injustice to stand.

Speaking from my own experience, government and parliament have never heard my evidence of how MI6 funded Islamic terrorists in Libya to assassinate Colonel Gaddafi, an operation which sent wrong killing innocent civilians, among other concerns. The psychopathic element of the political class has called deaths like this 'collateral damage' rather than 'murder', as if men, women and children were physical objects not sentient living beings.

[Spies, Lies and Whistleblowers, MI5, MI6 and the Shayler Affair](#), Chapters 10, 15 and 17, Annie Machon, Book Guild, 2005

Nor has government or parliament heard my evidence relating to how Israel used a false-flag operation against its own embassy in London and then framed two

Palestinians for the attack.

[Ibid](#), Chapter 14

Nor have they heard how a section in MI6 called I Ops – or Information Operations – used agents of influence within the press to undermine the evidential case against the two Libyans who were at the time indicted for the Lockerbie attack. These shadowy elements continue to use disinformation or propaganda to wrongly implicate Iran in the attack.

[Ibid](#), Chapter 7

Bloody Sunday

On 30 January 1972, British soldiers turned on demonstrators at a civil rights parade in Derry, Northern Ireland, wounding 26 demonstrators and killing 14, all of them Catholics. The first government enquiry, the Widgery Tribunal, held in the aftermath, cleared the soldiers and their command of blame. The enquiry accepted their claims that they shot at gunmen and bomb-throwers. At the time, the report was widely criticised as a 'whitewash'.

In 1998, the Saville enquiry was set up to re-investigate what happened that day. Following a twelve-year investigation, Saville's report was made public in 2010, nearly forty years after the killings. It concluded that the killings were 'unjustified' and 'unjustifiable'. Lord Saville found that all of those shot were unarmed, that no bombs were thrown, that none were posing a serious threat and that soldiers knowingly put forward false accounts to justify firing on demonstrators.

During the enquiry, MI5 submitted evidence from an agent codenamed Infliction claiming that Martin McGuinness, the leader of Sinn Fein and the Provisional IRA, had admitted firing a shot which provoked the soldier's response. In 2003, I gave evidence to the enquiry stating that MI5 knew this agent was a 'bullshitter'. MI6 reacted the assessment of Infliction's reliability from a document which was part of its submission to the enquiry.

See [Spies, Lies and Whistleblowers, MI5, MI6 and the Shayler Affair](#), Chapter 19

Daniel Morgan

On 10 March 1987, private investigator Daniel Morgan was found dead in the car park of the Golden Lion pub in Sydenham, London. He had been murdered with an axe. Five separate police investigations failed to successfully bring anyone to justice.

In the course of the police enquiries some 750,000 documents related to the case had

been gathered. After the trial of a number of men charged with Morgan's murder collapsed, four additional crates of material not disclosed to the defence at trial were found in March 2011. This followed earlier problems with crates of documents being mislaid and discovered by chance.

For much of the Morgan family's campaign for justice, they say they encountered obstruction at the most senior levels of the Metropolitan Police; a police complaints system that lacked teeth; and little motivation on the part of successive governments to resolve the issue.

In 2013, the Home Office set up an independent review into the handling of the police investigation into Morgan's killing, chaired initially by Sir Stanley Burnton -- replaced a year later by Baroness O'Loan. In May 2021, Home Secretary Priti Patel tried to delay publication of the report on 'national security grounds', although it was finally published a month later, thirty-four years after Daniel Morgan's murder.

The enquiry found that the Met Police suffered from 'institutional corruption' which had concealed or denied failings in the case and included criticism of then Metropolitan Police Commissioner, Cressida Dick, for failing to provide access to information to the panel over a seven- year period.

Hillsborough

Ninety-seven Liverpool fans died after being crushed in a fenced terrace at an FA Cup semi-final at the Hillsborough ground, Sheffield, on 15 April 1989. In the following weeks, the press reported that drunken, hooligan fans were to blame for the disaster, based on briefings from the South Yorkshire police.

The Taylor Report of 1990 found that the main cause of the disaster was a failure of crowd control on the part of the police. In 1991, the coroner at the first of two inquests ruled all the deaths accidental. Six years later, an investigation by Lord Justice Stuart-Smith concluded that there was no justification for a new inquiry.

After a decade of campaigning by the families of the deceased, the Hillsborough Independent Panel was set up to review the evidence. After it found that South Yorkshire police officers had lied to shift blame from themselves to the fans, another inquest into their death was opened. In 2016 -- 27 years after the incident -- the coroner concluded that the 97 fans had been unlawfully killed as a result of police and ambulance service negligence.

Stephen Lawrence

On 22 April 1993, a black teenager, Stephen Lawrence, was murdered in a racially

motivated attack in Eltham, London. After an initial investigation, two suspects were arrested but not charged. In 1998, a public inquiry, headed by Sir William Macpherson, concluded that the original Met investigation was incompetent and that the force was institutionally racist.

On 18 May 2011, after a further review, it was announced that two of the original suspects, Gary Dobson and David Norris, were to stand trial for the murder in the light of new evidence. In January 2012 – nearly twenty years after the original attack -- Dobson and Norris were found guilty of Lawrence's murder and sentenced to minimum terms of imprisonment of 15 years 2 months and 14 years 3 months respectively.

Two further official inquiries in 2012 ruled that there was no basis for further investigation. A year later, a former undercover police officer reported that he had, at the time, been pressured to find ways to smear the Lawrence's family, in order to undermine the public campaign for justice over the murder. In 2014, an independent inquiry led by QC Mark Ellison concluded that a catalogue of mistakes was down to endemic incompetence and racism rather than corruption.

In 2020, it was reported that the Crown Prosecution service was considering charges of misconduct in public office for four officers involved in the original failed investigation.

Final Comment

None of these cases are trifling matters. They concern the murder of human beings with two of them – Bloody Sunday and Hillsborough -- representing mass murder. They all involve a conspiracy of state, government and media to cover up the obvious evidence and obstruct justice being done. We shall see a similar conspiracy repeat itself again and again in this report.

4. My Experience

How can government ministers claim that the intelligence service work within the Law when they simply ignore evidence that they do not?

Background

Having demonstrated that the powers-that-be have covered up their crimes and corruption for decades, only for campaigners to eventually see justice done, I now set out some detail of my experience at the hands of corrupt government -- in its widest sense – supported by a compliant mainstream media and legal system.

These elements have conspired to deliberately ignore compelling, irrefutable evidence about false-flag terrorism and the role of the intelligence services in it. Sometimes, their motivation is simply to cover up their own criminal actions. On other occasions, it is to wrongly implicate others to deflect attention from their role in it.

I draw on my experience within the Security Service and being persecuted by the shadowy forces who operate behind the scenes to show why I have come to similar conclusions with regard to the 'Covid-19 pandemic' being a deliberate hoax created and covered up in a similar way to the obviously false-flag terrorism.

My whistleblowing and the response

I blew the whistle in 1997 because I had been officially briefed on an MI6 operation which funded Islamic terrorists in Libya to assassinate then Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi, which went wrong murdering civilians. At the time, MI5 assessed that Gaddafi was unlikely to sponsor or carry out attacks against Western interests whereas the service knew by this time that Islamic terrorism posed a threat to the people of the West. The attack made no sense in terms of protecting the safety of the nation or in terms of mainstream geopolitics.

Although many still see Gaddafi as a dictator, the proof that he gave Libya and North Africa a certain level of stability has been proven by the human rights abuses which happened after he was removed from power in 2011.

When I first came to public attention, the Prime Minister of the day, Tony Blair -- who went on to commit murder in Afghanistan and Iraq by waging war -- treated me as a

traitor without ever hearing my evidence.

See [Spies, Lies and Whistle-blowers, MI5, MI6 and the Shayler Affair](#), Chapter 22, for an expert analysis of Blair's faked case for war

Instead, he went to the very people I was blowing the whistle on -- who stood to face possible criminal charges related to my whistleblowing -- **to get their assessment of evidence I had yet to provide!**

As we shall see throughout this paper, the shadowy forces who are waging war on mankind rely on useful middle-class idiots with a superiority complex like Blair to escape scrutiny of their criminal plots and avoid being brought to justice. The failure to hear my evidence set a dangerous precedent.

A year later, when I used a lawful route to alert Blair to the MI6 conspiracy with Islamic terrorists, I was imprisoned in France after the government filed an urgent extradition request against me. Rather than hear my evidence about MI6's role in terrorism and funding those sharing the philosophy of Al Qaeda, Blair had me locked up. This prompted the BBC to show a [Panorama investigation](#) based on an interview with me, carried out before my arrest.

While in prison, the Foreign Secretary in the Blair Cabinet, Robin Cook, claimed that my disclosure was '[pure fantasy \[...\] with no basis in fact](#)'. In the interview on BBC's Breakfast with Frost programme, he confirmed that the Conservative Foreign Secretary at the time of the attack in 1996, Malcom Rifkind, had not given permission for the operation, making it unlawful under the 1994 Intelligence Services Act.

After I had spent four months in prison, the French appeal court declared my 'offence' to be political and therefore exempt from the terms of the extradition treaty [so I was freed](#).

Documentary Confirmation of the MI6-backed Plot

In February 2000, The Sunday Times reported that the MI6 document, referred to above, CX95/ 53452, had appeared on the web-site [www.geocities.com/byanymeansthe necessary2000](#). (It has since been taken down). When interviewed about the document, the then Foreign Secretary Robin Cook refused to confirm that it was genuine, although it obviously is.

Nick Rufford, [Cook misled public over Libya plot](#), Sunday Times, 13 February 2000

The MI6 report clearly demonstrates that an MI6 agent among the coup plotters was meeting his MI6 handler to discuss the assassination of Colonel Gaddafi 'in which he was involved':

The coup plotters would launch a direct attack on Gaddafi and would either arrest him or kill him. [...]

The military officer said that the plotters would have cars similar to those in Gaddafi's security entourage with fake security number plates. They would infiltrate themselves into the entourage in order to kill or arrest Gaddafi.

CX95/ 53452, 4 December 1995

The first three pages of the CX report as it first appeared on the internet are reproduced below:

```

ECED 109225 004274 009411 800088 041221Z 95 000000 000000 000000
OO 001 009 000 100
.E 04 1800Z
LAX954
AAAA
041807Z DEC 95
FM LONDON
TO COMD 185 IMMEDIATE
TO RESEARCH DEPT 734 IMMEDIATE
TO MCD 513 IMMEDIATE
TO CABINET OFFICE 721 IMMEDIATE
TO SECURITY SERVICE 109 IMMEDIATE
BT
IMMEDIATE
LEADER UK A B C R E T/DELICATE SOURCE/UK EYES ALPVA
ENCLOSURE: 22A7201
LEADER DISTRIBUTION,
FLD - PMSD
      DECID
      WMSAD
      AAD - ME
      MOO - DILL AND M1
      D12ADW1A
      CABINET OFFICE - JIC (ASSESSMENTS STA.)
      CORD - 8182
      SECURITY SERVICE - CMAA, 06AS AND 06AJ
      BRITISH AUTHORITIES INFORMED:
      CAIRO
      TOKYO
      WASHINGTON
CX 95/53452(R/ME/C) 09 04 DECEMBER 1995 1000      EXT 7
/ENDPOMY

```

UK A B C R E T/DELICATE SOURCE/UK EYES ALPVA

MO: 95/53452(R/ME/C)

TLS: LIBYA: PLANS TO OVERTHROW GADDAFI IN EARLY 1996 ARE WELL ADVANCED

RCR: A NEW SOURCE WITH DIRECT ACCESS WHOSE RELIABILITY HAS NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED

BT

Libyan colonels in charge of plans to overthrow GADDAFI, 0 died to coincide with the next General Peoples Congress in ry. Coup will start with unrest in Tripoli, Misratah and al. Coup plotters not associated with Islamic fundamentalist (ADNA) Al-DAM murdered by coup plotters in June. Attempt to (inate GADDAFI) in August thwarted by security police.

In late November 1995, Plans to protect, T/FACPTED identified bed plans, in which he was involved, to overthrow Colonel T. He said that 5 colonels from various parts of the armed were in charge of the coup plot. These included: The latter was most likely overall control.

The coup was scheduled to start at around the time of the 1 Peoples Congress on 14 February 1996. It would begin with on a number of military and security installations including military installations at TARRUNA. There would also be strated civil unrest in Benghazi, Misratah and Tripoli. The plotters would launch a direct attack on GADDAFI and would BT

or arrest him or kill him.

The coup plotters had 1275 active sympathisers in the following areas: TRIPOLI 240 persons; BENGHAZI 115; TORBUX 114; AYAH 148; SIRTE 40; AL-ZAWIYA 180; AL-SUMARAH 100; AL-KHUMS 28; AMIS 30. Their occupations ranged from students, military personnel and teachers through to businessmen, doctors, police sergeants and civil servants. The plotters were divided into 8 cells, each with 3 officers in charge. Messages to members of cells were passed via schools and Mosques. The start of the coup would be signalled through coded messages on television and radio. Coup plotters had sympathisers working in the press, radio and television.

The military officer said that the plotters would have cars mix to those in QADHAFI's security entourage with fake security plates. They would infiltrate themselves into the entourage in order to kill or arrest QADHAFI.


One group of military personnel were currently being trained in the desert area near KUYYA for the role of attacking QADHAFI and his entourage. The aim was to attack QADHAFI after the GPC, but if he had returned to SIRTE. One officer and 20 men were being trained especially for this attack.

The text of the document is available [here](#) with my footnotes to clarify understanding of it and a press release commenting on the results of a Met police investigation which took place three years after I had first blown the whistle on the attack.

The Manchester Bombing

Ramadan Abeidi – the MI6 agent codenamed 'Tunworth', whose name is redacted from the document -- turned out to be the father of Salman Abeidi, who reportedly murdered 22 people in the Manchester arena on 22 May 2017. Four years ago, I offered my evidence about this MI6 connection to the Manchester attack to then PM Theresa May; then Leader of the Opposition, Jeremy Corbyn; and then Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, Cressida Dick. Not one of them got back to me.

[An investigation into the Manchester attack](#) conducted by Richard D Hall, an independent investigator, has gathered evidence from police communications citing eyewitnesses which indicates that Abeidi did not blow himself up in the attack but instead placed the bomb in the arena and then fled the scene – after getting into a grey Audi -- contradicting the official account of the attack (see next page).



Richard D Hall, [Manchester: The Night of the Bang](#), Rich Planet, 15 May 2020, 18:51

The police did not report that anyone else was seen in the vehicle. Later police reports reveal that they had the same Audi under surveillance in the vicinity of the Manchester Arena (from 20:30 in video). Police radio confirms that a man in a grey Audi was later arrested by police shortly after, captured in a video shot by a bystander showing armed police arresting a man (20:36).



No CCTV footage has been released from the time of the attack, although one photograph has been officially released, allegedly of the aftermath of the bombing (above – 31:30). Forensic analysis of the metadata for the image proves it was taken at 07:58:18, 22 May 2017, fifteen hours before the time of the reported explosion

(32:35).

Source	PA
Date Created	2017:05:22
Time Created	07:11:18+00:00
Urgency	5 (normal urgency)
Caption-Abstract	Helpers attend to injured people inside the Manchester Arena, Manchester, Britain, it ended Monday night, killing over a dozen of people among a panicked crowd of y
City	Manchester
Credit	AP
Country-Primary	GBR
Location Name	
Country-Primary	GBR
Location Code	
Copyright Notice	PA
Special Instructions	UNITED KINGDOM OUT, NO SALES, NO ARCHIVE, PHOTOGRAPH CANNOT B
Category	I
Composite	
Date/Time Created	2017:05:22 07:11:18+00:00
Date/Time Original	2017:05:22 07:11:18+00:00
Image Size	640x480
Megapixels	0.307

On 10 January 2022, I offered to give my evidence to [the enquiry into the Manchester bombing](#) in an email sent to the enquiry's official account, marking it for the attention of John Saunders, the official chairing the investigation. I have not since received a reply.

This all gives us extraordinary insight into the mindset of the powers-that-be and the civil servants who advise them, when faced with primary source evidence which implicates in terrorist atrocities the state that employs them. And a failure to learn from making the same mistake over and over again, which indicates this attitude is anything but a simple error.

In my case, the powers-that-be were actually aware of my evidence showing the crimes and failures of the British intelligence services. However, because ministers and MPs hadn't actually heard it from the horse's mouth and confirmed it by investigation, they were able to ignore it when it came to assessing the reliability of evidence and intelligence relating to the 9/11 attacks and the allegation that Iraq was harbouring weapons of mass destruction.

Expert analysis of Tony Blair's cases for unlawful invasions

In September 2001, shortly after the 9/11 attacks on the US, I went on to public platforms to warn people that it was negligent and criminal to invade Afghanistan without first properly establishing that Osama Bin Laden and 19 Muslim terrorists had been behind the 9/11 attacks (see Expert analysis of the 9/11 official hypothesis below). I also pointed out that history had shown us that no military force had ever successfully controlled the whole of Afghanistan so any invasion and occupation was

likely to fail in the long run.

In August 2021, after a 20-year occupation, Nato forces were obliged to hastily withdraw from the country allowing the Taliban they had set out to replace – in the false belief that they were connected to the 9/11 attacks by giving safe haven to Osama Bin Laden – to resume power.

In the year running up to the invasion of Iraq in Spring 2003, I spoke out about the unlawful nature of the proposed invasion and the detrimental effect it was likely to have on the stability of the region. I made it clear that, from my experience in MI5, Saddam Hussein had not had time to develop the programmes of nuclear, chemical or biological warfare that were being alleged to justify the invasion.

Before each invasion happened, I made it absolutely clear that these military actions stood to act as a clarion call to many people, particularly young men, to take up arms to defend themselves and their family and friends, as had happened after the Bloody Sunday massacre in Northern Ireland twenty years earlier. Or for them to take up the philosophy and practices of Al Qaeda -- which happened with the rise of Isis – Al Qaeda rebranded – in the surrounding countries, destabilising the region and causing millions to be murdered, maimed or displaced.

The Case for the Iraq War as 'Conspiracy Theory'

As already stated, any theory lives or dies on the primary evidence and reasoned analysis which underpins it. All journalism and history are in a sense accounts of 'conspiracy theory' in that they investigate how human beings conspired with each other to make events happen.

What 'conspiracy theorists' do

The term does though have another pejorative meaning when it is used to describe a particular type of researcher, the kind of person who:

- takes information out of context;
- fails to analyse their information in the context of scientific, expert or established fact;
- looks for the slightest inconsistency in official accounts yet fails to take on board the wider usually better-sourced evidence;
- attaches importance only to information which proves their theory and conceals or ignores it when it proves the opposite;
- shows no critical faculty when too-good-to-be-true information conveniently

surfaces at just the right time;

- quotes shadowy anonymous sources to make outrageous claims that cannot be independently verified.
- shouts down any informed critic of their argument.

However, when we adopt this definition, we find that it is invariably more applicable to the intelligence services than to the traditional image of the wide-eyed loner scouring the web for his latest fix of sensationalist outrage.

The powers-that-be are the real conspiracy theorists

When we examine the case for the Iraq War set out in [the Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction](#) report published in September 2002 -- we come to realise it was predicated on information put forward by people who committed all the *faux pas* listed above. They just happen to be intelligence operatives; government ministers; and unprincipled mainstream journalists -- rather than the usual 'conspiracy theorists' -- so no one dares call them by the 'c-word'.

By a curious 'coincidence', my trial -- at which I was denied the fundamental right to freely cross-examine my accusers and freely speak in my defence -- took place at the very time that report was published. This meant that as the best-informed critic of the government case based on my experience in MI5 (where I shadowed the Iraqi desk), I was silenced.

See [Spies, Lies and Whistleblowers, MI5, MI6 and the Shayler Affair](#), Chapter 20

By its very nature, intelligence is conspiracy theory because it is predicated on shadowy sources who cannot be cross-examined like a normal witness. In the case of the IWMD report, the intelligence was contradicted by a witness who could be questioned, a defector from the Iraqi army who insisted that Saddam Hussein did not have the weapons in question.

See [Spies, Lies and Whistleblowers, MI5, MI6 and the Shayler Affair](#), Chapter 22

Like 'conspiracy theorists', the authors of the report also used selective evidence, consciously ignoring intelligence from agents who expressly stated that Saddam did not have the weapons. The report also neglected to point out useful context:

- objectively verifiable satellite photos had shown no data consistent with the preparation or movement of WMDs.
- the US had insisted a few years earlier that Saddam had a chemical weapons factory, which turned out to be an innocuous pharmaceuticals plant -- but only after the US had bombed it and killed innocent people.

The 45-minute claim

The most eye-catching claim in the report -- the allegation that Iraq could launch 'biological and chemical' weapons at 45 minutes notice -- -- was later established to refer not to long range warheads -- which could hit the UK -- but battlefield munitions with a limited range. But by that time, the US and UK coalition had already invaded Iraq.

Given that the 45min claim first emerged just as the US and UK governments were preparing their case for war, why didn't anyone in government or the intelligence services have the objectivity to pause for a moment and ask themselves -- like a rational human: 'Hang on, isn't the timing of this just a little bit too convenient?'

But they didn't. They instead uncritically used it to support their case. Like the wilder and more excitable 'conspiracy theorists' out there, they relentlessly hounded an informed critic of their cause, government scientist Dr David Kelly. In this case, if you believe the official story, they drove him to commit suicide, far worse than anything achieved by the usual conspiracy types on the net.

It has also emerged that the intelligence was not extensive and comprehensive as claimed by Blair in the report itself. It revealed the very opposite: the intelligence services were making assessments on the basis of very little information and where it existed at all was of no better provenance than rumour and gossip.

But I already knew this at the time. When in MI5, I had researched the threat from the Libyan regime. I came to the following conclusion: 'The Security Service does not have enough reliable intelligence to come to an informed assessment about any threat the Libyan regime may pose to the UK'.

Strangely enough this thoroughly researched Box 500 report never went out to government or MI5's partners in crime in the murky world of intelligence. It would though have been a useful fact to have known when assessing the reliability of Blair's Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction dossier.

The Iraq War was unlawful

In 2016, [the enquiry into the war, chaired by Sir John Chilcott, concluded the war had no clear basis in law](#) because peaceful alternatives had not been exhausted:

- Saddam Hussein did not pose an urgent threat to British interests;
- intelligence regarding WMDs was presented to give it a certainty it did not merit;
- the UN Security Council had not sanctioned the invasion.

This is as close as any British judge will ever come to saying the government committed a war crime.

The real conspiracy theorists in the intelligence services

There are of course plenty of outrageous websites pushing the wilder aspects of 'conspiracy theory'. Usually on closer examination though they turn out to be run by covert disinformation and disruption agents working on behalf of some intelligence service -- whether privately or state-funded -- or some secret society or other.

Yes, the people the political class and mainstream media think are the 'real conspiracy theorists' are often covert intelligence disruption agents, pushing 'straw man' theories to undermine critics of official policy when they are disproven in the mainstream media. This refutation is then used to dismiss any new evidence which emerges on the same or a similar subject, no matter how well-established its provenance and reliability.

On this basis -- alongside the wholly flawed case for the invasion of Afghanistan -- the wildest and most gullible 'conspiracy theorists' are the intelligence services and the governments and media which use their ill-researched, cherry-picked or simply unfounded information.

Unlike the diligent independent researchers on the web, these conspiracy theorists are responsible for murder, torture and suffering on a grand scale, as we continue to see in the Middle East today.

The lessons which must be learnt

In both the case of Afghanistan and Iraq, the US-led invasions were based on a failure to act with due diligence with regard to faulty intelligence and assessment on the part of the British intelligence services, MI5 (the Security Service) and MI6 (the Secret Intelligence Service) -- and their US counterparts. The services failed to show the requisite courage, when the respective leaders of their countries, George Bush and Tony Blair, pressured them to find to find a case for war. For this, they have blood on their hands.

Given that the powers-that-be are again using a dubious case to wage war against a country they wrongly perceive to be a threat -- in this case, Russia -- to justify a military conflict, it is imperative that the British government takes evidence about the fakery Nato used to justify the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan, exacting it to the highest levels of scrutiny. **Otherwise, there is an enormous risk that any Nato action will provoke a third world war, in which the lives of British soldiers will be**

unnecessarily sacrificed along with those in the civilian populations of Europe.

Once again, young people who signed up in the service of their country will be turned into war criminals, not heroes.

It is also no co-incidence that an invasion is being predicated at the very time that people are waking up to the fraudulent nature of the 'Covid-19 pandemic'.

Expert analysis of the 9/11 official hypothesis

In 2005, my attention was drawn to the glaring gaps in the Official Account of the 9/11 attacks carried out by the US Congressional Commission into the events of that day. Having worked on the Lockerbie attack in December 1988 -- in which a civilian jetliner was blown out of the skies -- I was particularly concerned by the fact that:

- [no air crash enquiries had been carried out](#), even though these are required for each air craft that goes down, by international treaties and domestic law;
- None of the planes' black boxes had been recovered, even though these are designed to withstand crashes and transmit a signal to their location after a plane goes down.
- no forensics had been carried out on the crime scene;
- there was no evidence whatsoever to link the alleged mastermind, Osama Bin Laden, to the plot (meaning that the FBI were unable to indite him in connection with the operation).

A summary of what I learnt is available in a documentary, which I co-authored and presented.

[9/11 and the British Broadcasting Conspiracy](#),
Official Confusion Productions, Vimeo, 2007

It also looks at how the BBC has failed to adhere to journalistic standards and the scientific methodology when reporting on the event that 'changed the world', a failure 'Auntie' ignorantly and contentiously repeated [on the 20th anniversary of the attacks in September 2021](#).





This BBC article acted as an echo chamber for already discredited official accounts and reports. It did not explain how the [Reuters news agency had supplied information](#) to the corporation about the collapse of World Trade Centre Building 7 -- and the causes of it -- some 20 minutes or so before it actually happened -- [on which the BBC based a report](#).

Although the BBC claimed in response that its journalists make mistakes when reporting world events as they unfold, I challenge it to find another example of the corporation reporting an event shortly before it actually happened. To the objective investigator, it is a clear example of someone releasing a report ahead of a script which was being otherwise followed.

The BBC's failure to objectively consider the implications of this means it has joined the conspiracy surrounding the attacks on behalf of the shadowy forces waging war on mankind rather than broadcast the truth; protect lives and serve the common good, the duty of us all.

After examining the 9/11 evidence in detail, I came to the conclusion that the Official Story put forward by the 9/11 Commission where it concerned the hijacking of jetliners was scientifically impossible. Radar data shows that the object which was alleged to be Flight AA11, which went into the WTC North Tower, and the object which was alleged to be Flight UA175, which went into the South Tower, were travelling at speeds of 430mph and 560mph respectively on impact:



Dr Daniel R Bower, Senior Aerospace Engineer, [Rada Data Impact Speed Study, AA11 and UA175](#), National Transportation Safety Board, 7 February 2002

The evidence gathered by Dr Daniel Bower, the Senior Aerospace Engineer at the National Transportation Safety Board, which is responsible for aircraft safety in the US, was provided to the 9/11 commission in a letter dated 17 July 2003, along with other radar data collected by the NTSB (see page 3 of attachment to [letter below](#)).

Impact Speed from Radar Data for WTC aircraft	Bower	report	complete	estimate of impact speeds for WTC aircraft
---	-----------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	--

Ronald S Battocchi, General Counsel, National Transportation Safety Board, [Letter to Daniel Marcus, General Counsel, National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States](#), 17 July 2003

The Commission does not specifically refer to the speeds in its final report – if it had done, it would have given the game away. The Commission does though [otherwise rely heavily on the radar data to form its conclusions](#) about the events of that day. In its final report, there is nothing to indicate other than it accepted these impact speeds for 'Flight AA11' and 'Flight UA175'.

I came to the conclusion that the Official Story put forward by the 9/11 Commission was scientifically impossible because [jet planes cannot fly at the speeds attributed to](#)

them by this radar data at an altitude so close to sea level.

In 2006, when interviewed by Brendan O'Neill for the New Statesman magazine, I made it clear to him that the evidence showed that the objects which went into the towers were – for a number of scientific reasons – not jet airliners. Although I explained the evidence to him during the interview, [the article his editors chose to publish](#)—under the headline: 'Meet the No Planers: They believe there weren't any planes on 9/11, just missiles wrapped in holograms – failed to mention the evidence on which I came to my conclusions. This is a tactic often used against those arguing for compelling theories likely to embarrass the powers-that-be.



Instead, the left-wing magazine sought to damn me by quoting my theory then publishing discredited evidence showing parts of 'planes' at the site of the Pentagon, which I had already explained to O'Neill during the interview had been shown not to come from a commercial jet airliner – and had not been forensicated to establish their provenance. I have consistently written to the magazine outlining the evidence but they have never replied to my communications, let alone issued a correction:

See also, [Interview with Sky News, 6 December 2006](#), Bitchute, 14 May 2018

We know these recorded speeds for the two planes are not an error for four reasons. The speed of the second object at least has been verified in an independent investigation by Richard D Hall. Based on the video footage's [record of the time taken for it to cross New York and hit the tower in relation to the distance covered by the object](#), he calculated that 'UA Flight 175' was travelling at around 580mph.

The manufacturer of the 767, Boeing, has confirmed that their jetliners cannot fly that fast so close to sea-level. A spokeswoman, Leslie Hazzard, told a 9/11 investigator, there was: 'Not a chance' the aircraft could be going at 500 mph at 700 feet altitude.

[Call To Boeing, 767 Speed, World Trade Centre](#), Youtube, 15 August 2011



This is confirmed by testing on the 767. The speeds are based on the weight ranges in the A11M Type Certificate data sheet which also give an altitude range:

$V_D = 420$ KCAS to 17,854 ft/.91M above 23,000 ft, linear variation between these points.

The above diagram is good from sea level, up to almost 18,000 feet. Above that, the V_g diagram moves to the left. In other words, structural failure speeds are less in terms of Indicated at higher altitudes. Real pilots can see this as they climb.

The VMO indicator (Barber pole) actually moves to a lower airspeed once you climb above the crossover altitude. The reason for this is the aircraft is no longer limited by raw dynamic pressure, rather it is now becoming limited by the effects of Mach.

In addition, the impossible speed has been sworn under oath by a former pilot:

The argument that the energy of the mass of the Boeing 767 at a speed of 540 mph fails because:


- a. No Boeing 767 could attain that speed at 1,000 feet above sea level because of parasite drag which doubles with velocity and parasite power which cubes with velocity.
- b. The fan portion of the engine is not designed to accept the volume of dense air at that altitude and speed.

John Lear, [Sworn statement](#), paragraph 8D, 28 January 2008

If Lear's sworn statement was wrong, then the powers-that-be had a duty to rebut it. I can find no record of them having done so.

In addition, study of the footage of the subsequent explosion shows the explosive ball of fire created immediately after impact does not distort but unfolds uniformly. A jet engine leaves a wake vortex – or hot vapour trail. If the object entering the South Tower of the WTC had been a plane, the ball of explosion would have distorted due to the heat.

Hall has also disproved the hypothesis that the video footage of the object entering the building was faked, which has been put forward to explain the scientific impossibility of 'planes' entering buildings without breaking up in any way. [He did this by creating a 3D model from all the videos available of the object going into the second tower.](#)




If you think this is what happens when a jet airliner hits a building made of steel and reinforced concrete, then you need to go back to school

In any case, any cursory examination of [the footage of the object entering the second tower](#) will demonstrate that the object passed into the reinforced concrete and steel without degrading in any way, even though an aircraft could not do this because its nose is made of carbon or plastics, which are not sufficiently dense to penetrate concrete and steel.

In the introduction, I referred to key or critical evidence. Here it disproves the hypothesis that Muslims hijacked planes and flew them into the Twin Towers because it proves beyond reasonable doubt that planes did not approach then crash into the WTC Twin Towers. So there were no planes to be hijacked.

The same arguments apply to the Pentagon, based on the following photographic evidence released by US officials (although the time-date stamp is incorrect):





A close-up of the vapour trail left by the objects shows it has a corkscrew shape. A jet engine does not leave a visible vapour trail so close to sea level. Missiles leave corkscrew vapour trails.



At the same time, there is also compelling physical evidence that the objects that hit the building were missiles, most likely Tomahawks. This is *prima facie* evidence of US military involvement in the attacks as no one can claim that this technology was within the grasp of Al Qaeda or other terrorists in the US.

The fact the left wing disappears in four of the videos of the event points to the 'plane' being a 3D volumetric holographic projection, along with the fact that many witnesses reported **seeing planes but not hearing them**. A comparison of audio from the Naudet brothers' footage of 'Flight AA11' demonstrates that the sound made by the object in the sky closely resembles the 'whistling' sound of a missile and not the low rumbling a jet engine would make at such a low altitude.

[9/11 Planes v Cruise Missile Audio Comparison](#), Bitchute, 7 November 2019

Although this may sound like science fiction, military analysts had recognised

holograms as part of the new 'psywar' -- or war waged by psychological deception and mind control -- by the turn of the millennium:

Part of PSYWAR is a fourth type of war, more important than land, sea and air warfare. [...Its] techniques include image projection technology (holograms) and camouflage by transfiguration to deceive an enemy.

Mind control can be achieved via electronic wave technology, sound and microwave weapons.

Timothy L Thomas, [Russian and Chinese Information Warfare: Theory and Practice](#), Foreign Military Studies Office, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, undated

The Evidence for Holograms

In 1999, Timothy L Thomas, the retired US army lieutenant colonel I quoted above with regard to holograms and mind control, wrote a book about Psy War, where he specifically drew on holograms as part of the war of deception:

Holograms are also being considered for their value in propaganda productions, such as morphing images of political leaders. Soldiers require training to recognize misleading information produced from holograms, voice synthesis or other psychological tricks.

Soon both sides will have the ability to use holograms and other IT manifestations that will offer the opportunity to completely fool one another.

Timothy L Thomas (USA Ret.) analyst at the Foreign Military Studies Office, [Information Technology: US/Russian Perspectives and Potential for Military-Political Cooperation](#), Macmillan, 1999

The new hologram technology can project a 3D visual image precisely into a selected area:

The holographic projector displays a three-dimensional visual image in a desired location, removed from the display generator. The projector can be used for psychological operations and strategic perception management. It is also useful for optical deception and cloaking, providing a momentary distraction when engaging an unsophisticated adversary.

[An Operational Analysis for Air Force 2025: An Application of Value-Focused Thinking to Future Air and Space Capabilities](#), A Research Paper, May 1996 p. 114

[A scientific paper explains how](#) the technology projects an image which can appear

real to the observer:

Hologram technology uses a laser to illuminate an object and write its image into a photo-refractive crystal, while another laser projects that image into a liquid scattering material.

At the same time, the technology has been patented:

- [Hughes Aircraft Company](#)
- [Holography Image Formation](#)
- [Optical Control Shaping Beam](#)

Holograms have also been featured in mainstream science publications, like Nature magazine, although they have been renamed '3D projections', with further evidence of how they work and with the advancement of making them touchable.

Physicists create Star Wars-style 3D projections — just don't call them holograms

Laser and particle system produces three-dimensional moving images that appear to float in thin air.

- [Volumetric Display achieves quality moving 3D images that are better than holograms](#)
- [3D Volumetric Display Concepts For The Future](#)
- [Better than holograms: A new 3-D projection into thin air](#)
- [NIST team proves 'spooky action at a distance' is really real](#)
- [Touchable Hologram Becomes Reality \(with video evidence\)](#)

Whether you choose to call them '3D volumetric displays' or 'holograms', they amount to the same thing: they are a projection of light designed to fool any observer with an image taking the place of the real thing, which clearly worked in that regard on 9/11.

As well as mentioning holograms as a form of Psy War, Thomas also mentioned 'mind control'. Although this also sounds like the realm of science fiction and conspiracy theory, the research and technology exist to make it happen -- through radio-waves and electro-magnetism, interacting with a genetically modified virus.

Rockefeller Mind Control via Wifi and Viruses

According to a report from the Rockefeller University published in April 2017, researchers have developed wireless technology to exert control over the brain cells

of mice 'at the push of a button'.

A team led by Jeffrey Friedman, a professor of molecular biology -- and qualified medical doctor -- at the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, and Sarah Stanley, assistant professor at the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai in New York, had developed a sophisticated technique to regulate appetite and metabolism in mice by wirelessly altering their neurons or brain cells.

At the flick of the switch of a radio-operated remote control, they found they could increase or suppress the appetite of the mice while the animals went about their daily lives without noticing. Although the technique is being used to study the 'neurological basis of eating' with a view to tackling eating disorders, it is likely it can be applied to other 'hard-wired behaviours'.

Previous efforts to induce reactions in the brain by stimulating neurons involved electric wires, pulses of light or drugs. In other words, the subjects would have been aware of the invasive techniques being used on them. In 'radio-genetics' or 'magneto-genetics', biologists can quickly and repeatedly turn neurons on or off in a live animal at will, without the creature being conscious they are being manipulated by radio waves or a magnetic field. To make the animals receptive to these forms of radiation required a **genetically engineered virus**:

Friedman's team realised that they could use a genetically engineered virus to create doorways into a neuron's outer membrane.

If they could then somehow attach each door to a ferritin particle, they reasoned, they might be able to wiggle the ferritin enough to jostle the door open.

'The 'door' we chose is called TRPV1', says Stanley. 'Once TRPV1 is activated, calcium and sodium ions would next flow into the cell and trigger the neuron to fire'. The bits borrowed from camels and jellyfish provided what the scientists needed to connect the door to the ferritin.

W Wayt Gibbs, [Flipping a Switch Inside the Head](#),
Rockefeller University, 1 April 2017

Friedman et al, [Bidirectional electromagnetic control of the hypothalamus regulates feeding and metabolism](#),
Nature, 23 March 2016

In other words, by creating a genetic mishmash of human, camel and jellyfish DNA and combining it with an 'adenovirus', the research team created a bio-device which works in the following way:

- The genetic mishmash produces TRPV1 -- a protein that normally helps cells detect heat and motion -- to embed itself into the membrane of a neuron -- or brain cell wall -- and create a door in the wall.
- The camel antibodies then create a key to the door while the jellyfish protein enables the ferritin -- which stores and releases iron in cells -- to attach to the key in the lock.
- The radio-waves then turn the key to open the door in the cell.
- Once open the calcium cells can enter the neuron and make it fire a signal to regulate sensations in the subject.

This is proof that mind control is not some theoretical idea. If it can be done in mice, the same technique can presumably be used in humans. Yet, if you told people that the Rockefellers had used radio-waves and a genetically engineered virus with a view to mind control, they would probably say you were a 'conspiracy theorist'.

The only remaining issue would be how to get the genetically modified virus into the target without them noticing and that is where the 'mRNA jab' programme may have come in.

As we shall establish, there is no isolated 'SARS-Cov2 virus', nor is there -- or was there -- any evidence of a pandemic. There is therefore no justification or reason for the mass 'vaccination' of humanity under Emergency Authorisation legislation.

Applying Occam's Razor in the light of that established evidence, it would not be unreasonable to believe that the shadowy forces induced people to have the experimental jab because it contained a genetically altered virus to control their minds (see also [What SARS-Cov2 actually appears to be](#) below)

There is also academic research to show that -- once inside the body -- drugs can be released from inside carbon nano-technology particles like those established to be in mRNA jab vials by laboratory analysis (see [Evidence gathered by UK Citizens 2021](#) above) [by boiling the water within](#). The same principles could of course be used to release a virus, like the one above. There is also [patented 5G technology](#) which could draw on the ability of 5G's milli-wavelengths to boil the water in the nanotube -- in conjunction with the newly rolled out 5G networks (see [Covid, 5G and Wireless Radiation](#) below).

Voice in the Head Technology

It may be though that mind control by planting a voice in an individual's head -- inducing them to act on what they heard in the belief that it was a divine communication, for example -- could be achieved without a genetically manipulated

virus.

In December 2007, a previously classified US army document dating from 1998, [Bioeffects of Selected Non-Lethal Weapons](#), was released under the Freedom of Information Act. Dubbed a 'telepathic ray gun' by New Scientist magazine, the technology could send pulsed radiofrequencies at 2450 MHz at humans causing 'thermo-elastic expansion', making any target experience the immediate sensation of 'microwave hearing' in the head.

The sounds heard would include buzzing, ticking, hissing or knocking. As the report explains, tuning microwave hearing could enable communication with individuals from a distance of up to several hundred meters.

The phenomenon is tunable in that the characteristic sounds and intensities of those sounds depend on the characteristics of the RF energy as delivered.

Because the frequency of the sound heard is dependent on the pulse characteristics of the RF [radio frequency] energy, it seems possible that this technology could be developed to the point where words could be transmitted to be heard like the spoken word, except that it could only be heard within a person's head.

In one experiment, communication of the words from one to ten using 'speech modulated' microwave energy was successfully demonstrated. Microphones next to the person experiencing the voice could not pick up these sounds. [...]

Application of the microwave hearing technology could facilitate a private message transmission. It may be useful to provide a disruptive condition to a person not aware of the technology. Not only might it be disruptive to the sense of hearing, it could be psychologically devastating if one suddenly heard 'voices within one's head'.

Pages 7-8, [Bioeffects of Selected Non-Lethal Weapons](#), US Army Office of Intelligence and Security Command, 17 February 1998

At the time the report was prepared the technology to create these effects -- aiming devices; microwave energy and radar units, which could be adapted for purpose -- was already available.

The report also outlined several other types of non-lethal laser applications, including disrupted neural control, microwave heating and temporary blinding.

In May 2020, the US Army Joint Intermediate Force Capabilities Office issued guidance for the deployment of this weapon, focussing on only the microwave heating effect, which it called 'Active Denial Technology':

ADT may be used to complement force application and force protection missions, to include manoeuvre, patrol and convoy protection, perimeter security, and other defensive and offensive operations from fixed-site or mobile platforms. [...]

Traveling at the speed of light, an invisible DE beam of radio frequency milli-meter waves engages the subject, penetrating skin to a depth of only about 1/64th of an inch—the equivalent of three sheets of printer paper. This repel-effect produces an intolerable heating sensation, compelling the targeted individual to instinctively move.

[Active Denial Technology Factsheet](#), Joint Intermediate Force Capabilities Office, U.S. Department of Defense Non-Lethal Weapons Program, 11 May 2020

Milli-meter length waves are associated with 5G (see [The difference between 5G and previous Wifi technology](#)). Although the document stresses the non-lethal nature of the weapon and its defensive capabilities, officials are hardly likely to admit to its use to attack, for example, individuals at a demonstration. It is also reasonable to surmise that a change in frequency might induce lethal or long-term adverse effects on health (see [Havana Syndrome](#) below). It could also be used in conjunction with drone technology to attack individuals over a far greater range.

See also:

Allan H Frey, [Human auditory system response to modulated electromagnetic energy](#), *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1 July 1962

Xiang-Jun Hu et al, [Recent advances in the effects of microwave radiation on brains](#), *Military Medical Research*, 21 September 2017

The Use of Exotic Weapons

In 2006, Dr Judy D Wood', a former professor of mechanical engineering -- along with Morgan Reynolds, a retired professor of economics at Texas A&M University turned independent 9/11 investigator -- published [Star Wars Beam Weapons and Star Wars Directed Energy Weapons](#), an expert analysis of evidence observed on the day of the attacks and privately gathered for forensic examination in the aftermath in the failure of the powers-that-be to do so.

She concluded that the Twin Towers had been brought down by Directed Energy Weapons on 11 September 2001 -- rather collapsing after fire weakened the steel frame of the structures.


Wood is a former professor of mechanical engineering with research interests in

experimental stress analysis, structural mechanics, optical methods, deformation analysis, and the materials characterisation of biomaterials and composite materials. She is a member of the Society for Experimental Mechanics (SEM), co-founded SEM's Biological Systems and Materials Division, and has served on the SEM Composite Materials Technical Division. She is ideally qualified to study the collapse of buildings with her formal degrees in:

- civil and structural engineering (BSc);
- engineering mechanics and applied physics (MSc);
- materials engineering science (PhD).

Dr Wood started to question the events of 9/11 as they happened. She knew what she was witnessing on television violated the laws of physics and was unimpressed with the account of the collapse ventured that same day – that burning airline fuel weakened the structures, inducing collapse. Since then, she has used her knowledge of engineering mechanics to prove that the collapse of the World Trade Centre Twin Towers could not have happened in the way the mainstream media put forward, unchallenged, and accepted by the 9/11 Commission.

In 2010, her forensic analysis was published in book form, [Where Did the Towers Go? Evidence of Directed Free-Energy Technology on 9/11](#). It identifies a series of phenomena which are only encountered when 'beam weapons' are fired. For over a decade, she has [presented her expert detailed and forensic analysis](#) to a wide range of audiences.



She has created [a slideshow of the evidence on which she has based her research](#). It is divided into the following key evidence which proves that only DEWS could have been responsible:

- Dustification of the Towers.
- Toasted Cars parked for from the WTC.
- Energy and Heat.
- Weather, the observation of the Hutchison Effect.
- Seismic and Bathtub, including earthquakes.
- 'The Towers didn't burn up'

In some ways, everyone can become a witness to the events of 9/11 simply by opening their eyes and observing the evidence recorded on the day. Any examination of the material collected here unequivocally demonstrates that the Twin Towers were not brought down by fire and gravity, the official hypothesis, or by explosives in a conventional controlled demolition, the alternative theory put forward by [Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#) (although explosions were clearly used on the day as a Psy Op to create confusion in the aftermath of the attacks).


See also [Irrefutable](#), a documentary explaining Dr Woods's research

The official US congressional enquiry into the attacks did not hear her evidence so it was not considered in their final report.

The Government and Opposition know the Official Story of 9/11 is wrong

Over the years, I have alerted various UK governments to the fact that exotic technology was the only explanation of the events of 9/11. I sent emails to different Prime Ministers at the email address given on the 10 Downing Street website but have never received any response at all.

On 9 December 2021, I sent an email to Keir Starmer, the leader of the opposition, to alert him to the fact that the official story of the attacks was physically impossible, after also alerting him to aspects of the 'Covid-19' fraud. I know he received the email as I got a standardised confirmation reply.



But he appears to think it is more important to quiz the Prime Minister about parties during lockdown, which breached the rules, rather than address an unlawful government conspiracy to wage war by deception on mankind or uncover the enormous injustice done to the people of the Middle East by the governments and militaries of the West.

The evidence clearly demonstrates that technology only available to the government or the shadowy individuals and organisations who operate behind them was used on 9/11. Some though – experiencing what psychologists call 'cognitive dissonance' – may still want to think that the visible powers-that-be would never plan to murder their own people in broad daylight. Even this can be disproved by evidence.

In 1962, the military Chiefs of Staff put forward a plan -- under the [codename Operation Northwoods](#) -- to create pretexts to take military action against Cuba, which had gone through a revolution led by Fidel Castro and Che Guevara, three years before. The plans included faking the shooting down of a civilian airliner over Cuban airspace which could be blamed on the Cuban air force and staging terrorist attacks on US soil, along with faked funerals of the victims.

We absolutely know this to be true because the document was fully published by the National Security Archive in April 2001, five months before the 9/11 attacks. Despite being 'well-advanced', the plans were never put into practice because the Kennedy administration refused to give its permission for the false-flag operations.

The 7/7 bombings

After the 7/7 attacks in London in 2005, I also co-wrote and presented [Mind the Gap](#), Official Confusion Productions, 2006) which looked at inconsistencies in the Official Account of the events of 7/7 published by the government in the absence of a formal enquiry, which made several basic errors.

The narrative it set out, for example, claimed the alleged bombers got the 7:40 train from Luton railway station that morning and even had unnamed witness reports appearing to confirm this:

There are conflicting accounts of their behaviour on the train. Some witnesses report noisy conversations, another believes he saw 2 of them standing silently by a set of train doors.

No author, [Official Account of the Bombings in London on 7th July 2005](#), House of Commons HC 1087, The Stationary Office, 11 May 2006, Page 4

However, enquiries carried out by independent investigators established that the 7:40 train was cancelled that day. So who were these witnesses? Why didn't they tell investigators that the alleged bombers were not on the 7:40 train as it had been cancelled? Or, more likely were they planted? If they weren't planted, why weren't they called to testify at the inquest into the deaths, which took place in 2011?



The impossible picture, see [Mind the Gap](#) and [7/7 Revisited](#), Windows on the World

The Official Narrative also asserted that three of the men had driven down the M1 from Leeds by drawing a line on a map but provided no evidence for this assertion ([Official Account](#), Page 3). CCTV images alleged to be of Hasib Hussein at Kings Cross were published in the media without a date-time stamp or camera identifier and appear to be faked (as does the CCTV image of the four alleged bombers supposedly at Luton railway station, above).

The Official Account makes extraordinary statements like the following:

CCTV images show the platform at Liverpool Street with the eastbound Circle Line train alongside seconds before it is blown up. Shehzad Tanweer is not visible, but he must have been in the second carriage from the front.

[Ibid](#), Page 5

In early 2011, nearly six years after the bombings, the powers-that-be released video alleging to be of the four men together at Kings Cross to the formal inquest into the deaths on 7/7, which took place under coroner Lady Justice Hallett. (A screenshot from it is below). Can you identify the men from this? There was no article to accompany it but it carried the caption below:

'CCTV images at King's Cross station show the four bombers

together for the last time. They are seen splitting up, each one apparently going towards a different section of the London Underground'.



BBC News, 4 March 2011

There was though a voiceover from an unidentified commentator, which explains that the video was shown at the inquest into the attacks. Although the video has titles at the bottom, these are not the original date-time stamp and camera identifier for the CCTV. No one can claim to identify the alleged bombers from images of this quality.

Yet images of the 'practice run' on 28 June 2005 are much clearer and were released with date-time stamps about two months after the attacks. Unfortunately, the BBC has removed [the video images from its site](#). But a clear still from the video is still available [here](#).



A police handout image taken from CCTV footage and released on Tuesday shows London bombing suspects Shahzad Tanweer, left, Germaine Lindsay, center, and Mohammed Sidique Khan, right, at Luton train station in central England on June 28. Reuters

The failure of the powers-that-be to diligently investigate the biggest terrorist attack in history on British soil constitutes a fraudulent cover-up, which I believe was perpetrated to conceal the fact that at least one of alleged suicide bombers -- Mohammed Siddique Khan -- was an intelligence service agent. He had certainly worked with local police reportedly to stop 'radicalisation' of young Muslim men.

Summary

In summary, speaking from personal experience, I have warned government ministers, journalists and editors, legal practitioners and the people about:

- the terrorism carried out by MI6;
- MI5's inability to prevent terrorist attacks;
- MI5 lying to government ministers to cover up its mistakes;
- MI5's inability to countenance the idea that terrorism might be carried out by states and blamed on people unconnected to the attacks -- see Israeli Embassy Bombing, Chapter 14, Spies, Lies and Whistle-blowers);
- the existence of I Ops or Information Operations, a section in MI6 dedicated to plating stories in the media to discredit its enemies and further the agenda of the shadowy forces;
- the unlawful nature of the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq and the terrible consequences that would ensue;

- the falsehoods in the Official Narrative of the 7/7 attacks;
- the impossibility of events as described in the Official Story of 9/11;
- the MI6 connection to the Manchester attack.

In all the cases cited above, the visible powers-that-be conspired to prevent compelling evidence being heard or disseminated to a wider audience. This included putting me in prison. It doesn't matter whether these individuals are left or right wing – although a majority of them self-identify as 'liberal' but their actions do not conform to any traditional definition of liberalism -- they consistently operate to stop vital primary evidence and its reasoned analysis reaching the wider public.

Where this concerns covert technologies and the activities of shadowy conspiracies, they have gaslighted the population while green lighting the future operations of the conspirators. 'Gaslighting' is the term used to describe a form of mind-control which frequently repeats knowable lies to an individual in order to compromise their mental health, after the eponymous 1944 film, in which a husband used the technique on his wife.

Because of this repeated and orchestrated failure to apply [the Principles of Law, which are the principles of good government, diligent enquiry and compassionate conduct](#), designed to do justice and protect life, liberty and livelihood -- millions of people have been killed or suffered other forms of extreme harm, loss and injury, damaging not just them but the reputation of this country, its institutions and its people.

It means that – unlike in World War II --British soldiers did not make the supreme sacrifice in the defence of freedom. They, instead, committed war crimes.

This political class should have been at the very least driven from public life yet Blair in particular continues to appear in the mainstream media because he supports the shadowy forces who are at war with humanity.

In that regard, he has consistently -- along with the rest of the political class -- supported the 'Covid pandemic' and the mass 'vaccination' programme in response to it, even though as we shall see, the disease has no basis in evidence while the vaccines were developed at record speed without proper testing.

The reward for his compliance was to be made a Knight Companion of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, one of the highest honours, bestowed directly by the monarch, [even though over 1,100,000 people signed a petition opposing it](#).

The failure to learn lessons from the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq and the false-flag attacks 9/11 and 7/7 on the part of the political class has meant that the shadowy forces have been allowed once again to wage war on the people of the world – this time using the pretext of the fake pandemic, meaning many more millions have

suffered harm, loss or injury while our fundamental rights have been further eroded.

5. The Fake PCR Test and the Pandemic

The worldwide crisis triggered by the coronavirus pandemic has no parallel in modern history. We cannot be accused of hyperbole when we say it is plunging our world in its entirety and each of us individually into the most challenging times we've faced in generations. It is our defining moment -- we will be dealing with its fallout for years, and many things will change forever.

Klaus Schwab and Thierry Malleret, [COVID-19: The Great Reset](#), WEF

Background

According to the official narrative, the 'Covid' pandemic began on 12 December 2019, when two men and a woman linked to an open-air, wholesale seafood market in Wuhan, Hubei province, central China, were admitted to hospital, displaying symptoms associated with coronaviruses (but also other diseases): fever, dry cough, breathing difficulties, headache and pneumonia. They did not respond well to traditional antibiotics.

Scientists currently think there are six types of 'coronavirus' which cause disease in humans. Four of them — 229E, OC43, NL63, and HKU1 — are prevalent and said to typically cause common only cold symptoms in individuals in good health. Although the other two coronaviruses, SARS-Cov and SARS-Mers, provoked apocalyptic headlines across the world in 2003 and 2012 respectively, they were in reality only responsible for miniscule numbers of cases and a negligible number of deaths worldwide, according to official WHO figures:

- SARS-Cov: 8,098 cases; 774 associated deaths [during the 2003 outbreak](#).
- SARS-MERS: 2,578 cases, 888 associated deaths [by end of October 2021](#)

By 26 January 2020, Chinese doctors had identified 2,794 cases with similar symptoms to the three individuals originally admitted to hospital in Wuhan, which led to 80 deaths -- in a population of 11,212,000 people -- with a further 33 deaths reported in ten other countries. On this basis, the Chinese powers-that-be concluded that there was a novel, highly contagious deadly disease.

The Corman-Drosten Study

Three days earlier, on 23 January 2020, Dr Christian Drosten -- Deputy Coordinator, Emerging Infections, the German Centre for Infection Research at The Charité Institute

of Hygiene and Environmental Medicine in Berlin -- published a paper in *Eurosurveillance* -- 'Europe's journal on infectious disease surveillance, epidemiology, prevention and control' -- stating:

In the present case of 2019-nCoV [later renamed SARS-Cov2] virus, **isolates or samples from infected patients have so far not become available** to the international public health community. We report here on the establishment and validation of a diagnostic workflow for 2019-nCoV screening and specific confirmation, **designed in absence of available virus isolates or original patient specimens.**

Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR, [Eurosurveillance 25/3](#), 23 January 2020

Some individuals -- often politically motivated -- will try to undermine the evidence of what they perceive as an opponent without formal qualifications in the field of study in question by claiming their enemy is unlikely to understand 'the science' or the scientific method. In my defence, I have over thirty years of experience as an investigator, where I employ similar objective methods of enquiry to scientists because we are trying to do the same thing: establish the truth.

That said, I here apply simple reason to the above statement. You cannot devise a test for something you do not have an example of. It is the equivalent of asking surveillance officers to track a suspect without giving them a photograph of him or any identifying details. Drosten therefore cannot devise a PCR test to detect a 'virus' that he admits he has no record of. This is irrational and scientific nonsense.

Although the study claims to have designed and validated the test for the novel 'SARS-Cov2 virus' by the close genetic relatedness to the 2003 'SARS-Cov virus', this only serves as an admission that the test was devised for a completely different coronavirus, which we have already seen did not cause the number of infections, 8,098, or deaths, 774, that shrieking media headlines claimed it would. Later research established that the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' shared 75% genetical material with 'SARS-Cov'. Human beings share around 98% of their DNA with chimpanzees, yet are very different species in physical characteristics, mentality and behaviour.

In any case, any claimed resemblance to the 'SARS-Cov virus' should only have served to quell the fears of the powers-that-be that this was not likely to be a highly contagious disease with a high fatality rate.

To continue our analogy, it is like intelligence officers trying to positively identify a reported suspect (who may not even exist) by giving them a picture of another individual who is suspected to be his cousin.

However, a recent online lecture by Dr Andrew Kaufmann, a qualified medical doctor

and forensic psychiatrist, has thoroughly refuted the report published in the prestigious journal, Nature, claiming that the original 'SARS-Cov virus' had been isolated according to Koch's diagnostic postulates (see [Proof there was no isolated SARS-Cov virus](#) below).

Peer review

A key component of the scientific method is peer review, in which scientists with similar specialisms -- who have no stake in the original study -- check the method has been carried out in the manner described according to objective standards and the data has not been corrupted or misrepresented in the paper under review.

There is no evidence that the Corman-Drosten paper was properly peer-reviewed, given that it was published only 24 hours after submission to Eurosurveillance for publication.

This did not though stop it being greeted with immediate endorsement by the Director General of the WHO, Dr Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, a doctor of research, into immunology and disease prevention. He is not a medical doctor -- as has always previously been the case with the head of the WHO. He has spent the vast majority of his career as a politician rather than in the pursuit of practical science. That said, you might reasonably think the Director General of the WHO should understand the scientific method and the importance of peer-review, given he does have [a PhD in disease control](#).

The unreliability of medical research

However, it is clear that over the years the process of peer-review has been undermined by the pursuit of Big Pharma research grants and Big Pharma profit making peer-reviewed medical literature -- in the conclusion of two eminent doctors -- wholly unreliable:

Everyone should know that **most cancer research is largely a fraud**, and that the major cancer research organisations are derelict in their duties to the people who support them.

Linus Pauling, PhD, and two-time Nobel Prize winner.

It is simply no longer possible to believe much of the clinical research that is published, or to rely on the judgment of trusted physicians or authoritative medical guidelines. I take no pleasure in this conclusion, which I reached slowly and reluctantly over my two decades as an editor of the New England Journal of Medicine.

Dr Marcia Angell, physician and long-time editor in chief of the New England Medical Journal

And there are plenty of journal-published papers, backing their conclusions. Writing in The Lancet in 2015, Richard Horton, editor-in-chief of the magazine and a medically qualified doctor, wrote:

The case against science is straightforward: much of the scientific literature, perhaps half, may simply be untrue. Afflicted by studies with small sample sizes, tiny effects, invalid exploratory analyses, and flagrant conflicts of interest, together with an obsession for pursuing fashionable trends of dubious importance, science has taken a turn towards darkness.

In their quest for telling a compelling story, scientists too often sculpt data to fit their preferred theory of the world. Or they retrofit hypotheses to fit their data. Journal editors aid and abet the worst behaviours.

Richard Horton, [What is medicine's 5 sigma?](#)
The Lancet, 11 April 2005

He has also recently drawn attention to the politicisation of science in the 'Covid pandemic', with regard to the misrepresentation of medical data, in the light of the Omicron variant and the feud between US congressman Rand Paul and Dr Tony Fauci, director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases or NIAID -- part of the US Institute for Health responsible for advising the US federal government on health matters. It has recently spilled over into the issue of whether the US funded 'gain of function' -- or weaponisation experiments -- relating to viruses at the Wuhan Institute of Virology (see Evidence of a man-made origin for 'SARS-Cov2' below).

Horton's conclusions are supported by the earlier findings of John Ioannidis, a professor of medicine, statistics and bio-data science at Stanford University, who applied statistical analysis to a number of published studies. He established that:

Simulations show that for most study designs and settings, it is more likely for a research claim to be false than true. Moreover, for many current scientific fields, claimed research findings may often be simply accurate measures of the prevailing bias.

John Ioannidis, [Why Most Published Research Findings Are False](#),
Public Library of Science, 30 August 2005

He identifies several areas which help create false conclusions. For example, modelling the framework creates false positive findings meaning any results are simply accurate measures of the prevailing bias in science. He found that this applies to most research designs in most fields. [His paper was accessed 3million times](#), the

most for any paper published by the Public Library of Science.

Another serious concern is how conflict of interest compromises researchers' ability to assess objectively and in an unbiased fashion the data they collect, particularly in industry-funded studies, which are often designed in a way that is more likely to produce favourable results to the backer. Even then, the decision to publish the results may be affected by the favourability of the findings to the corporation funding the research. We simply cannot know much scientific research contradicting the prevailing orthodoxies of modern science has been effectively censored.

[In a study published in 2003](#), Bodil Als-Nielsen, a researcher at the Trial Unit of the Centre for Clinical Intervention Research at Copenhagen University Hospital, found that almost 75% of US clinical trials in medicine were paid for by private companies and that raw data were only considered evidence once they had been interpreted in a way that reflected scientific thinking.

In one case, an experimental drug was recommended as treatment of choice in 16% of trials funded by non-profit organisations, 30% of trials not reporting funding, 35% of trials funded by both non-profit and for-profit organisations, and 51% of trials funded by for-profit organizations. In the world of drug research, it appears that 'he who pays the piper, calls the tune'.

As will become increasingly obvious in this paper, this holds particularly true for research which is likely to be used by the pharmaceutical industry -- to create a market for its products -- even after being supposedly subjected to peer-review as part of the publication process in prestigious journals.

In the studies that claim to have isolated 'SARS-Cov2' we review below, we see all of these criticisms made manifest, poor design of the trial, confirmation bias; a failure to apply the scientific method and a willingness to tailor results, if not to the corporation funding the studies, then to ensure that future funding is secured from these businesses.

Academic publishing is in itself a highly lucrative market and is therefore cursed by the corruption which money seems to have on anything it touches.

[According to research in The Guardian from 2017](#), the academic publishing market was then worth \$19billion (£14billion) with a profit margin of around 40%, comparable to the tobacco industry. A successful non-academic publisher makes a profit of around 12-15%.

According to The Guardian article, 50% of the academic publishing market is controlled by five publishing houses: Elsevier, Black & Wiley, Taylor & Francis, Springer Nature and SAGE -- not to be confused with the British Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies -- with the largest, Elsevier, controlling around 16% of the total market

with more than 3000 academic journals.

The ultimate scam is that governments have to pay the publications for access to research they have themselves funded. In other words, taxpayers fund the research then have to pay again to access the material they have funded.

Formal refutation of the Corman-Drosten Study

On November 27 2020 – only seven months into the pandemic so government ministers cannot say they did not know-- a group of 23 international virologists, microbiologists and related scientists published a call for Eurosurveillance to retract the original article. Their peer-review of it established ten fatal flaws of fact and methodology and an incompetence that cannot be attributed to simple error:

The published RT-qPCR protocol for detection and diagnostics of 2019-nCoV [SARS-Cov2] and the manuscript suffer from numerous technical and scientific errors, including insufficient primer design, a problematic and insufficient RT-qPCR protocol, and the absence of an accurate test validation. **Neither the presented test nor the manuscript itself fulfils the requirements for an acceptable scientific publication. [...]**

We provide compelling evidence of several scientific inadequacies, errors and flaws. Considering the scientific and methodological blemishes presented here, we are confident that the editorial board of Eurosurveillance has no other choice but to retract the publication.

[Review report Corman-Drosten et al](#), Eurosurveillance, 27 November 2020

Furthermore, they pointed out that the authors of the Corman-Drosten paper had failed to declare serious conflicts of interest on the part of the authors: Drosten himself was a member of the board of Eurosurveillance so was considering the merits of his own material for publication.

One of Drosten's co-authors, Olfert Landt, also failed to declare a conflict of interest until 29 July 2020: he was the CEO of TIB Molbiol, the maker of a PCR kit based on the published assay sequence in the paper under review. There have also been reports that Drosten -- who also authored a paper claiming to have 'isolated' the original SARS-Cov virus said to cause Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome in 2003 – lied about his PhD qualification. If true, he is also guilty of the crime of fraud.

The RT-PCR Test created the 'Pandemic'

Official case figures for 'Covid-19' are almost wholly based on a 'positive' result from a sample taken from an individual's saliva – whether they were symptomatic or not – that was then subjected to the RT-PCR or Reverse-Transcriptase Polymerase Chain Reaction Test. Any death up to 28 days after a positive RT-PCR test was recorded as a 'Covid death', even where there were significant co-morbidities – which was actually observed in the vast majority of cases. This has obviously meant that deaths caused by other factors like heart disease and cancer were wrongly attributed to 'Covid-19', enormously inflating the apparent death toll from the disease (see [The Death Toll in Context](#) below).

However, the inventor of the test, Kary Mullis -- who coincidentally died in August 2019 at the age of 74, just four months before the pandemic began in Wuhan – is on record stating that the technique was never meant to be employed to detect for viruses. (He also on record criticising NIAID director Tony Fauci for his lack of experience in actual clinical practice in the field of treatment):

[Kary Mullis Explains the PCR Test](#), Youtube, 4 October 2020

[Kary Mullis on Fauci](#), Youtube, 8 December 2020

In November 2021, Dr Mark Bailey and Dr John Bevan-Smith published a review paper of the 'Covid fraud' which identified the RT-PCR test as the third of four pillars which propped up the 'Covid' fraud:

The third pillar of the COVID-19 fraud concerns the misapplication of the PCR (modified as RT-PCR, reverse-transcriptase-PCR in order to detect single-stranded RNA because the PCR can only reliably amplify DNA).

This misapplication centres on the amplification of RNA sequences taken from human subjects said to belong to SARS-Cov2 and also a disease termed Covid-19. However, the PCR cannot confirm either of these things; its capability is solely confined to the amplification of the selected nucleotide sequences, not to determining their provenance or significance. [...]

With regards to the short nucleotide sequences being detected by the PCR kits in use, they exist but come from somewhere else, not from a virus labelled 'SARS-Cov2'. [...]. Furthermore, the PCR cannot diagnose the infectious status of a human in any proven way and no consistent link has ever been found between a disease state and the PCR results.

Four pillars of the Covid-19 Fraud, PCR, [Covid Fraud](#), [War on Humanity](#), Dr Mark Bailey and Dr John Bevan-Smith, 11 November 2021

The authors also draw attention to the fact that at higher amplification of the RNA from the original sample, the PCR test cannot be considered reliable. However, the World Health Organisation from the outset of the so-called pandemic insisted that the PCR protocol was done at 40 times or more amplification. Yet, over 35 times amplification is generally considered to be absolutely worthless in diagnostic terms. This was known to Fauci, early on in the current 'pandemic':

[This Week in Virology, Episode 641, COVID-19 with Dr Anthony Fauci](#), American Society for Virology, 2020

So far, we have established that the paper proposing the PCR protocol, the Corman-Drosten paper, has been wholly refuted while the test itself has been withdrawn because it is a wholly inaccurate diagnostic tool which has been proven to be unfit for purpose:

In short, the misapplication of the PCR means that Covid-19 is a scientifically meaningless construct that represents nothing more than a [self] referential illusion.

Four pillars of the Covid-19 Fraud, Third Pillar, PCR, [Ibid](#)

In other words, the PCR test has through its misapplication and the resulting inaccuracy of its results created a wholly unreliable record of a 'pandemic' rather than the numbers being a result of considered clinical diagnoses and analysis of any actual disease. This fraud -- which was known to public health bodies -- was the principal mechanism used to create the idea of a deadly pandemic.

On September 2021, the CDC announced it was to withdraw its Emergency Authorisation Use of the PCR test on 31 December of that year.

6. The Proof that Viruses do not exist

If I could live my life over again, I would devote it to proving that germs seek their natural habitat, diseased tissue -- rather than being the cause of the diseased tissue.

Rudolph Vircho, the father of modern pathology

Proof there was no isolated SARS-Cov virus

In November 2002 -- some months after the appearance of the disease which became known as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome or SARS in Foshan, Guangdong, China -- Nature magazine published an article trumpeting that Koch's Postulates -- the gold standard of isolation of microbes and their relationship to diagnosis of disease -- had been met for SARS.

[Koch's postulates fulfilled for SARS virus](#), Fouchier et al, Nature, 15 May 2003

Koch's postulates were devised and published by Robert Koch, one of the founders of modern bacteriology, in the late 19th century. They use the following criteria for determining whether a microbe has a causal relationship to a disease:

1. The microorganism must be found in abundance in all organisms suffering from the disease, but should not be found in healthy organisms.
2. The microorganism must be isolated from a diseased organism and grown in pure culture.
3. The cultured microorganism should cause disease when introduced into a healthy organism.
4. The microorganism must be reisolated from the inoculated, diseased experimental host and identified as being identical to the original specific causative agent.

In 1937, these were revised by Thomas M River, a researcher at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in New York, to identify whether a specific 'virus' caused a particular condition. They vary from Koch's version because, according to current scientific thinking, viruses can only reproduce themselves in cells but not in a pure, non-biological culture, like bacteria can:

1. The particle in the host material must be isolated from any other microorganism.

2. The particle obtained must be cultivated in host cells.
3. The particle obtained must be filtered from those host cells.
4. The 'virus' obtained must then produce the specific disease in another suitable healthy host.
5. Similar material (viral particle) from the newly infected host (test organism) must be isolated and capable of transmitting the specific disease to other healthy hosts.
6. Testing must provide evidence of infection by the detection of a specific immune response to the 'virus'.

Thomas M Rivers, J [Bacteriol](#), 33, 1-12, 1937

Although many people will quote these postulates, they will omit the most pertinent observation of Rivers mentioned in his paper: that the postulates **must be used with 'proper controls'** and the application of 'common sense, proper training and sound reasoning' (p11, [ibid](#)).

In October 2020, Kaufmann published a presentation in which he forensically examined whether the claim made by Nature magazine that Koch's Postulates had been met for SARS-Cov -- and SARS-Cov2 -- coronaviruses.

Koch's Postulates: Have they been proven for viruses?
Dr Andrew Kaufmann, [Bitchute](#), 6th October 2020



He established that from the outset, the article was highly misleading. Although headlined: 'Koch's postulates fulfilled for SARS virus' (see above), the report began:

According to Koch's postulates, as modified by Rivers for viral diseases, six criteria are required to establish a virus as the cause of a disease.

The first three criteria – isolation of virus from diseased hosts, cultivation in host cells and proof of filterability – have been met for SCV [SARS Corona Virus] by several groups.

Koch's postulates fulfilled for SARS virus, Fouchier et al, [Nature](#), 15 May 2003

The first line therefore contradicts the eye-catching title of the article: it admits the study is examining the reported existence of a novel virus with reference to River's -- and not Koch's -- postulates which require a more thorough standard of 'isolation'. It seems that headlines in prestigious scientific journals are no more reliable than those in the tabloid press.

The article goes on to state that the first four criteria of River's Postulates have been met in the following four footnoted research papers:

- S M Poutanen et al, [Identification of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome in Canada](#), New England Medical Journal, 15 May 2003
- C Drosten et al, [Identification of a Novel Coronavirus in Patients with Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome.](#), New England Medical Journal, 15 May 2003
- T G Ksiazek, et al, [Novel Coronavirus Associated with Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome](#) New England Medical Journal, 15 May 2003
- J S M Peiris et al, [Coronavirus as a possible cause of severe acute respiratory syndrome](#), Lancet 361, 19 April 2003

This is the same Dr Drosten who has been discredited over his PCR test paper and his claimed credentials (see Formal refutation of the Corman-Drosten Study above). But the claim that these six criteria of River's Postulates have been fulfilled is not correct. Detailed examination of the source material -- not discussed in the Nature article -- shows that in all of these studies:

- The researchers obtained only generalised genetic material, not an isolated virus;
- Examination of the obtained material under an electron microscope did not produce evidence of a new 'virus';
- The genetic material was cultivated with Vero host cells from a monkey kidney, creating contamination;
- Researchers did not filter the product of this. They simply screened it for bacteria and other 'viruses'.

Despite claims to the contrary on the part of Nature, these studies did not therefore prove that the first three of River's Postulates had been met. In the Nature article, Fouchier et al then went on to describe how their work had fulfilled the other three criteria set out by Rivers:

We have tested for the three remaining criteria: production of comparable disease in the original host species or a related one, re-isolation of the virus, and detection of a specific immune response to the virus. We inoculated two macaques with Vero-cell-cultured SCV

[SARS Corona Virus] isolated from a fatal SARS case.

The authors make the presumption that their sample has been taken from 'a fatal SCV case' but, in the absence of proof of such a 'virus', there is no evidence that the individual in question died from SARS-Cov. The proof there is a 'virus' is the purpose of this study so it is a non-sequitur to claim that what the study is trying to prove exists already exists for the purpose of the study. Again, you don't have to be a scientist to understand that: just a man of reason.

Of the two inoculated macaque monkeys, one did show respiratory symptoms but the other did not. The lung pathology findings were also different. The authors did not re-isolate the virus and, although the authors claimed that there had been the requisite specific and unique antibody response, the paper only describes a general antibody response.

Rather than meeting all six criteria of River's postulates -- let alone all four of Koch's Postulates, as advertised in the article's headline --the study which was limited to two macaques provides no evidence that any of these criteria have been met. Even if the criteria had somehow been met, this does not prove that any isolated material would have caused SARS in a human being.

The lead author of the original article, Ron Fouchier, belongs to the SARS Aetiology Study Group, which is part of the WHO, funded by the Bill Gates Foundation (see [Grants from the Gates Foundation to the 'discoverers' of the new virus](#) below).

Not a single one of these papers, not the original Nature article, nor the studies it draws upon, use any form of control. Without it, they make any conclusions meaningless. This glaring omission is not mentioned anywhere in any of their literature, even though it provides a good scientific reason to rebut the findings and conclusions and set it aside until more compelling evidence can be gathered on the subject (see also [The Lack of Controls](#) below).

Proof there is no isolated SARS-Cov2 virus

I can find no evidence anywhere that there is an isolated SARS-Cov2 virus (despite the claims of so-called 'fact checkers' and other uninformed commentators). The peer-reviewed studies which are widely quoted as having isolated the SAR-Cov2 'virus' -- swiftly following the now discredited Corsten-Drosten paper -- are listed with a later study, published by an arm of the US Centres for Disease Control, some months later:

- Fan Wu et al, [A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China Nature, volume 579, 3 February 2020](#)
- Peng Zhou et al, [A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of](#)

[probable bat origin, Nature, volume 579, 3 February 2020](#)

- [Na Zhu et al, A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, The New England Journal of Medicine, 20 February 2020](#)
- [Jeong-Min Kim et al, Identification of Coronavirus Isolated from a Patient in Korea with COVID-19, Osong Public Health Res Perspect, February 2020](#)
- [Caly et al, Isolation and rapid sharing of the 2019 novel coronavirus \(SARS-CoV-2\) from the first patient diagnosed with COVID-19 in Australia, MJA, 212/10, 9 March 2020](#)
- [Jennifer Harcourt et al, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 from Patient with Coronavirus Disease, United States, Emerging Infectious Diseases, June 2020](#)

Political Influence of the Chinese State

Three of these studies were carried out by individuals under the jurisdiction of the Chinese Communist Party, which we know does not tolerate dissent and has no concept of free speech. In fact, people living under the jurisdiction of the government of China have never enjoyed these rights during the entire history of Chinese civilisation. China became one of the world's biggest polluters precisely because individuals had no right to petition or lobby the government to change things.

I mention this because one explanation for the respiratory symptoms displayed by the initial patients in Wuhan may simply have been a result of atmospheric pollution by itself or in conjunction with 5G wireless radiation (see Covid, 5G and Wireless Radiation below). 5G is a pre-requisite of the Internet of Things which is being pushed by shadowy international organisations, as the basis of digital payment systems, social credit scores and other control mechanisms (see The Influence of the World Economic Forum below).

The Chinese state's plans for a social credit system are already well-advanced. In 2018, the Boston Globe and Mail reported on the case of Liu Hu, a journalist in China who had written about censorship and government corruption:

In late 2013, he was arrested and accused of 'fabricating and spreading rumours'. Late in 2016, in a separate case, a court found him guilty of defamation and ordered him to apologise on his social-media account, which at the time had 740,000 followers. If he was unwilling to do that, the court said, he could pay for publication of the verdict in an authorized news outlet.

Liu paid the court \$115, an amount he says he believed would cover publication costs. Then, he said, the judge told him the entire verdict needed to be published, at a cost of at least \$1,330.

'There was no file, no police warrant, no official advance notification. They just cut me off from the things I was once entitled to,' he told the *Globe and Mail*. 'What's really scary is there's nothing you can do about it. You can report to no one. You are stuck in the middle of nowhere'.

Nathan Vanderklippe, Beijing, [Globe and Mail](#), 3 January 2018

The leading researchers on three of the papers claiming to have isolated the novel 'virus', Fan Wu, Pheng Zhou and Na Zhu all relied upon the facilities of various bodies of the Chinese Communist one-party state. We therefore have a duty to treat their findings with some scepticism, ensuring we observe particular diligence when verifying their methods of enquiry and checking the evidence they claim to have found.

The same arguments apply to the Harcourt et al paper, given the need of the US federal public health bodies and government to prop up in retrospect the case for the lockdowns and other restrictions implemented on a state-by-state basis, as it was published in June 2020, three months after the US federal government had imposed its counter-Covid restrictions.

In fact, the Peng Zhou et al paper repeats the canard that the original SARA and MERS have caused 'two large-scale pandemics in the past two decades', when the entire death toll of the two combined was around 1,600 people from under 11,000 cases worldwide, as we have already seen, while there is no evidence of an isolated novel virus causing the disease.

I stress this is not an ad hominem attack. It is an attempt to contextualise the socio-economic circumstances in which the research took place. In this instance, the authoritarian CCP were looking for an explanation for the respiratory deaths in Wuhan. In the absence of rights over government, the researchers may have felt coerced into producing the required results, which the CCP was also looking to use as an excuse to justify the new social credit system under the guise of disease control and prevention.

At the same time, the CCP was looking to deflect attention from 5G being the cause of the sickness in Wuhan, even though it had been switched on there a couple of months beforehand.

Grants from the Gates Foundation to the 'discoverers' of the new virus

It is also worth mentioning that after they published their findings, the institutions the researchers belonged to received enormous grants from the Gates Foundation to continue their research into matters related to the 'Covid pandemic'. In 2020, it gave:

- US\$900,000 to two institutions to which 14 of the 19 co-authors of the Fan Wu et al study were affiliated: [US\\$300,000](#) [£22,200] went to Fudan University to aid product development to deal with the high risks of Covid-19 and the China CDC received [\\$600,000](#) [£44,400] to research how China might prepare for the potential pandemic.
- [US\\$359,820](#) [£266,266] to the Institute of Micro-biology at the Chinese Academy of Sciences, with which 24 of the 27 co- authors of the Peng Zhou et al study were affiliated to study Covid 'vaccines'.
- [US\\$71,700](#) [£53,058] to the National Institute for Viral Disease Control and Prevention, with which 13 of the 18 co-authors of the Na Zhu et al study were affiliated, to support China's CDC in evaluating Covid-19 serological diagnostic reagents in China.

Pp15, 17, 18, [The Covid-19 Fraud & The War on Humanity](#), Mark Baily and John Bevan-Smith, 11 November 2021

Having made these points, we can though only properly refute the findings of these researchers by reference to evidence and informed and reasoned analysis.

Detailed Refutation of Existence of SARS-Cov2

In their November 2021 review of the Covid fraud, Dr Mark Bailey and Dr John Bevan-Smith identified 'isolation' as the first of the four pillars propping up the Covid fraud. Here, we find that virologists are not using the word 'isolate' in the way most people would understand it:

Verb

Chemistry Biology

Obtain or extract (a compound, microorganism, etc.) in a pure form.

Noun

Biology

A culture of microorganisms isolated for study.

Lexicon, [Oxford English Dictionary](#)

If I boil up peas and carrots in the same pan of water, then drain the water off, would I consider what I had left as 'isolated' peas or carrots. Of course not. If I mashed them all together with, say, potato, would anyone seriously think that I had isolated, for example, peas from the mix, even though I could see still green fragments that were originally peas? If I then got ill from eating this mixture, would I be able to credibly claim that the peas had caused my illness as opposed to the carrots or potato?

The layman would believe that to 'isolate a virus' meant removing organic material to leave only particles which looked similar and which could be sequenced to establish their genome or genetic code. Modern virologists do not carry out this process of filtration and purification, although there are techniques available to them.

I repeat Bailey and Bevan-Smith's analysis of the four early papers claiming to have 'isolated the virus' paper by paper here:

Fan Wu et al

It is important to note that the samples sent for sequencing were not physically isolated viruses but crude samples containing millions of unique genetic fragments from the patient himself, innumerable microbes, even from the air the patient had breathed on the way to the hospital. [...]

Thus, a 'genome' that was as close genetically as a human is to an Abyssinian house cat became the template used for primer design for the RT-PCR method to supposedly detect a virus that had not been shown to exist. [...]

One year later, Dr Wu Zunyou of the China CDC, in an interview with Janis Mackey-Frayer, would state that isolation had never taken place: 'They didn't isolate the virus', he said. 'That's the issue [why no data has been shared]. I do not suspect it's coming from what we originally thought'.

Peng Zhou et al

[This was published in the same edition as the study above even though the paper was received by Nature 13 days later and would therefore have had far less time to be considered for thorough peer-review]

These authors likewise claim successful isolation of what they call '2019-nCoV BetaCoV/Wuhan/WIV04/2019' (EPI_ISL_402124) [SARS-Cov2] but on the basis of the CPEs [Carbapenemase Producing Enterobacteriaceae] they observed in three cell lines. However, these are illegitimate proxies for the postulated infection of a healthy (non-diseased) animal or host. [...]

Bizarrely, on the basis that RNA of unknown provenance was part of the culture in which many cells died by way of induced starvation and stress with cytotoxic [toxic to living cells] ingredients, the authors claimed that they had successfully isolated their virus, 2019-nCoV BetaCov [SARS-Cov2], not that the cocktail of cytotoxic ingredients had decimated their abnormal cell lines. [...]

In short, Peng Zhou et al fulfilled none of the postulates to identify

the virus or confirm it as being causative of any disease [River's Postulates]. The alleged virus had not even been physically isolated and purified for biochemical characterisation and hence remained entirely theoretical.

[It is notable that neither of these studies published electron microscope images of the previously unidentified 'virus' for independent verification]

Na Zhu et al

[The authors] describe their study of lower respiratory tract samples, including bronchoalveolar lavage fluid (BALF), collected from four patients with pneumonia of unknown cause, all of whom had visited the Huanan Seafood Market in Wuhan shortly before their clinical presentation.

Despite claiming isolation of the virus, it is clear that the authors do not mean 'isolation' in the dictionary and postulated sense but virology's substituted antonymic meaning and the substitution of diseased for non-diseased host cells to establish causality between a purported virus and the patient's illness.

Unlike Fan Wu et al and Peng Zhou et al, Na Zhu et al did produce images of what they described as '2019-nCoV particles' but without any verification of their biochemical composition from a purified specimen.

It is simply impossible to establish from the proffered images that the particles are viruses (i.e., infectious and disease causing) or that they contained the alleged SARS-Cov2 genome.

Yet despite this double deception that haunts virology, virologists still cling to their beliefs and their jobs. For as Na Zhu et al put it: 'Although our study does not fulfil Koch's postulates, our analyses provide evidence of *implicating* 2019-nCoV in the Wuhan outbreak'. The basis of this claim seems to be the authors placing arrowheads on extracellular vesicles of unknown composition and christening them '2019-nCoV'.

Leon Caly et al

Leon Caly et al reported using the single case of a 58 year-old man from Wuhan who 'felt unwell' when he arrived in Melbourne on 19 January 2020. They were unable to find 'virions' [the complete, infective form of a virus outside a host cell, with a core of RNA and a capsid] with the purported spike protein, so they added more trypsin to the cell culture medium, [...] the function of which is to digest proteins, [they ended up with] 'the characteristic crown-like fringe of spike proteins, which, they added without the slightest hint

of irony, 'immediately improved virion morphology'.

In other words, when the exosomes did not look like their desired virus, they gave it a little trypsinised encouragement. The alleged virions were not purified so their biochemical composition could not be established: the proffered 'genome' was in fact put together after generating 'approximately 30,000,000 reads' from the tissue culture mix.

pp 11-19, [Covid Fraud, War on Humanity](#), Dr Mark Bailey and Dr John Bevan-Smith, 11 November 2021.

None of these original studies provided an explanation as to how these particles are known to cause disease or whether these very same particles exist inside humans. Although Caly et al do provide electron microscope images of prepared tissues *in vitro*, whether they even resemble living cells is called into question by the Bailey/Bevan-Smith paper, although they admit it is outside the scope of their work to come to any firm conclusion. In the absence of a formal study, we must conclude there is insufficient evidence to make that case (see also Statement on Virus Isolation below).

The Bailey/Bevan-Smith study did not consider the Jeong-Min Kim et al paper. The authors though discredit themselves in the first paragraph when they boldly state:

Following reports of patients with unexplained pneumonia at the end of December 2019 in Wuhan, China, the causative agent was identified as coronavirus (SARS-Cov2).

As we have already discussed, none of the previous three papers published on the subject, Fan Wu et al, Peng Zhou et al and Na Zhu et al, have isolated a 'virus' in any way, let alone established a causal link between what they observed and the symptoms displayed by the subjects they took samples from. These original studies do not even consider their findings against River's Postulates, although one, N Zhu et al admits that their findings do not conform to 'Koch's Postulates'. The Jeong-Min Kim et al paper has a footnote linking to another [paper](#), appearing to verify the source of the claim.

Full-genome evolutionary analysis of the novel corona virus (2019-nCoV) rejects the hypothesis of emergence as a result of a recent recombination event, D Paraskevise et al, [Infectious Genet Evolution](#), 29 January 2020.

However, this study does not claim to have isolated the 'SARS-Cov2 virus'. It instead fails to find evidence supporting the claim that the novel coronavirus came about as a result of combining with a mutating bat 'virus'. Given that there is no evidence of the SARS-Cov or SARS-Cov2 'viruses' being isolated in the first place, we are left wondering how the authors can stand up the following claim:

Full genome sequencing showed that the virus genome exhibited sequence homology of more than 99.9% with SARS-Cov2 which was isolated from patients from other countries, for instance China. Sequence homology of SARS-CoV-2 with SARS-Cov, and MERS-Cov was 77.5% and 50%, respectively.

[Ibid](#)

The authors of the study mention using a 'published SARS-CoV-2 DNA sequence', this is a reconstructed laboratory version of the 'virus' (see Genomic Sequencing below).

You can of course claim that something you've spliced together by combining bits of RNA shares 99.9% similarity with something that has also been spliced together in the lab but, if you don't have an example of the already existing phenomenon derived from an infected host in nature, then this is a meaningless statement for the purposes of determining the cause of disease. I can paint an exact copy of a landscape painting of a particular vista but that does not in itself confirm that the original painting I have copied is an accurate representation of the vista in reality.

The study is otherwise subject to the same critiques as the three papers coming out of China:

- There is no isolation of a 'virus'.
- The Vero monkey culture in which the infected sample is placed has most likely contaminated any findings, given there is no filtration;
- There is no evidence that River's Postulates have been met with regard to re-infection and specific antibody response in a human patient.
- There are no controls to verify whether a sample taken from an uninfected individual produces similar observable phenomena to a sample taken from an infected individual.

Harcourt et al reported some months after the papers we have already discussed. Their study involved one US man who had been 'diagnosed with Covid-19' in January 2020. The paper makes the same canard as we have already discussed:

A novel coronavirus, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), has been identified as the source of a pneumonia outbreak in Wuhan, China, in late 2019.

Jennifer Harcourt et al, Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 from Patient with Coronavirus Disease, United States, [Emerging Infectious Diseases](#), June 2020

It appears that supposedly prestigious, well-funded research is subject to the same curse often attributed by the powers-that-be to what they call 'fake news' or

'misinformation' websites (which in reality challenge official dogma): it acts as an echo chamber of rumour and unverified allegation posing as established fact. The paper does not otherwise differ in methodology and error from the papers already discussed. The same critique applies, particularly with regard to lack of control against which any findings can be judged (see The Lack of Controls below).

There is one further report of the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' being 'isolated'. In March 2020, under the headline, 'McMaster researcher plays key role in isolating Covid-19 virus for use in urgent research', McMaster University reported that one of its researchers had played a role in successfully isolating the virus and growing copies of 'the virus responsible for Covid-19'. Despite the claims, I cannot find any evidence of an academic research paper by the university's scientist being published on this subject.

[Wade Hemsworth, McMaster researcher plays key role in isolating Covid-19 virus for use in urgent research](#), Brighter World, McMaster University, 12 March 2020

There may be other papers which have claimed to 'isolate the SARS-Cov2 virus'. However, if they have not used a control in the study, they are subject to the same critique as for the studies above.

Fol Enquiries to Official Bodies

Researcher Christine Massey has written to governments and health bodies across the world -- generally calling on freedom of information legislation where it exists -- to induce them to disclose any evidence they hold of a novel virus isolated in the sense of being purified through filtration known as 'SARS-Cov2'. She comments:

Would a sane person mix a patient sample (containing various sources of genetic material and never proven to contain any particular virus) with transfected monkey kidney cells, foetal bovine serum and toxic drugs, then claim that the resulting concoction is 'SARS-COV2 isolate' and ship it off internationally for use in critical research (including vaccine and test development)?

Because that's the sort of fraudulent monkey business that's being passed off as 'virus isolation' by research teams around the world.

Christine Massey, [Hundreds of FOI's reveal that health/science institutions around the world have no record of COVID-19 isolation/purification, anywhere, ever](#), The Expose, 18 May 2021

She has compiled 70 responses from 53 institutions in more than 11 jurisdictions regarding the isolation/purification/existence of 'SARS-COV2'. The responses are at the following links:

<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/FOI-replies-SARS-COV-2-isolation-existence-causation-47-institutions-Feb-12-2021-chrono-part-1.pdf>

<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/FOI-replies-SARS-COV-2-isolation-existence-causation-47-institutions-Feb-12-2021-chrono-part-2.pdf>

<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/FOI-replies-SARS-COV-2-isolation-purification-existence-part-3-April-3.pdf>

Her requests have not been limited to studies recording isolation performed by the respective institution, or limited to records authored by the respective institution. They include any records these institutions hold pertaining to the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' isolation/purification performed by anyone, ever, anywhere on the planet.

So far, not one of them has been able to provide a single example of the isolation in the sense of filtration of any 'virus' which causes 'Covid-19' directly from a patient sample that was not first adulterated with other sources of genetic material, let alone establish a causal link with the symptoms attributed to 'Covid-19' or show that the findings were validated by use of a control sample from an uninfected host.

One response is though particularly telling. On 1 March 2021, the US Centres for Disease Control claimed that isolation of 'SARS-COV-2' would require the replication of a 'virus' without Vero animal host cells which is 'outside of what is possible in virology'.

[Reply to Freedom of Information Request,](#)

Roger Andoh, CDC Freedom of Information Officer, 1 March 2021

If a virus cannot be 'purified' without host cells – as admitted above -- then how can scientists ever satisfy themselves to the necessary degree of certainty that the particle they observe under the electron microscope is a single 'virus' rather than corrupted materials in the Vero animal cells let alone or causes the symptoms displayed by a patient?

Statement on Virus Isolation

In a statement on virus isolation released at the end of 2020, Sally Fallon Morell, Dr Andrew Kaufman and Dr Thomas Cowan, author of [The Contagion Myth](#), describe the correct way to isolate in the sense of 'purify' a 'virus', using a common virology technique, known and carried out for decades to isolate bacteriophages and so-called giant viruses in every virology lab:

- Take samples (blood, sputum, secretions) from many people (say, 500) with symptoms which are unique and specific enough to characterize an illness;
- Without mixing these samples with ANY tissue or products that also contain genetic material, macerate, filter and ultracentrifuges the specimen until purified;
- Demonstrate with electron microscopy that thousands of identically sized and shaped particles exist.

These particles are the isolated and purified 'virus', which can then be checked for uniformity by physical and/or microscopic techniques. Once the purity is determined the structure, morphology, chemical composition and genetic make-up of the particles could be examined using genetic-sequencing techniques, such as Sanger sequencing, that have also been around for decades. Then a final analysis could be carried out to confirm that these uniform particles are exogenous (external) in origin as a 'virus' is conceptualised to be.

Even then, the authors conclude:

As of May 2020, we know that virologists have no way to determine whether the particles they're seeing are viruses or just normal break-down products of dead and dying tissues.

[Statement On Virus Isolation](#), Dr Andrew Kaufman, Dr Thomas Cowan and Sally Fallon Morell, not dated but available from at least December 2020

[Virus isolation: is it real? Andrew Kaufman responds to Jeremy Hammond](#), Bitchute, 19 January 2021

Genomic Sequencing

In their paper, *The Covid-19 Fraud & War on Humanity*, authors Bailey and Bevan-Smith conclude there are four pillars to the fraud.

- Isolation
- Genomic Sequencing
- PCR
- Outbreak modelling

We have already thoroughly exposed the first: there is no isolated 'SARS-Cov2 virus' which can be said to cause 'Covid-19'. Any claim to isolation was not under any natural definition of the word -- and the so-called 'SARS-Cov2 virus' --in so far as viruses can be said to exist at all -- has never been detected in nature, as opposed to

being something cobbled together in a lab. In any case, no control was used to see if similar results could be observed from a non-diseased specimen

We have also demonstrated that the entire so-called 'Covid-19 pandemic' was created by the application of a faulty PCR test protocol which meant false positive tests for an unproven 'virus' were recorded as 'cases' and deaths up to 28 days after a false positive were recorded as 'Covid deaths', even though they were most likely caused by other fatal conditions.

The fourth, outbreak modelling, has already been demonstrated to be wholly unreliable, often because it is tailored to the whims of a political class looking for 'evidence' to promote a particular programme or outcome. It is anything but scientific and objective, as has been much observed as such – even in mainstream media and politics --and accepted as fraudulent by the wider population (see Professor Neil Ferguson's Wild Projections below.

However, if you venture the idea the pandemic is made-up because of the misapplication of the PCR test or the failure to identify the 'SARS-Cov2 virus', people who think they are well-informed will send you links from the 'fact-checkers' to papers claiming to have entirely sequenced the genome of the 'SARS-Cov2 virus', to 'prove' that it exists:

**Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 isolate
SARS-CoV-2/human/TUR/IMU-SP-02/2020, [complete genome](#)**

**Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 isolate
Wuhan-Hu-1, [complete genome](#)**

In the Covid-19 Fraud & War on Humanity, Bailey and Bevan-Smith demonstrate that genomic sequencing to piece together a 'virus' in silico, digitally as opposed to observing it 'in vitro' – on a slide or in a laboratory test tube or petri-dish; or 'in vivo' -- from a living organism -- proves nothing about the existence of a real virus or a causal relationship between their invented genome and any actual disease:

From the biological 'soup' taken from patient's lungs or nose swabs containing all sorts of material from the human subject, innumerable commensal microbes and potential contaminants, **de novo assembly platforms** search for short genetic fragments.

After finding millions of unique fragments in the brew, these software programmes piece together a 'genome' (one long piece) based on parameters set in the programme. Along the way there is a bit of cut-and-pasting and if pieces are 'missing', other ready-made templates can be added to fill the gaps.

However, the man-made algorithms, probability models and arbitrary selections cannot deliver the 'yes' or 'no' answer to the question of its physical existence in nature, not least because any coronavirus 'genome' used as a template in its production will likewise be propositional, the methodology providing no confirmable connection with the material or physical universe, making the new member of the coronavirus genus merely another product of virology's sui-referential processes. [...]

What takes place is simply the shotgun sequencing of crude samples which contain genetic fragments of unknown provenance. Therefore, there is no evidence whatsoever, not even the vaguest guarantee, that the resulting in silico 'genome' exists in nature or has anything to do with a 'virus'.

In this manner, however, the invention of the 'virus' is presented as a *discovery*, its faux status retroactively secured through the act of denotation whereby its naming purports its prior existence and its pathogenicity.

That a notional hypothetical genome invented by such anti-science should lie at the heart of this assault on humanity is a scientific and ethical outrage.

Second Pillar, Genomic Sequencing, pp 19-22, [ibid](#)

Evidence of a man-made origin for 'SARS-Cov2'

This also explains why some people have put forward the theory that 'SARS-Cov2' may have been genetically engineered in the laboratory, possibly as part of a biological warfare programme, which is quaintly referred to in the mainstream as 'gain of function' research.

While analysing 'SARS-Cov2 samples' in 2020 in an attempt to create a 'vaccine', Professor Angus Dalglish -- professor of oncology at St George's University, London, best known for his breakthrough creating the first working 'HIV vaccine' -- and Norwegian scientist Dr Birger Sørensen, discovered 'unique fingerprints' in the 'virus' which made it distinctly different from the original SARS-Cov virus:

It is a matter of fact that there are unique inserts in the SARS- Cov2 spike protein when they are aligned with other SARS-Cov sequences as shown in ([Zhou et al., 2020](#)) [See above].

Angus Dalglish et al, [Bio vacc-19: A Candidate Vaccine for Covid-19 \(SARS-CoV-2\) Developed from Analysis of its General Method of Action for Infectivity](#), Quarterly Review of Biophysics, 29 May 2020

They conclude that the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' could only have arisen from manipulation in a laboratory. Dagleish and Sorenson carried out further research into their apparent discovery, which confirmed their initial finding.

The two then spent a year trying to persuade academic publications to publish their evidence, which they believed would overturn the consensus that 'Covid-19' had occurred naturally but were rejected. Eventually, they got their findings published in a Norwegian periodical, Minervanett:

Our discovery of the high pI number, the high accumulated charge and how it comes about, in the course of our bio- chemical analysis, suggested several features which individually seem unlikely to be the result of natural evolution and which, taken together, and applying Occam's Razor to hone the most parsimonious hypothesis, make **natural evolution a less likely explanation than purposive manipulation, specifically for Gain of Function.**

Birger Sørensen, Angus Dagleish & Andres Susrud, [The Evidence which Suggests that This Is No Naturally Evolved Virus: A Reconstructed Historical Aetiology of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike](#), Minervanett, 1 July 2021

Sørensen and Dagleish clearly believe that Peng Zhou et al have isolated a virus which occurred naturally in an infected specimen which had already been subjected to genetic tampering before Zhou et al isolated it -- which was then provided to them to help develop a vaccine to counter it. However, they were instead supplied with a genome created by combining bits of RNA found in a genetic soup with already existing genetic templates – the 'unique insert' spotted by Dagleish and Sorenson -- posing as a naturally occurring single organism, as Bailey and Bevan-Smith's findings have made clear:

After finding millions of unique fragments in the brew, these software programmes piece together a 'genome' (one long piece) based on parameters set in the programme. **Along the way there is a bit of cut-and-pasting and if pieces are 'missing', other ready-made templates can be added to fill the gaps.**

P19, Second Pillar, Genomic Sequencing, , [Covid Fraud, War on Humanity](#), Dr Mark Bailey and Dr John Bevan-Smith, 11 November 2021

In August 2021, the Office of the Director of the US National Intelligence Council declassified its updated assessment on the origins of the 'SARS-Cov2 virus'. In the middle of what often appear to be contradictory assessments made to toe the political line, its report observed;

Repeated passage of a closely related virus through animals or cell

culture—which we consider laboratory adaptation and not genetic engineering—could result in some features of SARS-Cov2, according to publicly available information.

P13, Updated Assessment of [The Origins of Covid-19](#), Office of the Director, National Intelligence Council, undated but 'up to August 2021'

The authors of the report do not explicitly state that the alleged original 'genome' for the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' is wholly created through the 'laboratory adaptation' which involves combining bits of RNA with existing templates, indicating that they too do not understand the nature of laboratory 'isolation of a virus', although they do appear to hint at it in the above quote in regard to 'laboratory adaptation':

Repeated passage of a closely related virus through animals or cell culture—[...] could result in some features of SARS-Cov2, according to publicly available information.

At the same time, the NIC report hints at it by briefly mentioning that the original SARS-Cov virus itself bore signs of an insertion, which did not appear to have a natural origin:

Academic literature has indicated that a FCS [furin cleavage site] had previously been inserted into SARS-CoV-1 [SARS-Cov], the causative agent of SARS, complicating differentiation of how such a feature may have appeared.

P4, [Ibid](#)

In fact, the component parts which are now said to make up the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' were patented in 2007 which, by definition, would require the genome to be somehow man-made.

Curtis et al, [Methods for producing recombinant coronavirus](#), United States Patent No: US 7,279,327, 9th October 2007

Although the US Supreme Court has ruled that naturally occurring DNA sequences cannot be patented because they are not man-made, the act of combining RNA with existing genetic sequence templates could be viewed as the invention of something new and therefore within the purview of patent, copyright or intellectual property law.

The very fact that the 'SARS-Cov virus' was patented proves that it is not a naturally occurring phenomenon but was the invention of scientists in a laboratory. This is not though the genetic engineering of a 'virus' as such. It is merely what modern virologists do in the laboratory to wrongly claim they have identified a new 'virus'.

It is an extraordinary reflection of the compartmentalisation of modern scientific study that Dagleish and Sorenson when charged with creating a vaccine for 'Covid-19' did not know this and wasted a year trying to convince people that the insertion into the genome of the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' was a form of genetic manipulation.

None of the above of course rules out the fact that hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by shadowy US research institutions trying to create a 'chimera virus'-- sometimes spelt 'chimaera,' based on the Greek mythological [fire-breathing hybrid monster](#) – which can be deployed as a bioweapon. As we have already seen, the Rockefeller Institute has created just such a genetically engineered chimera, although it is most likely based on an exosome, not a virus (see Rockefeller Mind Control via Wifi and Viruses above and Dr Kaufman's Observations below).

See also Colonel Michael J Ainscough, Gene Therapy as a Weapon, [Next Generation Bioweapons](#), The Counter-Proliferation Papers, USAF Counter-Proliferation Centre, April 2002, pp19-20

Given the rapid development of the mRNA jab, it is clear the pharmaceutical corporations simply used versions of the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' created from the genetic soup with template in silico. There was never a naturally occurring version of the 'SARS-Cov' virus to use to develop an effective 'vaccine' against it.

Without a virus to counter-act, no 'vaccination' can be effective. Vaccines normally take years, if not decades, to develop yet the mRNA jab for the made-up 'SARS-Cov2 virus' was rolled out a year after Chinese scientists had claimed to first identify 'Covid-19' in Wuhan.

Reason dictates there can therefore be no long-term safety data.

We have already seen how the mRNA jab might work in concert with the Rockefeller-produced mind-control chimera and 5G, making it the delivery mechanism in a bioweapon (see Rockefeller Mind Control via Wifi and Viruses above). The 'vaccine' has in any case in its declared use already killed or severely maimed tens of thousands and that is before the long-term effects have been observed.

Variants and 'vaccines'

At this moment, it is worth briefly pointing out that without a template of a naturally occurring virus which has been proven to cause the unique symptoms attributed to 'Covid-19', there can be no evidence of a mutated variant of that 'virus'. Any scientist claiming to have identified a variant was most likely simply finding similar but different material in the genetic soup after using the discredited RT-PCR technique to test amplified RNA.

In any case, I can find no record of a modified PCR test which can specifically distinguish between one variant and the other. Without a specific test, any claim to have identified a variant with any certainty is highly unscientific.

Variations were promoted in the mainstream media to shore up anti-Covid restrictions as the number of deaths and hospitalisations attributed to Covid-19 fell,

Contrary to the propaganda of the pharmaceutical industry, diseases like polio, smallpox and diphtheria were rapidly dying out before the introduction of vaccines -- which in fact slowed down their eradication -- most likely as a result of the body's defences adapting to any new pathogen, as it always does.

This is borne out by the experience with the actual disease called 'Covid-19', which I do not dispute exists. Where it is not flu, I believe on the evidence I have seen that it is more likely caused by lifestyle and, particularly, environmental factors (see 5G set in context):

- [atmospheric pollution and Covid-19](#);
- [review of evidence re 'chemtrails' or persistent contrails](#).

A polluted environment introduces toxins into the body, weakening the natural mechanisms of defence and inducing below-optimum health, which in turn induces disease, referred to as the 'terrain theory' of disease. A documentary exploring [the evidence behind this theory is come out shortly](#).

The most recent 'variant', Omicron, led to far fewer deaths and hospitalisations (subject to the usual discredited and unreliable 'positive PCR test'). This did not though initially prevent the powers-that-be from using it to threaten more lockdowns and justify the continuation of other restrictions.

Given the inaccuracy of the PCR test, particularly at the 40 times or more amplification, governments in the UK -- particularly in Scotland and Wales -- were in late 2021/early 2022 essentially using wild, computer-modelled projected cases of the common cold -- also recognised by virologists as a 'coronavirus' -- to justify their restrictions on the freedom of the British people!

The Lack of Controls

It is notable that none of the studies claiming to have isolated the SARS-Cov2 virus employ a control, the most basic requirement of the scientific method. Without an uninfected sample --or a placebo group in the case of a new drug trial -- to check the findings against, any observation and conclusion are meaningless, as any true scientist will tell you.

Imagine, for example, you want to trial a new medical drug for a new disease. You give it to 200 people who are all showing symptoms of the disease. Six weeks later, 175 of them have recovered, 10 still have it and 15 have died. You might be tempted to think this was a miracle cure. But without controls, I have no idea if the drug worked to cure people or kill them.

But if I give 200 people showing symptoms the new drug (and get the same results as above) but also monitor another 200 people showing symptoms without giving them the new drug and 195 of them get well and 5 die, then it is obvious that it is not the drug that is curing them. In fact, the evidence shows the drug is killing them. (In practice, the trial would also need a placebo-control group, which is told they are getting the drug but in reality are given a sugar pill, because medical studies have shown that even the application of a suggested cure can work).

In the case of all the so-called 'virus isolation' studies cited above, the researchers should have undertaken the same processes on a sample which did not come from an infected specimen -- that is an individual who had not displayed similar symptoms or on samples which had not been exposed to the disease -- in order to check whether the same or similar evidence could be observed under the electron microscope after being added to the Vero solution and toxified.

Why wasn't this pointed out by the qualified scientists carrying out the peer-review process?

This may surprise those coming to the study of 'viruses' for the first time but controls have in fact never been employed in studies which have claimed to 'isolate' them:

All claims about viruses as pathogens are wrong and are based on easily recognisable, understandable and verifiable misinterpretations. [...]

All scientists who think they are working with viruses in laboratories are actually working with typical particles of specific dying tissues or cells which were prepared in a special way. They believe that those tissues and cells are dying because they were infected by a virus. **In reality, the infected cells and tissues were dying because they were starved and poisoned as a consequence of the experiments in the lab.** [...]


The death of the tissue and cells takes place in the exact same manner when no 'infected' genetic material is added at all. The virologists have apparently not noticed this fact. **According to [...]** scientific logic and the rules of scientific conduct, control experiments should have been carried out. In order to confirm the newly discovered method of so-called 'virus propagation' ... scientists would have had to perform additional experiments, called

negative control experiments, in which they would add sterile substances [...] to the cell culture.

These control experiments have never been carried out by the official 'science' to this day. During the measles virus trial, I commissioned an independent laboratory to perform this control experiment and the result was that the tissues and cells die due to the laboratory conditions in the exact same way as when they come into contact with alleged 'infected' material.

The Misconception called 'Virus', Dr Stefan Lanka, [Wissenschaftplus](#), January 2020

See also: [Why Virology is a Fake Science](#), Dr Stefan Lanka, 10th November 2021 and [Stefan Lanka, Dismantling the Virus](#), [Wissenschaftplus](#), June 2015
Interview with Dr Stefan Lanka, [CPE - Control Experiment](#), 21 April 2021



Cytotoxic effects: no virus required

What SARS-Cov2 actually appears to be

In 2020, very early on in the 'pandemic', Dr Andrew Kaufman gave a presentation detailing his research into exosomes, which bear a striking resemblance to 'viral

particles' under the electron microscope – as well as sharing other aspects with what virologists call 'viruses'. He concluded that rather than being the cause of disease, these micro-particles were in fact the body's way of countering toxins to prevent disease.

The presence of membranous vesicles outside cells was first recognized 50 years ago, although these were originally assumed to be waste products released via the shedding of the cell's plasma membrane. The recognition of what we now call exosomes didn't come until 1983. Despite 30 years of research, the very basics of exosome biology are in their infancy and scientists claim to know little of the part they play in the normal make-up of cells.

James R. Edgar, [Q&A: What are exosomes, exactly?](#)
Article 46, volume 14, BMC Biology, 13 June 2016


Exosomes are formed when a certain type of vesicle, known as a multivesicular endosome or MVE becomes fused with the cell's plasma membrane or wall. These are then released as intraluminal vesicles or ILVs into the fluid outside the cell. The vesicles released are known as 'exosomes'.

Exosomes are released by cells in the body as part of its day-to-day functions. Depending on their specific function, they are targeted at specific cells in different parts of the body. They have tiny squares on the outside which act like a lock. As they circulate around the body, they look for the right key to fit their lock or target, which they then lock onto and neutralise. There are many factors which can increase the production of exosomes within the body (see immediately below).


Dr Kaufman's Observations

In his lecture, Dr Kaufman presents several slides displaying images taken with an electron microscope, demonstrating the remarkable resemblance between exosomes and the particle which virologists have called 'SARS-Cov2'. They are presented below with the time they appear in the video:


[Anatomy of Covid-19](#), Dr Andrew Kaufman, Bitchute, 16 April 2020



23min45: electron microscope images showing MVBs or multi-vesicular bodies (left) within a cell and exosomes leaving the cell, compared with particles identified as 'SARS-Cov2' (right) both taken from a micro-thin slice of tissue. The difference in quality of the images is accounted for by the thickness of the slice, which is finer in the image on the right.



25min33: similar comparison but showing the endosome and SARS-Cov2 within respective host cells. Top right is a nerve cell. Similar phenomena are observed, with vesicle and particle about the same size, 500 nano-meters in diameter



32 min: comparison of electron microscope images of a 'SARS-Cov2 virus' from another study, [the Na Zhu et al](#) paper (left) and exosomes

You don't have to be a qualified research scientist or virologist to observe the clear resemblance between exosomes and what have been wrongly called 'viruses', which according to modern scientific consensus can only 'reproduce' within a cell – in the same way endosomes are observed to be created within the cell before passing through the cell wall to become exosomes.

Kaufman then shows further comparisons between the two.

	Exosomes	COVID-19
Diameter inside cell	500 nm (MVE)	500 nm
Diameter outside cell	100 nm	100 nm
Receptor	ACE-2	ACE-2
Contains	RNA	RNA
Found in	Bronchoalveolar (lung) fluid	Bronchoalveolar (lung) fluid

27min: comparison of exosomes and so-called 'SARS-Cov2' particles. Although they are not always be exactly the same size, the size differences exist over the same range as each other.


ACE2 is an enzyme in the kidneys which works to regulate blood pressure. The researchers working with the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' have described how it uses this enzyme to invade cells but exosomes use exactly the same enzyme to protect cells exposed to toxins. Both contain genetic RNA material, not DNA. The 'SARS-Cov2 virus', Kaufman concludes, is fully an exosome in every sense of the word.

The factors which induce the production of exosomes

There are a number of accepted factors which cause exosomes to enter into circulation: chemicals and bacteria in the environment; fear and stress; infection and bodily injury and the body's immune response itself. Virtually any disease can cause the body's cells to respond by producing exosomes but specific individual research papers have identified asthma and cancer as causes as well as ionising radiation, although there has been no research carried out to specifically link the production of exosomes to Wifi and 5G in particular (which is suspicious in itself).

It is notable that 'fear' is specifically mentioned as it may account for some of the false positive PCR tests during the 'pandemic' -- given that the powers-that-be sought every opportunity to create the impression a deadly disease was sweeping across the planet -- along with the close resemblance to/identical nature of exosomes and 'SARS-Cov2'. The same observation can be made about the stress induced by lockdowns and other restrictions on people's ability to earn a living and otherwise enjoy life.

Rather than being the cause of disease, the particles virologists have been observing since the invention and commercial availability of the electron microscope in the 1930s and now rightly identified as exosomes in fact act as defence against toxins entering the cell, enabling the body to fight off disease.



34min: electron microscope image colourised to show different particles: toxins released by the bacteria are coloured purple; the exosomes yellow; and the cells green

Exosomes act like a defensive sponge, preventing toxins -- for a period of time, at least -- from entering the cell. Toxins which evade the exosomes burrow into the cell wall, puncturing the membrane making the cell's contents leak out, eventually killing the cell. This leads to tissue degradation manifesting in the body as the symptoms of

disease. To prevent this, the cell responds to the toxins by emitting exosomes to lock on to the toxics then swallow them up. In brief, when mixed with bacteria in a petri-dish, cells put out exosomes and survive. If they don't, they die.

From this, we can conclude, in the absence of 'viruses' that respiratory disease at least is caused by toxins, which prompt cells to release exosomes as a form of defence. Both toxins and exosomes are detected when amplified in the RT-PCR test which detects the RNA from exosomes, rather than the 'SARS-Cov2 virus'.

These [exosomes are the body's natural mechanism of defence to toxins and the diseases they cause](#) rather than causing 'Covid-19' and other diseases.

This means that it is not just the fear and stress induced in individuals by the powers-that-be's so-called counter-measures to the spread of 'Covid-19' that contribute to disease but also the mandated wearing of masks and holding the population under effective house arrest. This is because masks and being indoors both restrict and lower the concentration of oxygen in the air which we breathe, which is vital to the optimum functioning of cells.

What 'Covid-19' actually is

Most individuals who were recorded as dying from 'Covid-19' most likely died of the seasonal flu which was made more severe -- and more likely to be transmitted -- as a result of lockdowns, forcing people into confined spaces with less access to exercise and fresh air, depriving them of the higher concentrations of oxygen which help regulate good health.

The mainstream media has gone to great lengths to claim the flu died out during the alleged pandemic due to anti-Covid measures:

Not a single case of flu detected by [Public Health England](#) this year as Covid restrictions suppress virus

Flu cases drop to zero as [Covid measures cut transmission](#)

Flu cases drop to [zero as Covid measures cut transmission](#)

Flu cases '[almost completely wiped out](#)' this winter in England, but COVID-19 continues to soar

Flu Has [Disappeared for More Than a Year](#)

Children's National [Has Seen Zero Flu Cases](#) Since the Start of the Pandemic

[The Flu Vanished During Covid](#). What Will Its Return Look Like?

[Flu-zero](#): More than a year since Australia's last flu death

[Influenza cases hit an all-time low in Australia in 2021](#) — that could be a problem when it returns

CDC: Covid-19 [Wiped Out the Flu Around the World This Year](#)
'Influenza positivity rates in specimens tested (a standard metric of community flu activity) fell 98% in 2020 during March 1-May 16 relative to Sept 29, 2019-Feb. 29, 2020, plummeting from a median of 19.34% to 0.33%, reported Sonja Olsen, PhD, of the CDC in Atlanta, and colleagues'

[A sharp drop in flu cases](#) during COVID-19 pandemic
'The Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recently reported that it had logged 1,316 positive flu cases in its surveillance network between September 2020 and the end of January 2021. During that same period last year, the CDC had recorded nearly 130,000 cases'

[Where has the flu gone?](#) Influenza activity hasn't been this low in recent memory and Covid has a lot to do with it

However, applying Occam's Razor to the actual data, the simplest explanation would be that the flu was wrongly diagnosed as 'Covid-19', given:

- the similarity of the symptoms of the flu and the symptoms of 'Covid-19' in the vast majority of cases;
- the unreliability of the PCR test and the absence of any evidence of a virus causing 'Covid-19'.

I quote the many examples above from across the English-speaking world to demonstrate the contortions the mainstream journalists went through to maintain the illusion of the 'Covid pandemic' and the propaganda supporting 'Covid-19' counter-measures. Rather than questioning the official narrative coming from governments and health bodies, like SAGE, NICE, the WHO, the US CDC etc -- especially in the light of the data showing the curve for excessive deaths spiked during lockdowns rather than flattened – the editors and journalists chose to support these eugenicist policies.

In a free society, the media is supposed to hold government to account.

If editors had performed their duty to the truth in this area after the first lockdown, they might have saved the lives of the tens of thousands who died in the second and third lockdowns. Yet, they continued to support official calls for lockdowns, even as late as December 2021 when the 'Omicron variant' emerged, even though the symptoms were mild and by the government's own manipulated figures based on the faulty PCR test did not cause the levels of hospitalisations and deaths attributed to the 'delta variant' (see Variants and 'vaccines' above).

These editors, journalists and publishers have blood on their hands and that is before we hold them to account for their fraudulent failure to fact check the case for the existence of a non-existent, supposedly deadly virus or verify that the PCR test could do what the powers-that-be were claiming.

Rebutting Germ Theory

Rather like in the case of 9/11, the current thinking of the powers-that-be is not just slightly wrong. It is the complete opposite of the truth. That failure to establish the truth has meant that the response of governments and health bodies across the world has not just been wholly ineffectual. It has actually contributed to the cause of disease (see Even allowing for excess mortality caused by lockdowns, when examined against age-standardised mortality rates for the last 20 years, the excess mortality in the UK was still lower in 2020 than for the years 2001 to 2007, when there was no alleged pandemic but the seasonal flu existed.

At the same, 2021 -- which had generally less stringent lockdown restrictions than 2020 -- has a lower rate of excess mortality than 2001 to 2010 and is only negligibly different from 2011 to 2018 with the exception of 2015. In other words, there has never been an evidential case for a deadly pandemic.

Because only First World nations have generally carried out draconian lockdowns and similar measures, this slightly elevated excess mortality rate in the UK is not significant in global mortality rates, which for the years 2016-2020 have remained stable at 7.7 deaths per 1,000 people. If there had been a global pandemic driven by a highly contagious disease with severe symptoms causing death then we would expect to see

higher excess mortality rates across the planet:

[CIA World Factbook](#), last updated December 2020

Dr Denis Rancourt's findings proving there was no Covid-19 pandemic above).

In the 1850s, Florence Nightingale reportedly reduced the mortality rate in military hospitals during the Crimean War from 42% to 2% partly by opening the windows to let fresh air into the wards.

The findings above utterly destroy 'germ theory' as an explanation for the transmission of disease. Although the layman will quote the example of measles parties giving (some of) the children who attend them the measles, this does not provide evidence of transmission by microbe. Yawning and laughter can be highly infectious yet no one seriously suggests that they are spread by germs.

As have already demonstrated earlier in this paper, the application of the scientific method with regard to the use of a control has disproved the claim that viruses are what cause a disease to be transmitted from one host to another.

On further investigation, the germ theory of transmission of disease -- like the idea that 19 Muslims flew planes into buildings which then collapsed due to fire and gravity -- is proved to have never been more than a putative hypothesis, which when tested against evidence has been found to be wholly disproved.

This means that the genetically sequenced 'viruses' invented in the laboratory -- see Genomic Sequencing above -- are in fact composites of exosome RNA. This is particularly relevant when we reconsider the Rockefeller Institute's invention of a genetically engineered 'virus' which determines a form of mind control (see Rockefeller Mind Control via Wifi and Viruses above).

These researchers are in fact using the properties of the endosome/exosome to breach the cell wall and then lock on to the shape of a specific toxin to neutralise it but genetically engineered to create a door into the cell and a key to open that door

and enter the cell.

Because viruses do not cause or transmit disease, all the massive amounts of funding that have been spent to develop biological warfare have been a vast waste of money in terms of inventing replicating super-viruses which might wipe out entire populations. That does not of course rule out the manipulation of exosomes being used to induce other conditions like the mind control described above and developing a 'vaccine' as a bioweapon delivery system.

7. Lockdowns and the Excessive Deaths

As of 19 March 2020, Covid-19 is no longer considered to be a high consequence infectious disease (HCID) in the UK

UK Health Security Agency

The Run-Up to Lockdown

As we have already established, there was never any evidence of a new 'virus'. But let us suppose scientists had isolated a new 'coronavirus'. Let us not benefit from hindsight or the proofs established here. Let's instead put ourselves in the shoes of a government minister believing the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' existed due to 'the science'.

At this time, there were six 'coronaviruses', according to the scientific consensus. Four of them — 229E, OC43, NL63, and HKU1 — were known to be no more serious than the common cold. The two other coronaviruses had led to 8,098 cases in the case of SARS-Cov, leading to 774 associated deaths and 2,578 cases in the case of SARS-MERS with 888 associated deaths.

Given that the latter two diseases had first been greeted with shrieking apocalyptic headlines warning of ravaging pandemics which didn't come to pass, ministers had a particular duty to have been on their guard. (The same argument applies to any other touted pandemic like bird or swine flu).

They also had no reason to think that SARS-Cov2 would be a highly contagious, deadly disease, given its close genetic relationship with the 'SARS-Cov virus' -- 75% of shared genetical material -- and with 'SARS-MERS' -- 50%.

In the three weeks running up to lockdown being announced, there were a negligible number of 'cases' in the UK. (Here we are also turning a blind eye to the pseudo-science behind the Drosten's PCR test, which was published in January 2020 and was therefore available to any minister who wished to verify the information for himself).

On 4 March 2020, 'cases' of Covid-19 were said to 'surge' in the UK, even though there were only 34 new cases, bringing the total to 87 in a population of 65million. By 10 March, six deaths had been attributed to the illness in the UK, while 373 had tested positive. A week after that, the UK's death toll attributed to the disease 'Covid-19' had risen to 55, with 1,543 confirmed 'cases,' though the powers-that-be were at the time claiming that up to 10,000 people had already been infected. Although this can sound alarming, an average of around 13,500 people die every day in the UK.

The next day, 19 March 2020, the government [announced Covid-19 was not a High Consequence Infectious Disease](#):

Status of COVID-19

As of 19 March 2020, Covid-19 is no longer considered to be a high consequence infectious disease (HCID) in the UK. There are many diseases which can cause serious illness which are not classified as HCIDs. [...]

They have determined that several features have now changed; in particular, more information is available about mortality rates (low overall), and there is now greater clinical awareness and a specific and sensitive laboratory test, the availability of which continues to increase.

Although the official line in the statement above claims that diseases can still be dangerous even when not categorised as a 'High Consequence Infectious Disease', this is disingenuous. If a disease does not conform to the definition of a 'HCID', then that's because it is not one and not dangerous. If a genuinely dangerous disease falls outside the definition of an 'HCID', then the definition needs to be changed. What is the point of medical professionals, civil servants and politicians coming up with these definitions, if they are not going to be adopted when faced with a real-world situation?

The government report also confirms that the mortality rate from 'Covid-19' is low overall.

Remember, even if you accept the falsehood that 'Covid-19' was caused by the 'SARS-Cov2 virus', previous experience had at this time shown that its close relatives in the coronavirus family had easily been contained, while reported pandemics like bird and swine flu had not come to pass (see Professor Neil Ferguson's Wild Projections below).

Yet during this period, the government ministers set about the following:

- The PM began daily press briefings, urging everybody in the UK to work from home and avoid pubs and restaurants.
- The postponement of sporting events began with football fixtures being suspended while schools were closed.
- The Chancellor of the Exchequer committed a £12billion emergency package followed by £330billion-worth of government-backed loans and more than £20billion in tax cuts and grants for companies threatened with collapse, the biggest package of emergency state support for business since the 2008 financial crash.
- The government committed to paying up to 80% of workers' wages under the furlough scheme.

On 23 March 2021 -- with worldwide cases attributed to Covid-19 standing at a mere 270,000 cases and attributed deaths at 11,000 in a world population of 7.8 billion -- not taking into account the figures were vastly inflated based on the wholly unreliable PCR test -- the PM announced a full-on lockdown -- to be enforced by fines for failure to comply -- to come into effect the next day.

From the above, combined with the fact that no coronavirus or other disease like bird or swine flu had ever caused mass deaths across the planet, it is clear there was no compelling reason for the actions ministers took.

The decisions of the Chancellor were more likely based on the need to supply liquidity or cash flow to an economy on the brink of collapse -- which could not be justified in normal circumstances -- rather than the need to protect the population from a dangerous disease. The government had been heavily criticised outside the mainstream for bailing out financial institutions a decade earlier to the tune of billions of pounds with the taxpayer expected to pick up the tab along with the compound interest (see More Government Debt below).

Given the economic deprivations, injustices and inequalities caused by the 2008-9 bailout, people were at the time of the outset of the 'pandemic' attending demonstrations in ever greater numbers and with ever greater intensity across the planet. The 'gilets jaunes' or 'yellow jackets' in France and other countries were the most prominent but not the only example of this.

In these circumstances, ministers were looking for any use excuse to distract or control the population.

Professor Neil Ferguson's Wild Projections

Government ministers then commissioned academic Neil Ferguson, professor of mathematical epidemiology at Imperial College's MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis -- a centre he helped found -- to produce a projection of UK deaths from 'SARS-Cov2'. In March 2020, he deduced there would be 500,000 deaths from the disease within months in the UK. Even using the inflated figures created by the wholly flawed PCR test, there have been only around 150,000 'cases' over two years.

Yet, Ferguson should have been discredited many years earlier. His previous models predicting apocalyptic pandemics had in reality not only failed to come to pass, they had been proved woefully wrong:

Year	Disease	Projected deaths	Actual Deaths	Location
------	---------	------------------	---------------	----------

2001	Foot-and-Mouth	150,000	200	UK
2002	BSE (Mad Cow)	50,000	177	UK
2005	Bird Flu	150,000,000	282	Worldwide
2009	Swine Flu	65,000	457	UK

Given that SARS-Cov and SARS-MERS had only caused deaths in the thousands worldwide, one might wonder what data and method this mathematician employed to come to statistical conclusions. Ferguson later admitted his computer model was based on undocumented, 13-year-old computer code designed to deal with the flu and not a 'coronavirus'. Despite pressure from his fellow academics, Ferguson declined to release his original code for peer-review for six weeks and then only a heavily revised version.

So why hasn't Ferguson then been accused of being a 'conspiracy theorist'?

But a government desperate to stave off economic collapse while maintaining control adopted his flawed model to justify lockdowns in the hope they could buy the people off and prop up the economy – to buy some time at least -- with furlough and other incentives. Both 'furlough' and 'lockdown' are, by the way, terms used in the prison system.

As we have already seen in my case and in the examples of 9/11 and 7/7, editors and journalists are more than ready to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with government to ensure that plans which benefit shadowy figures behind the scenes succeed -- no matter how flimsy the evidence on which they are based -- while the truth is suppressed. In this case, that meant that Ferguson's modelling was accepted as gospel truth by mainstream editors and journalists and medical practitioners working in the NHS.

The trouble is borrowing more money can only stave off the fateful day of financial reckoning (see More Government Debt below)

The Government's behaviour in the Lockdowns

While it is clear lockdowns were at least partly introduced as a short-term solution for decades of failed economic policies and to stave off a potential popular uprising -- rather than being a rational response to a disease -- this becomes even more obvious in the light of ministers' attitude to the restrictions they imposed on others.

Media investigations have detailed numerous parties where [members of the government and civil servants are reported to have broken their own rules with regard](#)

to 'Covid19' restrictions. This has been largely confirmed by an official enquiry conducted by Sue Gray, the second permanent secretary at the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities.

The results of her investigation have not though been published in a final report as twelve of the 'gatherings' are 'considered to [have reached the threshold for criminal investigation as a result of the evidence she gathered](#) and are currently under investigation by the Metropolitan Police.

They are summarised below:

First UK National Lockdown

24 March to 23 June 2020

15 May 2020: PM Boris Johnson and his wife Carrie were covertly photographed drinking wine at a party on the terrace in the Number 10 garden. It also shows the PM's principal private secretary, Martin Reynolds, and his then chief adviser, Dominic Cummings, and groups of other staff speaking around tables.

20 May 2020: the PM has admitted to being at a 'bring your own booze' gathering in the Downing Street Garden, arranged by his principal private secretary.

19 June 2020: Downing Street have confirmed that on 19 June 2020 there was a gathering in the cabinet room in Number 10 to mark the prime minister's 56th birthday with his wife and 30 other people present.

Second UK National Lockdown

5 November to 2 December 2020

13 November 2020: Dominic Cummings has alleged that a party took place in the Downing Street flat where the PM lives with his wife but the PM has denied this.

25 November 2020: The Treasury has confirmed 'impromptu drinks' occurred while working on the spending review at which a reported two dozen individuals were present.

27 November 2020: the PM is reported to have made a speech at another leaving party for a member of staff.

After second lockdown ended but many restrictions remained in place including social distancing, various parties are reported to have taken place involving civil servants and -- separately -- staff at Conservative HQ on **10 December 2020, 14 December 2020, 15**

December 2020, 16 December 2020, 17 December 2020 and 18 December 2020

Third National Lockdown

6 January 2021 to 16 July 2021

21 April: 30 Downing Street staff partyied into the early hours at a gathering which took place at Number 10, the night before Prince Philip's funeral, at a time when indoor mixing was banned.

Dates from [Lockdown Timeline, Institute for Government](#)

It is clear from the above that the UK government did not believe that there was a highly contagious disease with a high fatality rate justifying the counter-measures they imposed on the people of this country. Otherwise, they would have actually observed the restrictions to preserve their own health and to not transmit the disease to their loved ones and other individuals they encountered. The fact they frequently flouted them meant they did not see social gatherings as a risk to contracting or transmitting 'Covid-19'.



While the government was putting these adverts out, ministers and civil servants were partying the night away:

This is also proven by photographs of government ministers at various formal functions and conferences where they wore masks and socially distanced for the official pictures then took them off, without observing social distancing, when they thought they weren't being photographed.

The Psy Op

In fact, the inconsistency of the measures they promoted proves they had absolutely nothing to do with public health and everything to do with waging a psychological war on the British people. This pseudo-scientific advice has created divisions between those who have blindly followed government diktat -- wrongly believing their health was at risk -- and those who saw through the faked disease, partly because the counter-measures were so risible -- and tried their best to carry on as normal.

I cite the following examples:

- The Rule of Six meant couples with three children could only meet either nana or grandad but not both at the same time.
- It was illegal to see parents in their back garden but legal to meet them in a pub garden with lots of other people.
- Gyms and exercise classes were forced to close but fast-food outlets were allowed to remain open.
- Individuals had to wear a mask in pubs to get from the door to the table and the table to the toilet -- but not wear one while sitting down.
- People in a Tier 3 area could walk two minutes down the road for a pint in Tier 2.
- In Wales, supermarkets were allowed to stay open but the aisles containing children's clothing and books were taped off.
- Singing in a choir was illegal but not at a football match.
- Having a flask of tea or coffee on a walk meant it was classified as a picnic -- and therefore illegal.
- Two people were allowed to go for a walk on a golf course but if they took clubs and balls, it was an offence.
- One-way systems in shop and pubs ensured that people went everywhere in the establishment.
- People were allowed to work in a room with multiple people for hours but it was illegal to briefly sit on a bench drinking coffee with one of them.
- People were made to form a socially distanced queue at the airport before being sardined into a packed plane with the same people, two hours later.

The fines imposed on the refuseniks have only served to deepen the resentment towards government and its real attitude to its restrictive measures while of course bringing in much-needed revenue to service the government debts run up as a result of ministers' largesse with public money.

The Behavioural Insights Team

The idea that the government's approach to the fake Covid-19 pandemic was a form of psychological warfare is supported by a recent [letter to Parliament's Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee, signed by 40 psychologists](#). They drew attention to the government's campaign of 'grossly unethical' scare tactics, comparing it to 'totalitarian China', citing the example of adverts that used slogans like: 'Stay home to save lives' and 'If you go out and spread it, people will die'.

Sidley and his co-signatories held the Orwellian-sounding Behavioural Insights Team – cosily referred to as the 'Nudge Unit' or 'BI Team' – responsible for the tactics, although it has said it has had no involvement in the adverts and opposes the use of fear in awareness campaigns.

The World Health Organisation defines 'behavioural insight' as:

a term increasingly used within public institutions to **refer to efforts made to gain accurate and evidence-based understanding of how people behave and make decisions**.

Planning, designing and implementing policies and programmes on the basis of this deeper understanding increase their impact.

[Their emphasis]

Co-founded under the auspices of the Cabinet Office in 2010 by behavioural scientist, Simon Rud, the BI Team was part-privatised by the coalition government in 2014. At the time, it represented a new departure in that it was the first time government policy had been farmed out to a privately funded concern. The BI Team is now jointly owned by the charity Nesta, the government and the team's employees, with Nesta providing £1.9million in financing and services.

Nesta was initially set up as the National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts by New Labour in 1998 with £98 million endowment from the UK National Lottery Fund but has since switched from being an independent endowment to a registered charity.

Rud – who is no longer involved -- has accused the Nudge Unit of overemphasising 'propagandistic' modelling and data. This would tie in with what we have already observed with regard to the government adherence to Neil Ferguson's wholly discredited and propagandistic modelling. It is inconceivable that the BI Team has not played a role in policy making on behalf of the government during the fake pandemic, even if it is not – as claimed – directly behind some of the scare tactics.

[The BI Team's glossy website](#) describes how it is a 'global social purpose company with offices around the world' and outlines its approach to individual areas of policy,

including health:

Health

Long, happy and healthy lives should be the standard for everyone, but we are a long way from achieving this. However, we do know that the top contributors to years of life lost are almost all behavioural. [...]

Around the world, healthcare systems face multiple pressures, from ageing populations to antimicrobial resistance. The Covid pandemic has stretched resources even further and highlighted challenges and weaknesses that need urgent attention.

In other words, it sounds like the kind of buzz-word meaningless touchy-feely nonsense that we have come to associate with the study of psychology and the social sciences in academia. The Team's international role may help explain how governments across the world have fallen for the same propaganda regarding the fake pandemic and adopted the same failed policies in dealing with it.

It is notable that the Team has not bothered to check the primary sources with regard to the fake pandemic -- let alone 9/11 or 7/7 -- or consider the stresses and economic inequalities government restrictions in response to it have caused the most vulnerable in society. Nor have the academics it is made up of considered how the mistrust of government built up during the pandemic might have impacted: 'A strong and thriving society [...] [where the bond between citizens and their government is built on mutual trust and understanding](#)', which they promote on the group's website.

Psychology used to be studied to better understand human beings and motivate them to better things in life. In recent years, it seems to have been co-opted by shadowy forces to induce supine compliance with a system designed to exploit and defraud the honest man -- while pretending to help him.

It is also curious how the leaders of these organisations supposedly devoted to caring and the common good have allowed the government to proceed with eugenicist policies reminiscent of the Nazi regime in 1930s Germany (see Use of Midazolam on Care Home Residents below). Although no doubt staffed by self-identifying liberals, the BI Team -- as a privately and government-funded institution -- conforms to Mussolini's definition of fascism as the merger of state and private corporate interests into one power.

8. The Death Toll in Context

We in the World Health Organisation do not advocate lockdowns as the primary means of control of the virus. [...] It seems we may have a doubling of world poverty by next year. We may well have at least a doubling of child malnutrition [...] This is a terrible, ghastly global catastrophe.

No Long-Term or World-Wide Evidence of a Pandemic

Up to 15th January 2022, [official government figures](#) show that there had been 15.2million reported 'cases' attributed to 'Covid-19' in the UK, leading to 152,000 attributed deaths, a 1% death rate among those who caught it and 0.22% rate among the general population of 67million.

Across the world, up to the same date, there had been 328million reported 'cases', leading to 5,540,000 deaths attributed to Covid-19', a death rate of 1.6% among those said to have contracted the disease, or 0.07% of the world's population of 7.8billion.

This puts it toward [the relegation zone in the table of case fatality rates for individual diseases](#), even before we allow for the manipulation of the data by which deaths up to 28 days after a positive PCR test continue to be classified as 'Covid deaths'. When we do, the disease is likely to have a similar fatality case rate to the flu -- of around 0.5%, where people are largely killed by the co-morbidly of pneumonia.

Table showing mean and median averages by sex, distinguishing between deaths due to COVID-19 and all those involving COVID-19


	Median age in years		Mean age in years	
	Involving COVID-19	Due to COVID-19	Involving COVID-19	Due to COVID-19
Persons	83	83	80.3	80.4
Male	81	81	78.6	78.7
Female	85	85	82.3	82.5

Based on deaths registered in England and Wales up to and including week ending 2nd October 2020,
[Freedom of Information request reply](#), 11 January 2021

Covid also has a similar average and median age profile for death with the flu. The median -- the middle value when a data set is ordered from least to greatest -- age of


death both 'involving' and 'due to' 'Covid-19' was 83 and the mean or average age of death was 80.3 'involving' the disease and 80.4 'due to' it. In other words, we have no evidence of anything more severe than a condition which kills off the elderly and infirm, which is entirely routine for illnesses.

Even allowing for excess mortality caused by lockdowns, when examined against age-standardised mortality rates for the last 20 years, the excess mortality in the UK was still lower in 2020 than for the years 2001 to 2007, when there was no alleged pandemic but the seasonal flu existed.



At the same, 2021 -- which had generally less stringent lockdown restrictions than 2020 -- has a lower rate of excess mortality than 2001 to 2010 and is only negligibly different from 2011 to 2018 with the exception of 2015. In other words, there has never been an evidential case for a deadly pandemic.

Because only First World nations have generally carried out draconian lockdowns and similar measures, this slightly elevated excess mortality rate in the UK is not significant in global mortality rates, which for the years 2016-2020 have remained stable at 7.7 deaths per 1,000 people. If there had been a global pandemic driven by a highly contagious disease with severe symptoms causing death then we would expect to see higher excess mortality rates across the planet:



CIA World Factbook, last updated December 2020

Dr Denis Rancourt's findings proving there was no Covid-19 pandemic

Dr Denis Rancourt, a former physics professor at the University of Ottawa in Canada, has published several detailed studies of the raw statistics of excessive death rates from across the Western World during the 'pandemic'. His initial findings, [All-cause mortality during COVID-19: No plague and a likely signature of mass homicide by government response](#), has been available since June 2020, a few months into the 'pandemic'.

They prove that there is no excess mortality for the pandemic and -- where there are spikes of all-cause excess mortality -- they immediately follow the restrictions put in place to supposedly combat the so-called pandemic (see Accounting for the Raised Excessive Death Rate and Use of Midazolam on Care Home Residents below).

Government and media, among others, have no excuse for not knowing the deadly nature of its own 'Covid-19' counter-measures and restrictions, particularly the 'vaccine' and 'vaccine' passes.

Rancourt has published two further studies -- along with Marine Baudin, a researcher at the Laboratory of Biology and Applied Pharmacology at the University of Paris-Saclay in France, and Jérémie Mercier, an independent PhD qualified researcher based in Estonia -- proving that there is no excess mortality caused by Covid-19.

In the first study published, Rancourt et al found that these excess deaths are proportionately [higher in the elderly and young men](#):

Among the most elderly (85+ years), many died from the immediate response to the pandemic that was announced by the WHO on 11 March 2020.

Predominantly young males (0-44 years, and also 45-64 years)

probably indirectly died from the sustained pandemic response, in the summer months of 2020, and into the fall and winter, starting in May 2020, especially in Alberta, significantly in Ontario and British Columbia, whereas not in Quebec.

Denis G Rancourt, Marine Baudin, Jérémie Mercier, [Analysis of all-cause mortality by week in Canada 2010-2021, by province, age and sex:](#), Rancourt's Website, 6 August 2021

In their second study, the authors concluded that:

All-cause mortality by time is the most reliable data for detecting true catastrophic events causing death, and for gauging the population-level impact of any surge in deaths from any cause.

The behaviour of the USA all-cause mortality by time (week, year), by age group, by sex, and by state is **contrary to pandemic behaviour** caused by a new respiratory disease virus for which there is no prior natural immunity in the population.

Its seasonal structure (summer maxima), age-group distribution (young residents), and large state-wise heterogeneity are unprecedented and are opposite to viral respiratory disease behaviour, pandemic or not. We conclude that a pandemic did not occur.

We infer that persistent chronic psychological stress induced by the long-lasting government-imposed societal and economic transformations during the Covid-era converted the existing societal [factors] into **deadly agents**, largely acting together, **with devastating population-level consequences** against large pools of vulnerable and disadvantaged residents of the USA, far above pre-existing pre-Covid-era mortality in those pools.

Denis G Rancourt, Marine Baudin, Jérémie Mercier, [Nature of the COVID-era public health disaster in the USA, from all-cause mortality and socio-geo-economic and climatic data](#), 25 October 2021

Rancourt has also gathered data showing there has never been a rise in all-cause excess mortality for any of the reported pandemics throughout history. In an interview in February 2022 with independent investigator and analyst, James Corbett, Rancourt disproved the [selectively used statistics which claimed to corroborate a deadly pandemic](#) and set them in context. Graphs based on the data he gathered and analysed, discussed in the show, can be downloaded [here](#).


[NOW What About Excess Mortality?](#) - Questions For Corbett No083, The Corbett report, 15 February 2022

In an age of highly politicised science, Rancourt was dismissed by the University of Ottawa in 2008 after [he changed a course to focus 'not just \[on\] how science impacts everyday life but how it relates to greater power structure'](#). He has had to fight many battles with the powers-that-be in an attempt to uphold academic freedom, largely in vain. Like many individuals with an academic background who dissent from the orthodoxy, he has been drummed out of academia for reasons of politics, not the quality of his work. This once again demonstrates the bias that prevails against the truth in the academic system, which is funded by large corporations, both public and private.

His findings are part of [the proof that germ theory is wrong because there is no evidence of excess mortality at the time of pandemics](#) (see Rebutting Germ Theory below).

Accounting for the Raised Excessive Death Rate

The graph below is based on official government figures for deaths in the UK in the years 2020 and 2021.



It is absolutely clear that deaths in both the years 2020 and 2021 were close to the

five-year average indicated by the dashed blackline -- apart from the periods when the government obliged people to live under unusual and extreme lockdown measures:

- 24 March to 23 June 2020
- 5 November to 2 December 2020, although many restrictions remained in place afterwards:
 - 21 December: Tier 4 restrictions came into force in London and South East England
 - 26 December: More areas of England entered tier 4 restrictions
- Third Lockdown in England, beginning on 6 January 2021, lasting until July

In October 2020, Dr David Nabarro, the World Health Organisation special envoy for Covid-19, warned that the organisation did not advocate lockdowns as the best way to manage Covid and warned they could cause a 'global catastrophe':

We in the World Health Organisation do not advocate lockdowns as the primary means of control of the virus. [...] It seems we may have a doubling of world poverty by next year. We may well have at least a doubling of child malnutrition [...] This is a terrible, ghastly global catastrophe.

[WHO Covid-19 envoy David Nabarro with Andrew Neil](#)

The Week in 60 Minutes #6, Spectator TV, 8 October 2020

A UN report from April 2020 warned of [100,000s of children being killed](#) by the economic impact of lockdowns, while [tens of millions more](#) were said to face poverty and famine. The world body also said in its risk report that nearly 369 million children across 143 countries who normally relied on school meals for a reliable source of daily nutrition had been forced to look elsewhere.

Around the same time, Mark Reger, a professor of psychiatry and behavioural sciences at the University of Washington School of Medicine, applied the findings of existing research into the association between sustained economic stress and severe mental health problems to the psychological effects of the restrictions brought in to combat 'Covid-19'. As a result of his study, he predicted higher suicide rates induced by the increased economic pressures as a result of social distancing and closures of public institutions:

There are fears that the combination of cancelled public events, closed businesses, and shelter-in-place strategies will lead to a recession. Economic downturns are usually associated with higher suicide rates compared with periods of relative prosperity.

Since the Covid-19 crisis, businesses have faced adversity and laying

off employees. Schools have been closed for indeterminable periods, forcing some parents and guardians to take time off work.

Therefore, from a suicide prevention perspective, it is concerning that the most critical public health strategy for the Covid-19 crisis is social distancing.

Mark A Reger et al, [Suicide Mortality and Coronavirus Disease 2019—A Perfect Storm?](#) April 10, 2020

People's inability to earn a living; see family and friends or attend church and social events; have autonomy over their own lives; or see any hope for their own and others' futures can have a devastating impact on their mental health.

There was never any evidence therefore to show that locking down – or imprisoning the British people under house arrest, a tactic of totalitarian governments – would ever help prevent the spread of a disease, which -- it was become ever more apparent at the time -- was no more contagious or deadly than the seasonal flu.

Ministers cannot therefore say they weren't warned of the likely effect of their restrictions on the mental health of the population, which are already beginning to put enormous strain on already struggling health and social care systems from the economic devastation and the unemployment associated with it.

These in turn have led to [suicide](#), alcoholism, drug use and other social/mental health crises spiking all over the world.

At the same time, the restrictions brought about by the fake pandemic has hit women particularly hard on a global level. [According to a report by the charity Oxfam](#) published in April 2021, the crisis has meant that more than 64 million jobs done by women were lost, costing them at least \$800 billion (£592billion) in lost income in 2020, a 5% loss -- compared to a 3.9% loss for men -- more than the combined GDP of 98 countries.

The conservative estimate doesn't even include wages lost by the millions of women working in the informal economy — domestic workers, market vendors and garment workers — who had been sent home or whose hours and wages had been drastically cut.

At the same time. missed and [delayed surgeries](#) and [screenings](#) as a result of the government's draconian Covid-19 counter-measures -- which were fully supported by the Labour opposition -- are likely to have already increased mortality from heart disease, cancer etc. Even as the restrictions were relaxed, many more people are likely to have suffered early death or increased adverse effects from severe disease as a result of continuing to be denied treatment because already stretched health and care resources have been ascribed to the mass 'vaccination' programme and treating

the severe adverse reactions the jab has caused in some.

Flawed Formal Study into Covid-19 Cases and Lockdowns

In January 2022, four economists published the results of their meta-analysis study of other research from across the world into the effects of lockdowns on the mortality rate from 'Covid-19'. They concluded that lockdowns – along with mask wearing and social distancing -- had a negligible 0.2% reduction in deaths attributed to the so-called disease. They concluded that:

While this meta-analysis concludes that lockdowns have had little to no public health effects, they have imposed enormous economic and social costs where they have been adopted. In consequence, lockdown policies are ill-founded and should be rejected as a pandemic policy instrument.

Ambika Kandasamy, Jonas Herby, Lars Jonung and Steve H Hanke,
[A Literature Review and Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Lockdowns on Covid-19 Mortality](#), Studies in Applied Economics No200, January 2022

The paper has not been peer-reviewed. Critics have also accused the authors of 'cherry-picking' studies – which we have referred to in this paper as 'the selective use of evidence' -- to suit their narrative as they originally identified 18,590 studies into lockdowns, which they then whittled down to just 24 to establish their findings. The authors may also have been guilty of 'confirmation bias' – seeking only evidence which confirms their hypothesis -- as they have been vocal critics of lockdown policy.

In any case, their findings are meaningless because they only consider deaths attributed to 'Covid-19' and don't review lockdowns in the light of all-cause mortality and as the cause of other non-fatal conditions highlighted above. The authors do not consider the inflated death toll from the PCR test in which deaths up to 28 days after a positive test are put down to 'Covid-19'. Or the unreliable and unscientific nature of the test. Or question the existence of a disease caused by a single virus, which had been isolated.

The mild success the authors attribute to other counter-measures like closing schools -- a claimed 4.4% drop in fatalities -- and shops – a 10.6% reduction – are therefore also absolutely meaningless without reference to these other factors.

It is both abundantly and incontrovertibly clear that draconian lockdowns -- combined with other government-promoted Covid counter-initiatives like social distancing -- made a greater contribution to any excessive deaths than a mild disease with a fatality rate and profile no different from the seasonal flu.

But what happened in lockdown specifically that could cause such a massive spike in excess deaths?

Use of Midazolam on Care Home Residents

During the three lockdowns, there was a huge spike in deaths occurring in care homes, attributed to 'Covid-19' but more likely down to a deliberate programme of euthanasia, using Midazolam. [According to the Office for National Statistics \(ONS\)](#) s there were 26,541 deaths in care homes in the first full month of lockdown, an increase of 17,850 on the five-year average (see Table below), or around three times as many deaths.

Sold under the brand name Versed, among others, Midazolam is a benzodiazepine or depressant medication used for anaesthesia, procedural sedation, trouble sleeping and severe agitation. It is a commonly used drug in palliative – or end of life care. It has even been used in execution by lethal injection in the US.

	Month of occurrence	Five-year average (2015-2019)		2020	
		Home	Care home	Home	Care home
England	January	11,503.8	12,059.4	11,319	10,831
England	February	9,897.0	10,022.2	10,348	9,522
England	March	10,316.6	10,166.6	12,766	11,827
England	April	9,384.6	8,691.0	16,909	26,541
England	May	9,491.4	8,401.0	13,308	13,953
England	June	8,917.0	7,809.2	12,096	7,971
England	July	9,191.0	8,089.0	11,832	7,557
England	August	9,093.6	8,169.0	11,663	7,838
England	September	8,877.2	8,099.4	11,130	7,775
England	October	9,779.0	9,239.2	12,500	9,119
England	November	10,002.4	9,372.2	12,365	9,676
England	December	11,135.0	10,830.0	12,657	10,335

On the 19th March, [the NHS sent out a directive which required hospitals to discharge all patients who they deemed to not require a hospital bed](#). They declared that transfers from the ward must happen within one hour of that decision being made to a designated discharge area, and that discharge from hospital should happen within two hours – which looks like indecent haste. At the same time, NHS trusts were told that 'they must adhere' to the new directive. It freed up so many beds that bed occupancy from April to June 2020 was 30% down on the previous year.

At the same time, Matt Hancock, then health minister, [ordered a two-year supply of Midazolam](#) to be used according to the protocols laid down in the [National Institute for Health and Care Excellence guidance NG163 and NG31](#) for 'the last hours and days of life', where – at least in theory -- the disease, whatever it was, was proving to be

fatal.

After a month of lockdown, eleven consultants, doctors, medical academics and others wrote to the British Medical Journal to express concerns about the protocols for using the drug:

The earlier NICE guideline NG31 (2015) for symptom management at the end of life was based on studies [...from which] the evidence base was so poor that it did not publish detailed recommendations for drugs and doses.

We are unaware of more recent high-quality research evidence that NICE [the National Institute for Clinical Excellence] could have used to produce such specific drug and dosing recommendations now for Covid-19 patients.

Professor Emeritus Sam H Ahmedzai et al, The University of Sheffield, [Letter to the BMJ](#), 20 April 2020

The letter further explained that the NG31 guidelines were aimed at care of people who were likely to die imminently – usually from the advanced stages of diseases like cancer, from which recovery was highly unlikely. The letter went on:

It takes great skill and experience to use palliative sedation proportionately so that extreme physical and existential distress are palliated, but death is not primarily accelerated. NG163 states:

Sedation and opioid use should not be withheld because of a fear of causing respiratory depression.

If Covid-19 infection were uniformly fatal, this would be an acceptable statement. But for people not previously known to be at the end of life, there is potential risk of unintended serious harm, if these medications are used incorrectly and without the benefit of specialist palliative care advice.

[Ibid](#)

This is polite language for saying that any recommended doses of Midazolam were not based on sound science and would likely kill patients who were not otherwise at risk of imminent death. In law, this constitutes the offence of murder. By October 2020, the supply of Midazolam had been used up – hence the increased excess rate of death at the time -- meaning that the UK government had to order further supplies from France, presumably in time for the second and third lockdowns, where excessive deaths once again spiked.

At the same time, an Amnesty report [condemned the blanket use of 'Do Not Resuscitate' orders in Care homes in the UK](#). A month later, it was followed up by a

[report from the Care Quality Commission](#), which [found](#) 34% of Health and Social Care workers said they had felt pressured to place 'Do Not Resuscitate' orders on care home residents without informing the resident or their loved ones. In addition, [the government banned people from visiting care homes](#) and had by this time indemnified NHS workers for liability for any injury they caused [under section 11\(1\) of the 2020 Corona Act](#).

In other words, government directives were designed to ensure that people were hastily put into care homes without access to loved ones so they could be killed more easily by doctors and nurses who had been legally indemnified for their actions. This does not though give them an immunity for the crime of murder. This smacks of the kind of eugenics practiced by the regime in Nazi Germany in the 1930s and 40s, where those deemed imperfect or inferior were culled by psychopathic doctors without consequence under the legal system of the day. (Many of them were though put to death after being found guilty of crimes against humanity at the post-war Nuremberg trials).

But it is not the only example of this kind of behaviour practiced by the British government during the fake pandemic.

In December 2021, The Telegraph newspaper reported that children with learning disabilities had been offered DNRs during the first year of the fake pandemic. It cited the case of Oliver Corns – who had been diagnosed as an infant with a learning disability and congenital classic autism, which cannot in any way be said to be fatal conditions. During the pandemic, his doctor offered him a DNR to not apply CPR -- Cardiopulmonary resuscitation -- in the event of heart failure even though he was only 15. At the same time, the jab has been cited as a cause of unusual cardiac arrest in the young. You don't have to be a conspiracy theorist to see what is going on here.

Investigations Team, [Children with learning disabilities offered 'do not resuscitate' orders during Covid pandemic](#), 21 December 2021


On 21 December 2021, the People's Union of Britain – Common Law advocacy trust -- submitted its case to Westminster Magistrates' Court to take out a private prosecution against government ministers for their part in the Midazolam Murders. It has the support of a leading criminal prosecution barrister, among others, and is now finally being investigated by the Metropolitan police.

9. Economic Impact of Lockdowns

When plunder becomes a way of life for a group of men in a society, over the course of time they create for themselves a legal system that authorises it and a moral code that glorifies it

Frédéric Bastiat

The government's own research shows that the magnitude of the recession caused by 'the pandemic' is unprecedented in modern times. As we have already demonstrated, there never was a novel disease or 'pandemic'. This recession is entirely attributable to the government's lockdowns and other restrictions on the rights and liberties of the British people to earn a living and spend their income in ways they see fit. As we have already established, there has never been any reasonable justification for them.



[Coronavirus: Economic impact, Research Briefing](#), last updated on 17 December, 2021

During the first lockdown from March to June 2020, UK GDP fell 25% in two months before subsequent lockdowns meant it fell again. According to the Office for National Statistics, GDP fell by 9.7% for the whole year, as all sectors of the economy were affected by the plummeting demand during the lockdown and other government-enforced measures to counter the fake pandemic. It was the biggest fall in annual GDP since the [Great Frost of 1709](#), when the economy shrank by 13%.

After a brief recovery in spring 2021 growth slowed again in the summer and autumn but ended the year showing 7% growth. As of February 2022, the UK's GDP was still though 0.5% lower than before the pandemic. However, this does not reflect the need of the economy to grow at the long-run trend rate of 2.5% to maintain living

standards while paying off the interest on the national debt to stop the deficit from rising, the rate at which the country is getting into debt.


These growth figures also fail to reflect the fact that any increase in the size of the economy goes disproportionately to the wealthiest in society at the expense of the value of the labour of the poorest.

Government spending increased £315 billion in the form of subsidies to businesses, furlough to households and increased spending on public services and other commitments at this time. This meant the government ran up another £299 billion of debt in the first year of the pandemic or up to March 2021 which sent UK borrowing to its highest level since records began. At the same time, the government's budget deficit, reached a peacetime record in 2020/21 at 15.1% of GDP. Economists believe the government will have to borrow less in the financial year to April 2022 but the figure could still exceed £200 billion.

Another direct effect of lockdown and other restrictions will be a fall in tax revenue as a result of businesses shutting down or making lower profits and individuals becoming unemployed.

Impact on Households

As a result of the economic devastation caused by the fake pandemic, the government has raised national insurance meaning the average Briton will have to pay £214 a year more in contributions. At the same time, [inflation is running at 5.4%, the highest since March 1992.](#)



According to the consumer price index, food prices went up 4.2% year-on-year, the highest increase since September 2013 while petrol and diesel prices are at their highest ever.

Rising fuel bills

Energy bills are set to rise drastically after the energy regulator Ofgem announced its cap on prices would rise by 54% in April 2022. The average household's annual energy bill between £1,277 and £1,370 — will be raised by 54%, marking a record-breaking average increase of £700 for the 22million households across Britain. The poorest in the UK -- who are made to pay for their energy upfront and are charged more as a result — will be hit even harder.

At the same time, fossil fuel giant BP recorded a £9.5 billion underlying replacement cost profit — its preferred measure — for 2021 from losses of £4.2 billion the previous year, running up £3.01billion of profit in the final three months of 2021 - up from just £85.1 million a year earlier.

The company also announced more cash returns for shareholders, with another £1.1billion of share buybacks before its first-quarter 2022 results and a dividend payout of 3.37p a share for the fourth quarter, adding to the chasm in division of wealth between the haves and have-nots.

Rising house prices

Figures gathered by the building society Nationwide show house prices rose by 11.2%, year-on-year to January 2022, the highest annual rise for a January since 2004, and by 0.8% for the month.

The average price of a property in the UK rose to £255,556 over the month-- up from £254,822. During the pandemic, asset inflation in the housing market far outstripped any rises in wages. The transfer of wealth to the rich has enabled them to invest their gains in buy-to-let schemes and other property ventures.

The building society's chief economist, [Robert Gardner told the BBC that](#) a deposit now constitutes a record percentage of a first-time buyer's salary:

A 10% deposit on a typical first-time buyer home is now equivalent to 56% of total gross annual earnings, a record high. Similarly, a typical mortgage payment as a share of take-home pay is now above the long-run average, despite mortgage rates remaining close to all-time lows.

Although the base rate was slashed to 0.1% in 2020 in an effort to lessen the

consequences of the government's restrictions on economic activity to deal with the fake pandemic, the Bank of England raised it to 0.25% in December 2021 to combat surging inflation and again two months later (see More Government Debt below)

SMEs

The rise in interest rates will have an enormous effect on small and medium sized businesses or SMEs, which were already struggling as a result of the fake pandemic. According to a survey carried out by insurer, Simply Business, published in June 2021, [The impact of Covid-19 on UK Small Business](#), the fake pandemic will cost SMEs an estimated £126.6 billion – double what the business owners predicted it would cost them when first asked in 2020 and just short of twice the £69 billion forecast by the government.

With around 5.5 million SMEs in the UK – accounting for over 99% of all businesses, 33% of employment and 21% of all turnover – this £126.6 billion hole in the incomes of small businesses will in future severely impact the UK economy. At the same time, the Office for National Statistics reported there would likely be [50% more business closures in the UK in the third quarter of 2021 than for the same period in 2020](#).

At the same time, that most middle class of corporate retailers, Marks and Spencers, saw profits before tax and adjustments [leap from £176 million to £269million, an increase of a staggering 53%](#).

More Government Debt

Up until lockdown, the UK government had borrowed £445billion in 'quantitative easing' – where the Bank of England creates more money -- following the economic crisis of 2008/9. As a result of lockdown and other restrictions, the government had to borrow another £450billion in the three months following it. These loans incur compound interest – interest on the interest.

Going into the pandemic, government debt was equivalent to around 80% of GDP, [it is now 95% of GDP](#).

In 1997, the entire national debt stood at around £350billion. This means that as a result of restrictions due to fake 'Covid pandemic', the government has had to borrow 128% more money in a three-month period than the entire national debt – run up over 300 years -- a generation previously. In real terms, the economy has not grown and cannot grow to keep pace with real rising debt levels of that scale.

Rising interest rates

On 3 February 2022, the Bank of England again raised the base rate to 0.5%, meaning an already heavily indebted nation will face higher debt repayment prices. At the same, the central bank forecast that unemployment would likely increase from 4.1% to 5% in 2023, growth in GDP would fall to 1% in the next two years. Following the BoE's Monetary Policy Committee meeting, which raised the interest rates, the bank disclosed that four out of the nine committee members wanted to bump the rate to 0.75%.

That said, high street banks are in any case preparing for the base rate to treble to 0.75% by the end of the year. This will have enormous consequences on corporate and individual debt, particularly with regard to mortgages as repayments will rise. It will also begin to impact stocks and shares, which went up during the pandemic because companies and directors were able to borrow at record low interest rates and buy their own shares. Any rise in interest rates will limit this practice meaning that company share prices are likely to fall.

The surge in global inflation means the Bank of England is not alone in raising base interest rates. Three central banks who regulate the flow of cash in their respective societies -- the US Federal Reserve, the European Central Bank and the Bank of Japan -- are about to embark on 'the largest quantitative tightening in history', [according the analysts at Morgan Stanley](#), the multi-national, US-based investment bank. Financiers are estimating that \$2.2 trillion worth of will disappear from the wider economy during 2022.

The Federal Reserve, which is neither part of the US government nor a reserve, is now expected to raise US interest rates five times this year, which would be the fastest since 2005-06, while the ECB is likely to shortly deliver its first rise in a decade.

Deed of Indemnity

In April 2021, Dr Will Bateman, Associate Professor, Australian National University, [submitted written evidence to a parliamentary enquiry](#) into QE. He called for the Deed of Indemnity between the Bank of England's subsidiary Asset Purchasing Facility and HM Treasury which had been kept secret because it forms -- at least in part -- the legal basis of QE. His submission was included in the House of Lords report into the 'dangerous addiction' of QE, published in July 2021:

The 'secrecy' of the document is an 'extraordinary feature of the UK's quantitative easing programme'. It 'is a contractual document between two governmental institutions which commits the UK's taxpayers to potentially enormous liability and appears to authorise quantitative easing in the UK. It should be published.

Par 153, Quantitative easing: a dangerous addiction? HOUSE OF LORDS Economic Affairs Committee, [1st Report of Session 2021–22](#), 16 July 2021

It is often difficult to understand financial language as it is enshrouded in legalese, that language of the legal system which uses English words but often with different meanings. While an indemnity is normally a form of security -- an agreement to pay any debt run up by another person, for example -- in this context, it has a specific meaning:

1.1 Security against or exemption from legal liability for one's actions.

'a deed of indemnity'

1.2 A sum of money paid as compensation, especially one paid by a country defeated in war as a condition of peace.

[Lexicon, Oxford English Dictionary](#)

Until the deed is published, we cannot know for certain but it appears that the agreement formally binds the taxpayer to servicing the national debt directly to the Bank of England --with the implication he has lost a war!

It is reasonable to conclude that lockdowns and other counter-measures created in response to the fake pandemic have caused permanent damage to the real economy, transferring the nation's collective wealth to the Bank of England, which is managed by a private corporation, the Bank of England Nominees, set up in 1977. Its two shareholders' names remain secret, unlike all other company shareholders in the UK.

p19, Money and Debt, [The Truth Manifesto](#), Stephen Hopwood, May 2010 – ghost-written by me

Follow the Money: the Main Beneficiaries


'Follow the money' or 'Cui bono?' is often given as advice to aspiring journalists or investigators. Not surprisingly, the 'vaccine' producers have seen the greatest rise in income and profit since the start of the fake pandemic or 'scamdemic', as it is known in certain circles.

According to a [Resolution Foundation Study](#) published in July 2021 the 'Covid'-inspired QE resulting from lockdown benefited the richest 10% of people in the UK who gained £50,000 during the recession, compared to a negligible average gain of £86 for individuals in the poorest 30% of the population, mainly as a result of soaring property prices, while:

- The richest fifth of households were four times as likely to have increased their savings during the crisis when compared with the poorest fifth
- The gap between the wealthiest 10% and average households rose by 44,000 pounds
- The gap between the average and the poorest 10th of households grew by 7,000 pounds

This report was completed before payments of £20 a week were cut from universal credit by the Conservative government in October 2021. The outlook for the less well-off has therefore never looked more bleak as a result of the government's manufactured pandemic and the media's support for it.

At the same time in the UK, [the number of billionaires grew from 147 to 171](#), the highest ever.



Meanwhile, [according to Forbes Magazine](#), the 10 richest men in the world doubled their wealth during the fake pandemic, with Elon Musk becoming the World's Richest Man with a fortune of \$294.2billion (£217.7billion), up a staggering 1,016%, or nine-fold increase since March 2020 while Bill Gates -- once the World's Richest Man and No2 at the start of the pandemic-- increased his wealth by around a third to £137.4billion (£101.7billion), the lowest increase among the Top Ten.

[The World's Billionaires' List, The Richest in 2021](#), Forbes

Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg doubled his wealth to \$117.7billion (£87billion). However, in February 2020, Facebook -- now Meta -- lost more than quarter of its market capitalisation -- or company value -- in a day, the largest ever single-day fall in

value by a US company.

According to the financial news agency [Bloomberg](#), in February 2022, Meta CEO Mark Zuckerberg lost \$29.8 billion in a single day, the second-largest, single-day loss in history – beaten only by the \$35 billion that Elon Musk lost in November 2021 after he tweeted about selling 10% of his Tesla stake. Musk also lost \$25.8 billion from his net worth that week.

That still leaves both of them with far more wealth than they had at the beginning of the fake pandemic in March 2020.

Big Pharma, Big Profit, Big Influence

The other beneficiaries of the fake pandemic are obviously the pharmaceutical giants involved in supplying novel, experimental 'vaccines' which reportedly treat 'Covid-19'. Given that Moderna and BioNTech have no other significant commercial products besides the 'Covid-19 vaccines', their total profit margins result almost entirely from the mRNA jab.

Although Pfizer sells multiple products, the Covid vaccine has been an enormous windfall for the company. The figures here are based on the latest company reports on the financial forecasts from the third quarter of 2021 based on [vaccine sales up to 30 September 2021](#):

- Pfizer forecast \$36billion – around £26.4billion -- in revenue from vaccine sales in 2021 at a projected profit of at least \$9 (£6.66billion) before tax, based on a conservative 25% profit margin.
- BioNTech forecast €16-17 billion (£13.4-£14.3billion) in revenue from sales, a projected €12.3 billion (£10.3billion) at least in pre-tax profit before tax, based on a similar 77% profit margin, recorded in the third quarter of 2021.
- Moderna forecast \$15-18 billion (£11.1-£13.3billion) revenue, a projected pre-tax profit of \$10.5billion (£5.8billion) based on the its 70% profit margin recorded in the third quarter of 2021.

The research is based on the following:

- Pfizer's gross profit from the revenue is split 50/50 with BioNTech.
- Pfizer's guidance for its income before tax after the above -- was 'high-20s' as a percentage of revenue.
- In the 9 months ending 30 September 2021, BioNTech made €10.3 billion profit before tax on €13.4 billion revenue, giving a 77 percent profit margin.
- Moderna's profit before tax for the nine months ending 30 September 2021 was \$7.8 billion on \$11.2 billion revenue giving a pre-tax profit margin of 70

percent.

This dwarfs Big Tobacco's profit margin of 44% -- comparable to medical and science research publications -- and the financial services sector at 26%. The average company profit margin is 8% for all companies -- 7% excluding financial services. The median industry profit margin is 6%. Big Oil/Gas makes around 5.6% in average profits.

[Stern database, New York University](#), January 2018

Analysis of production techniques for the leading mRNA type vaccines produced by Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna by mRNA scientists at Imperial college [suggest these vaccines could be made for as little as \\$1.20 \(88p\) a dose](#), meaning they have a 24 times mark-up. Although I cannot find a primary source for this claim, it is consistent with the excessive profit margins we have examined above.

Despite benefiting from \$8.3billion (£6.1billion) of public investment in the development of their 'vaccines', Big Pharma companies have not paid their fair share of taxes. In the first half of 2021, Moderna paid a 7% US tax rate and Pfizer paid a 15% tax rate, well below the US statutory rate of 21%.

In 2005, the book [The Truth About the Drug Companies: how they deceive us and what to do about it](#) by Dr Marcia Angell -- a senior lecturer at Harvard Medical School and former editor in chief of the prestigious New England Journal of Medicine -- was published. The NEJM [also reviewed the book](#). Angell's research showed that:

[In 2002,] the combined profits for the ten drug companies in the Fortune 500 (\$35.9 billion) were more than the profits for all the other 490 businesses put together (\$33.7 billion).

Over the past two decades the pharmaceutical industry has moved very far from its original high purpose of discovering and producing useful new drugs. Now primarily a marketing machine to sell drugs of dubious benefit, this industry uses its wealth and power to co-opt every institution that might stand in its way, including the US Congress, the FDA, academic medical centres, and the medical profession itself.

Though this revealing book was published in 2005, the major corruption in the pharmaceutical industry it exposes has, if anything, [become far deeper and wide-spread](#). Big Pharma also spends a small fortune lobbying -- some would say bribing -- governments and advertising in the media to keep it onside.

According to Angell, the pharmaceutical industry's US trade association has the largest lobby in Washington, the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America. In 2002, it employed 675 lobbyists -- including 26 former members of Congress -- at a

cost of more than \$91 million, meaning that Big Pharma has consistently returned average profits of 17% in the past, 250% higher than the company average.

The novel gene rewriting jobs have proved to be the new gold mine for Big Pharma as they are free – at point of entry – to the recipient but funded in reality by the taxpayer.

See also a 10-page summary of [The Truth about the Drug Companies](#) by the author and mainstream articles about the corrupt pharmaceutical industry

Sharon Begley, [Why Almost Everything You Hear About Medicine Is Wrong](#), Newsweek, 24 January 2011

Sharyl Attkisson, [How Independent Are Vaccine Defenders?](#) CBS News, 25 July 2008

Tae Kim, [Goldman Sachs asks in biotech research report: 'Is curing patients a sustainable business model?'](#) CNBC News, 11 April 2018

[The Genome Revolution](#), Goldman Sachs, 25 June 2018

Despite inducements to get jabbed on the part of politicians, journalists, broadcasters and celebrities – otherwise ‘you might kill granny’ – there has never been any evidence that the mRNA jab stopped contraction or transmission of ‘Covid-19’ nor did the manufacturers ever make that claim. But they still made the enormous profits cited above on the jabs they manufactured because politicians, journalists and celebrities did. In fact, no one anywhere in the mainstream media mentioned that the jab did not stop transmission -- ever -- even though it was the sole lawful basis for the threatened mandating of the mRNA jab.

At the same time, the lobbying activities of Big Pharma account for the prevalence and publicity given to vaccinations, when there is little evidence that they provide any protection from disease or ever have.

In March 2020, a study conducted by Dr Michael L Anderson, PhD -- an associate professor in the department of agricultural and resource economics at the University of California, Berkeley -- evaluating 170 million care episodes and 7.6 million deaths concluded [that increased vaccination rates among adults aged 65 years and older did not reduce hospitalisations or mortalities](#).

The lobbying and advertising funded by Big Pharma’s high profit margins explains why the theory of viruses causing and transmitting disease has been allowed to thrive, despite having no credible evidential basis and why diseases have not been cured. If, though, there are no viruses to inject against, there is no purpose for any kind of vaccine or similar jab.

The germ theory of transmission has also likely been quietly allowed to proceed by Big Oil/Gas, the industry with one of the highest turnovers in the world, which has governments in its thrall because every company relies on its products to survive – along with every human being living in an industrialised society. It has been happy to let the germ theory of disease prosper unquestioned because its fossil fuel products are the principal cause of the toxins polluting the environment leading to a variety of diseases and health conditions. At the same time, the toxic by-products of the industry are sold to pharmaceutical companies as the basis for its treatments.

£37billion Test and Trace

However, the pharmaceutical industry was not the only corporate sector to benefit from the government's largesse with taxpayers' money. In May 2020, NHS Test and Trace (NHST&T) was set up – solely to operate in England and not the other home nations -- with an initial budget of £15 billion, rising to £22bn in November 2020 in the hope that an effective test and trace system would help avoid a second national lockdown. Even though it was later allocated a further £15 billion -- bringing its total budget to £37 billion over two years -- the UK went through two further lockdowns.

The system was designed to work in conjunction with the NHS Covid-19 app, which was originally announced for mid-May 2020 but subsequently delayed due to technical issues during its testing phase.

The idea was that the app would communicate via Bluetooth with other phones which had downloaded the app in the near vicinity. If the user then tested positive for 'Covid-19', they would use the app to inform a central server, which would 'ping' the other users of the app who has been in the vicinity of the 'infected person' and they would all have to self-isolate for a legally mandated ten days.

At one point in the summer of 2021, it nearly caused a national disaster as supply chains were threatened due to around a fifth of the workforce being absent in self-isolation as a result of being pinged. As time went on, users deleted the app rather than risk ten days of self-isolation, if they displayed no symptoms of being ill.

It was worked in conjunction with QR codes at venues like bars, restaurants and clubs. Although the government tried to make this mandatory, in many venues, 'test and trace' often became individuals writing their mobile phone number down on a piece of paper.

The scheme was designed to also work in conjunction with testing centres set up across the UK, funded from the £37billion budget.

From the outset Test and Trace was beset by allegations of 'cronyism' when it

emerged that seven in ten of the associated [contracts had been awarded without competitive tender](#) and that the scheme was headed by Conservative peer Dido Harding, the wife of a Tory MP, despite having no experience in public health.

Civil liberties campaigners also saw it as a totalitarian attempt to unreasonably monitor the movements and relationships of individuals.

On 10 March 2021, the parliamentary, Public Accounts Committee published its report on the NHS's Track and Trace System. It concluded that there was still no evidence that it made any contribution to reducing infection levels, when compared to other measures introduced to tackle the 'Covid-19' pandemic. And that its expense to the taxpayer could not be justified.

In March 2021, the Committee concluded the following:

NHST&T publishes a lot of performance data but these do not demonstrate how effective test and trace is at reducing transmission of Covid-19.

NHST&T still struggles to consistently match supply and demand for its test and trace services, resulting in either sub-standard performance or surplus capacity.

Although it had to act quickly to scale up the service, NHST&T is still overly reliant on expensive contractors and temporary staff.

The introduction of rapid-results testing was supposed to be a 'gamechanger' but confusion persists over why and how it should be used in different community settings.

Conclusions, ['Unimaginable' cost of Test & Trace failed to deliver central promise of averting another lockdown](#), Public Accounts Committee Report, 21 March 2021

Meg Hillier MP, Chair of the Public Accounts Committee, said:

The £22 billion for test and trace is about the annual budget of the Department for Transport. Test and Trace still continues to pay for management consultants at £1,000 a day.

DHSC [Department of Health and Social Care] and NHST&T must rapidly turn around these fortunes and begin to demonstrate the worth and value of this staggering investment of taxpayers' money. [..]

British taxpayers cannot be treated by Government like an ATM machine. We need to see a clear plan and costs better controlled.

[Ibid](#)

Ministers also wasted £8.7billion of taxpayers' money on unusable personal protective equipment which was not up to standard with a total of £12.1billion being spent on PPE in the first year of the 'pandemic' alone. At the same time, the UK government spent billions of pounds ordering 540million doses of eight different Covid vaccines, whose efficacy and safety has never been evidentially established -- in response to a 'virus' which we have seen doesn't exist.

It is no wonder that corporations see government as a cash cow, ever ready to dish out the taxes of those who pay a higher proportion of their income to the state, the less well off, who get less and less in return in terms of value for money, as a result. Curiously though, the magic money tree's fruit can always be picked when big corporations like finance houses need a cash injection or a bail out.

10. Covid, 5G and Wireless Radiation

I had the opportunity to be zapped by one of these systems. I stood about a half-mile from the source and the beam was turned on. The portion of my body exposed to the beam got hot really quickly, and I immediately stepped out of the beam. The feeling was as though someone had just opened the door of a large furnace right by me.

Background

Given that the Wuhan sickness was first observed a couple months after the 5G was first turned on there and was [also reported on the Princess Diamond cruise ship which had introduced 5G](#), some individuals reasonably suggested there might be a relationship between the two, especially as the symptoms attributed to 'Covid-19': nausea; digestive problems; muscle pain; tachycardia; hypotension; cardiac arrhythmias; strokes and seizures have been reported by people suffering the adverse effects of wifi radiation.

But before we examine how these concerns were dealt with by the media, let us first examine the overwhelming and absolutely concrete evidence which demonstrates that Wifi -- also known as electromagnetic frequencies or EMFs -- causes harm to the health of human beings.

5G set in context

There is no evidence showing that EMFs are safe. On the contrary, the available evidence shows that Wifi radiation can cause all sorts of diseases and other adverse conditions in relation to it. In an extensive review of the medical literature concerning the effects of EMF, Dr Martin L Pall, professor emeritus of biochemistry and basic medical sciences at Washington State University, concluded:

Putting in tens of millions of 5G antennae without a single biological test of safety has got to be about the stupidest idea anyone has had in the history of the world.

Martin L Pall, [5G: Great risk for EU, U.S. and International Health!](#)
Washington State University, 17 May 2018

His report discusses specific health effects of radio frequency energy, and why 5G is different and potentially more dangerous. He lists hundreds of studies on the effects of microwave energy on biological systems. Most of those studies, linking cell phones to cancer, autism and other disorders are known. Most astonishing is that no one independent of the telecommunications industry has yet tested the effects of pulsed 5G energy to determine its biological effects.

In his report, Pall concludes that there is a high level of scientific certainty, for each of eight pathophysiological effects caused by non-thermal microwave frequency EMF exposures, providing a substantial body of evidence on the existence of each effect. I quote them verbatim. EMFs:

- attack our nervous systems including our brains leading to widespread neurological/neuropsychiatric effects and possibly many other effects. This nervous system attack is of great concern;
- attack our endocrine (that is hormonal) systems. In this context, the main things that make us functionally different from single celled creatures are our nervous system and our endocrine systems – even a simple planaria worm needs both of these. Thus the consequences of the disruption of these two regulatory systems is immense, such that it is a travesty to ignore these findings;
- produce oxidative stress and free radical damage, which have central roles in essentially all chronic diseases;
- attack the DNA of our cells, producing single strand and double strand breaks in cellular DNA and oxidized bases in our cellular DNA. These in turn produce cancer and also mutations in germ line cells which produce mutations in future generations;
- produce elevated levels of apoptosis (programmed cell death), events especially important in causing both neurodegenerative diseases and infertility;
- lower male and female fertility, lower sex hormones, lower libido and increased levels of spontaneous abortion and, as already stated, attack the DNA in sperm cells;
- produce excessive intracellular calcium and excessive calcium signalling;
- attack the cells of our bodies to cause cancer. Such attacks are thought to act via 15 different mechanisms during cancer causation.

The substantial evidence he has reviewed indicates that in terms of actual disease EMF causes very early onset dementias, including Alzheimer's; ADHD and autism; fatal heart attack and many cancers.

The difference between 5G and previous Wifi technology

All 5G devices [will need 4G because they'll lean on it to make initial connections before trading up to 5G where it's available](#), known as a 'non-stand alone' or NSA network. This combination of frequencies poses even greater threats to the health of individuals. 5G technology is also different from previous generations of Wifi technology -- 2G, 3G and 4G -- in the following ways:

1. Frequencies (Cycles per second)

- a. One MHz is 1 million cycles per second. One GHz is 1 billion cycles per second.
- b. 4G uses several different frequencies from 750MHz to about 2,400-5,000 MHz.
- c. 5G uses 10GHz to 300GHz but will also use mid-length frequencies of previous generations of Wifi in conjunction with it (see above).

2. Length of the Wave

- a. 4G electromagnetic wavelengths are inches to feet long.
- b. 5G from frequencies 6 to 300GHz are very short and measured in centi-meters to milli-meters.

3. Depth of Skin and Body Absorption

- a. 4G microwave radiation at 2.4GHz to 5 GHz passes through bodies and the energy is absorbed by anything that contains water.
- b. 5G at 6 to 300GHz penetrates only the outer layers of the skin in humans.
- c. The mix of frequencies in cell towers and cell phones will therefore present the doubly adverse effects of penetrating skin and body.

4. Distance Radiation Travels

- a. 4G can travel dozens of miles in a line of sight and if poles are placed high.
- b. 5G at 6 to 300GHz can – according to [research](#) -- travel a few miles but is easily blocked by objects, trees and plants thus poles are planned for every 300 feet in cities.

5. Mechanisms of Harm

- a. 4G and low band 5G (600MHz) [emissions can cause oxidation of tissues](#).
- b. 5G at 6 to 300GHz milli-meter wavelengths can – according to [declassified military studies](#) – [damage tissue](#) by [the absorption of heat](#); by the resonance of increased vibration in an object the size of the wavelengths; and -- at low power levels -- by affecting the structure of the skin which in turn affects metabolism, the nervous system, the endocrine system and the reproductive system.

6. Amount of Testing Done

- a. 4G technology has been tested by the military and by international scientists with an abundance of studies showing marked and extremely harmful effects on human beings – as well as animals, plants, insects and bacteria.
- b. 5G at 6 to 300GHz has not been subjected to formal independent safety tests, even though it is being rolled out.

[5G Telecommunications Science](#), Physicians for Safe Technology

The mechanism by which EMF's cause harm have also been established by extensive research. It is summarised here:

1. EMFs enter cell.
2. Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) are generated.
3. Anti-oxidative mechanisms try to regulate ROS and protect the cell membrane.
4. Too much ROS is generated, which impairs anti-oxidative mechanisms can lead to many other diseases.
5. Membrane is compromise, EMFs can now enter cell nucleus.
6. EMFs break DNA strands, which damages cell and can lead to cancerous tumours.
7. Stress response increases heat shock stress proteins.

Havana Syndrome

5G also bears a resemblance to the kind of [Directed Energy Weapons technology](#) that was used on 9/11 to bring down the Twin Towers of the World Trade Centre (see The Use of Exotic Weapons above) and could be used in conjunction with the mind-control and 'voices in the head' technology (see Rockefeller Mind Control via Wifi and Viruses and Voice in the Head Technology above).

5G/EMF is also the most likely cause of [Havana syndrome](#), a series of otherwise unexplained symptoms, named after a number of individuals at [the US embassy in Havana, Cuba](#), experienced severe and unexplained symptoms in 2016. Since then, electromagnetic frequencies have been linked to reports of other similar incidents across the world, involving:

- [US and Canadian military and intelligence service personnel](#), including fifty CIA operatives.
- [diplomatic staff](#) at the US Embassy in Vienna in early 2021.
- [two diplomats in Hanoi, Vietnam](#) in August 2021

In 2020, [a study on Havana syndrome by the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine](#) identified a number of symptoms associated with the condition in 130 victims, which had in some cases left them [with permanent damage to their health](#):

- pressure on the face;
- loud noises;
- severe headaches;
- nausea and confusion.

They concluded that this was most likely caused by some form of electromagnetic radiation, although researchers at Cuba's Academy of Sciences [have ascribed the reported symptoms to psychological effects or a range of ordinary illnesses and pre-existing conditions](#).

In September 2021, Iain Boyd, an aerospace engineer and former vice chair of the US Airforce Scientific Advisory Board, wrote an article for Phys.Org relating his own research into – and experience of -- Directed Energy Weapons. On this basis, he rejected the findings of the Cuban Academy of Sciences:

I had the opportunity to be zapped by one of these systems. I stood about a half-mile from the source and the beam was turned on. The portion of my body exposed to the beam got hot really quickly, and I immediately stepped out of the beam. The feeling was as though someone had just opened the door of a large furnace right by me.

Iain Boyd, [Directed energy weapons shoot painful but non-lethal beams: Are similar weapons behind Havana syndrome?](#) Phys.Org, 20 September 2021

5G could of course be used to target higher, more dangerous frequencies at individuals, inducing greater adverse effects to health, up to presumably death.

The risks from Wifi radiation of electro-magnetic frequencies (EMF) are so great the [insurance industry is cautious to say the least](#), because – as demonstrated above -- there are no studies anywhere to show it is safe.

Any decent journalist might include these details in any article on 5G to provide context and understanding on the issue. But the Gates Foundation-funded BBC and The Observer, owned by the same group as The Guardian – which has also received funds from the Foundation – [see The Influence of the Gates Foundation](#) below -- chose not to and instead attacked anyone claiming a link between 5G and Covid-19 was a 'conspiracy theorist'.

The BBC and Observer Disinformation

Given the well-established harm from 5G and its ability to get beneath the skin and interfere with DNA, you might think that any decent journalist would exercise caution before dismissing any connection to the more peculiar symptoms attributed to 'Covid-19'. But if decent people were journalists, the shadowy forces would not have got this far with their war on mankind.

So rather than calmly researching the harm from 5G and coolly assessing whether this kind of harm was consistent with some of these symptoms', mainstream journalists ignorantly and predictably denounced individuals expressing concerns for human health as dangerous 'conspiracy theorists'.

As usual, the BBC led the charge:

Conspiracy theory

Many of those sharing the post are pushing a conspiracy theory falsely claiming that 5G -- which is used in mobile phone networks and relies on signals carried by radio waves -- is somehow responsible for coronavirus. [...].

They appear to fall broadly in to two camps:

One claims 5G can suppress the immune system, thus making people more susceptible to catching the virus.

The other suggests the virus can somehow be transmitted through the use of 5G technology.

Both these notions are 'complete rubbish', says Dr Simon Clarke, associate professor in cellular microbiology at the University of Reading.

Rachel Schraer and Eleanor Lawrie, [Coronavirus: Scientists brand 5G claims 'complete rubbish'](#), BBC Reality Check, 15 April 2020

See also [Viral: The 5G Conspiracy Theory](#),
@BBC Stories, Youtube, 14 July 2020

If an academic says 'It's complete rubbish', then it must be! Schraer is [the BBC's first specialist 'health disinformation reporter'](#) (although you could be forgiven for thinking that title means her role is to disseminate disinformation about health). As a specialist, you would expect her to know her subject and have some knowledge of the research into EMFs and 5G or have some experience of the scientific method relating to gathering evidence rather than simply quoting the opinion of an academic, given the enormity of risk to human health potentially posed by 5G.

Less than a fortnight later, The Guardian's sister paper, The Observer, was shooting off volleys in the same direction:

It should go without saying that there is no possible connection between the 5G radio waves and the spread of a virus. Even so, the government was forced to address the fears, calling them 'dangerous nonsense'.

Tim Adams, [5G, coronavirus and contagious superstition](#),
The Observer, 26 April 2020

Neither of these articles actually interview people working in the field of Wifi/EMF/5G research. Both the BBC and The Observer failed to subject the risible claims regarding the isolation and identification of the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' to proper scrutiny or mention there was a failure in the studies claiming to have isolated it to apply the scientific method with regard to controls.

As we have seen above, the technology has already been patented to use 5G radiation to vibrate nanotubes already within the body to release a drug or possibly a virus/genetically modified exosome, which could then control the subject's behaviour or make them ill (see Rockefeller Mind Control via Wifi and Viruses above).

In the absence of any credible evidence to support the viral or germ theory of transmission – particularly in the case 'Covid-19' -- the issue of how disease is 'transmitted' is up for grabs so this field needs to be properly researched.

There is though certainly evidence of a correlation between the introduction of environmental toxins -- of which Wifi radiation is a part – and the spread of certain disease. The Spanish Flu, for example, spread during the expansion in transmission of radio waves after World War One. Formal research needs to be carried out to verify whether there is a causal relationship.

But none of this was explored by journalists at either the BBC, The Observer or, indeed, in any other mainstream media (see also The Trusted News Initiative below).

Yet, many people in the UK political class, particularly those who self-identify as 'liberal', continue to wholly trust the output of these two corporations -- even though, for example, they have slavishly supported the official account of 9/11, which was long ago disproven with evidence by independent investigators.

The Evidence of a Link Before the Hit-Pieces

By the time of The Observer article at least, a [study done at Barcelona University](#) in March-April 2020 had been published. Although the exact publication date is not stated, a translation into English had appeared dated 24 April 2020, available [here](#). This is some three months before the [BBC video presentation on the 5G conspiracy theory](#) was uploaded to Youtube in July 2020 so the BBC has no excuse for not knowing this.

This failure borne of ignorance represents one of the failures of the rational and scientific method by dealing only with selective evidence, particularly because there is no independent research to show 5G or Wifi is safe for human beings.

The results obtained demonstrate a clear and close relationship between the rate of coronavirus infections and 5G antenna location, indicating a possible cause-effect relationship with the 'Covid-19' pandemic. I quote the study's conclusions verbatim here:

A 'border effect' is significant, original and unique to this pandemic: it presents marked differences between contiguous states with and without 5G installation. It is particularly significant that the countries bordering China have very low rates of infection. One may also compare between Mexico and the USA or between Portugal and Spain, etc.

The case of San Marino is particularly significant. It was the first state in the world to install 5G and therefore, the state whose citizens have been exposed to 5G radiation the longest, and suspiciously, the first state in the world with infections. The probability of this happening [randomly] is 1 in 37,636.

In the cities studied, Madrid, Barcelona and New York, this correlation is also observed. In the study of the city of Barcelona (pp. 7-8), it can be seen that the socio-economic factor plays a significant role.

It is very significant that on the African continent, with scarce health resources but without 5G, the rate of infection is very low, except for some antennas in South Africa, which also presents the highest rates of infection in Africa.

The rates of infection are diluted. The rates of some regions are influenced by cities with 5G, but the rates of infection of these cities are diluted in those of the region to which they belong.

So it is more significant, as is the case of Spain, to compare uni-provincial autonomous regions, than among those that are formed by 3 or more of the old provinces. **Thus we see that some regions with 5G such as Rioja, Madrid and Navarra, have rates between 4 and 8 times higher than others without 5G.**

The same is true in other cities around the world where the 5G network does not cover the entire territory of the state or region.


Bartomeu Payeras i Cifre, [Study of the correlation between cases of coronavirus and the presence of 5G networks](#), March-April 2020

So the 'conspiracy theorists' concerns were well-founded, while the journalists' dismissals – based on 'I know better' attitudes borne of ignorance and not experience -- were actually the disinformation. This reporting constitutes the criminal offence of fraud, while also defaming those raising relevant concerns.

This is propaganda on behalf of power and vested interests in action. This falsehood specifically covered up a grave, immediate and continuing threat to the health of individuals across the planet while protecting multi-national mega-corporations and the governments craven to them being prevented from prosecuting their war on mankind and being brought to justice. In the case of the BBC, the abuse of trust is made worse because it propagates disinformation at the expense of the taxpayers who fund it through the licence fee.

It is notable that the shrillness of the tone of articles coming from mainstream journalists -- and the editors who publish their material -- towards alternative but informed critics is in direct proportion to the validity of the truth they tell. That is because these truths wholly undermine the agenda of the shadowy forces.

In the case of 5G, it is central to the Internet of Things, part of the [World Economic Forum's vision of the future](#) and it's 'Fourth Industrial Revolution' (see The Influence of the World Economic Forum below). The WEF's graph below demonstrates how the impact of Covid-19 will accelerate the growth of the Internet of Things beyond pre-pandemic projections:



Large Scale Review of the Link

In September 2021, Dr Beverley Rubik and Dr Robert R Brown had a paper published which reviewed the existing peer-reviewed literature on the detrimental effects of wireless communications radiation or wifi had on human health.

First let me point out that the authors have on the surface allowed the echo chamber of the rumour mill to influence their thinking: they assume that there is a disease called 'Covid-19' caused by an isolated virus known as 'SARS-Cov2'. This may though be a ruse to slip their research under the noses of the unofficial censors as they point out:

Assessing the potentially detrimental health effects of WCR [Wireless Communication Radiation] may be crucial to develop an effective, rational public health policy that may help expedite eradication of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Beverly Rubik and Robert R Brown, [Evidence for a connection between coronavirus disease-19 and exposure to radiofrequency radiation from wireless communications including 5G](#), Journal of Clinical and Translational Research, 29 September 2021

If understanding the health effect of 5G helps expedite the eradication of 'Covid-19', then the authors must suspect that 'Covid-19' and its symptoms are not caused by a virus but by Wifi especially as the authors go on to say that the symptoms of Covid were first observed after a city-wide roll-out of 5G in Wuhan.

The authors have also established a 'correlation' between the introduction of 5G to

communities across the world and the spread of 'Covid-19' to those communities. We already know about 'Covid-19' appearing two months after 5G was switched on in Wuhan but outbreaks soon followed in other areas where 5G had also been at least partially implemented, including South Korea, Northern Italy, New York City, Seattle, and Southern California.

They also quote an earlier study, done in Belarus which comes to similar conclusions. In May 2020, Vladimir [Mordachev reported a statistically significant correlation between the intensity of radiofrequency radiation](#) -- and regulation of it -- and the mortality from SARS-CoV-2 in 31 countries throughout the world:

The validity of the hypothesis about the possible impact of the EM background created by the public wireless information systems, first of all by systems of cellular (mobile) communications, on the relative lethality rate from Covid-19 is indirectly confirmed by the results of the analysis of correlation between the degree of severity of hygienic regulation of levels of radio frequency EM background for the population in different countries according to data and the lethality rate from Covid-19, in relation to the number of people infected.

Vladimir Mordachev, [Correlation between State University of Informatics and Radio-electronics](#), Minsk, Republic of Belarus, 15 June 2020

In other words, the fatality rate from 'Covid-19' increases in countries which have not sought to regulate the background environmental pollution from EMF. Rubik and Brown go on to state:

During the first pandemic wave in the United States, Covid-19-attributed cases and deaths were statistically higher in states and major cities with 5G infrastructure as compared with states and cities that did not yet have this technology.

There is a large body of peer reviewed literature, since before World War II, on the biological effects of WCR that impact many aspects of our health. In examining this literature, we found intersections between the pathophysiology [the disordered physiological processes associated with disease or injury] of SARS-Cov2 and detrimental bioeffects of WCR exposure.

Background, [Ibid](#)

If this pathophysiology from Wireless Communication Radiation was well-known before the arrival of 'Covid', then clearly this range of symptoms cannot be caused simply by any notional 'SARS-Cov2 virus' which came later.

After a comprehensive analysis of the adverse effects of Wifi radiation -- even at low

levels documented in scientific literature across the world over six decades -- they identified several ways in which the adverse 'bioeffects' from Wifi exposure correlate with 'Covid19' manifestations then organised their findings into five categories:

1. Blood changes
2. Oxidative stress
3. Immune system disruption and activation
4. Increased intracellular calcium
5. Cardiac effects

They are summarised in the table below:

Bioeffects of Wireless Communication Radiation (WCR) exposure in relation to COVID-19 manifestations and their progression	
Wireless communications radiation (WCR) exposure bioeffects	COVID-19 manifestations
Blood changes Short-term: rouleaux, echinocytes Long-term: reduced blood clotting time, reduced hemoglobin, hemodynamic disorders	Blood changes Rouleaux, echinocytes Hemoglobin effects; vascular effects →Reduced hemoglobin in severe disease; autoimmune hemolytic anemia; hypoxemia and hypoxia →Endothelial injury; impaired microcirculation; hypercoagulation; disseminated intravascular coagulopathy (DIC); pulmonary embolism; stroke
Oxidative stress Glutathione level decrease; free radicals and lipid peroxide increase; superoxide dismutase activity decrease; oxidative injury in tissues and organs	Oxidative stress Glutathione level decrease; free radical increase and damage; apoptosis→Oxidative injury; organ damage in severe disease
Immune system disruption and activation Immune suppression in some studies; immune hyperactivation in other studies Long-term: suppression of T-lymphocytes; inflammatory biomarkers increased; autoimmunity; organ injury	Immune system disruption and activation Decreased production of T-lymphocytes; elevated inflammatory biomarkers. →Immune hyperactivation and inflammation; cytokine storm in severe disease; cytokine-induced hypo-perfusion with resulting hypoxia; organ injury; organ failure
Increased intracellular calcium From activation of voltage-gated calcium channels on cell membranes, with numerous secondary effects	Increased intracellular calcium →Increased virus entry, replication, and release →Increased NF-κB, pro-inflammatory processes, coagulation, and thrombosis
Cardiac effects Up-regulation of sympathetic nervous system; palpitations and arrhythmias	Cardiac effects Arrhythmias →Myocarditis; myocardial ischemia; cardiac injury; cardiac failure

Supporting evidence including study details and citations are provided in the study under each separate subject heading

Although the authors as academics are loathe to declare a causal link between adverse health effects attributed to Covid-19 and Wifi radiation, particularly 5G, the correlation is extensive, although not always there. Self-styled intellectual commentators will tell you that correlation does not equal causation but they don't seem to realise that it doesn't rule it out either. Correlation is in fact the first step to further investigation to confirm or rule out causation.

Given that we have established that there is no evidence of an isolated virus causing the more peculiar symptoms of 'Covid-19', there really is no other rational explanation for the relationship between increased presence of wireless radiation in our

environments and these 'bioeffects'. There may though be other factors contributing to them like [environmental pollution](#) – prevalent in Wuhan where 'Covid-19 first broke out -- which may work in conjunction with the wireless radiation (see also Rockefeller Mind Control via Wifi and Viruses above).

There can though be no doubt that the data analysed by Rubik and Brown has unequivocally demonstrated that Wifi radiation causes health issues even at low levels.

Either way, investing money in novel, experimental treatments like the mRNA jab to treat non-existent 'viruses' is a waste of government money, which would be better used cleaning up the air we breathe and removing the toxins which surround us. Any roll-out of 5G for the 'Internet of Things' needs to be paused and our reliance on Wifi in general should be scaled back and not increased. High speed communications can after all be passed through fibre optic cable.

The 'pandemic' actually increased exposure to WIFI, as Rubik and Brown observe:

Human exposure to ambient WCR significantly increased in 2020 as a 'side effect' to the pandemic. **Stay-at-home measures designed to reduce the spread of Covid-19 inadvertently resulted in greater public exposure to WCR**, as people conducted more business and school related activities through wireless communications.

Telemedicine created another source of WCR exposure. Even hospital inpatients, particular ICU patients, experienced increased WCR exposure as new monitoring devices utilised wireless communication systems that may exacerbate health disorders.

Discussion, [Ibid](#)

See also [Dr Beverly Rubik on Wireless and 5G Harms to Biofields, Blood, Life/Covid-5G Connection](#), Bitchute, 20 January 2022

Lockdowns were used as protection for the 5G Towers installed before the 'pandemic' began and as cover to allow further installation of them because some individuals had taken it upon themselves to pull them down, prior to lockdown. These individuals would, of course, have a defence in law, which recognises that you have a right to lawfully damage property to protect the safety and property of yourself and others.

11. The Shadowy Conspiracy

Today no war has been declared -- and however fierce the struggle may be, it may never be declared in the traditional fashion. Our way of life is under attack. Those who make themselves our enemy are advancing around the globe. [...] For we are opposed around the world by a monolithic and ruthless conspiracy

John F Kennedy

'Who are THEY?' is a question, frequently asked of the 'conspiracy theorists' who investigate issues like 9/11, chemtrails, the moon landings or the influence of secret societies. Usually, they have to give a vague answer, pointing to the fact that the evil men and women who make up the real-life Spectres and Schmershes of this world don't generally keep minutes of their meetings to discuss their Plot for World Domination or keep on file the reports of their agents of influence in the field.

However, in recent years, this has changed. Those behind the evil are far more willing to identify themselves, although they now couch their language and aims in touchy-feely terms designed to press the hot buttons of those who self-identify as 'woke'. In actuality, they tailor their propaganda to resonate with the egotism of these types to dupe them into supporting their war on mankind. When these shadowy figures don't get their own way, they then ruthlessly suppress any view that is not on message with their agenda, conscripting politicians, journalists, generals, civil servants, NGO campaigners and billionaires to toe the line.

In this modern age of internet, social media and online communication, it is extraordinary that they have managed to hold the line with regard to 'Covid-19' and the hoax 'pandemic'. How far that is down to which particular aspect of the following is hard to say, in the absence of a formal enquiry:

- Wifi already 'mind-controlling' people;
- the egotism of the mindset of wealthy and privileged politicians, journalists and legal practitioners;
- or just simple bribery or blackmail.

The latter issue needs though to be properly investigated by the police, given that the government ministers have classified evidence gathered into paedophiles under Operation Ore.

Without a shadow of a doubt though, it depends on an orchestrated network of once-trusted news outlets and agencies; prominent broadcasters and TV personalities; and social media platforms; and civil service departments and army brigades.

In fact, the mainstream publications and broadcasters have unquestioningly and uniformly promoted what can only be regarded as propaganda with regard to the following wholly unjustifiable statements:

- The pandemic induced by Covid-19 threatens the survival of all humanity;
- There has never been any effective alternative treatment to treat Covid-19 other than the jab;
- The PCR test was an accurate way of diagnosing the disease;
- The whole population has to be locked down to contain the pandemic;
- Freedom from the 'Covid' restrictions can only come from uptake of the 'vaccine';
- The mRNA jab is perfectly safe.
- Anyone exposing the four fallacies above is a dangerous 'conspiracy theorist' and/or an 'anti-vaxer' who must be stopped immediately -- even where they are leaders in their field of science and bring compelling evidence.

Here we examine the role of five key players to establish how that uniformity of false reporting has been achieved:

- The Trusted News Initiative
- 77th Brigade
- The Cabinet Office Rapid Response Unit
- The Gates Foundation
- The World Economic Forum

The Trusted News Initiative

As we have already seen, the BBC has been prepared to put out dangerous and ignorant propaganda to dismiss the research showing a direct correlation between 5G and the more unusual symptoms attributed to Covid-19. Along with that other 'liberal' institution, The Guardian, it has done more than most media to unquestioningly promote propaganda in support of the Tenets of Covid Disinformation, summarised above (see The BBC and Observer Disinformation above).

In July 2019, before the pandemic, the UK and Canadian governments hosted the FCO

Global Conference on Media Freedom. At the event, then BBC Director-General Tony Hall -- who has likened the rise of false and misleading news to a ['poison in the bloodstream of societies'](#) announced:

Last month I convened, behind closed doors, a Trusted News Summit at the BBC, which brought together global tech platforms and publishers. The goal was to arrive at a practical set of actions we can take together, right now, to tackle the rise of misinformation and bias. [...].

I'm determined that we use [the BBC's] unique reach and trusted voice to lead the way – to create a global alliance for integrity in news. We're ready to do even more to help promote freedom and democracy worldwide.

Leila Abboud, [News groups and tech companies team up to fight disinformation](#), Financial Times, 7 September 2019

Note that the initial meeting took place 'behind closed doors', which encapsulates the shadowy but not totally secret nature of the conspiracy. The initial Trusted News Initiative partners in attendance were the European Broadcasting Union, Facebook, the Financial Times, First Draft, Google, The Hindu, and The Wall Street Journal. Facebook and Google are also partners of the WEF (see [The Influence of the World Economic Forum](#) below).

This was the inception of a soon-to-become global media-wide Early Warning System that would – in theory at least -- rapidly alert members to 'disinformation which threatens human life or disrupts democracy during elections'.

By March 2020, the media partners had expanded to include Twitter, Microsoft, Associated Press, Agence France-Presse, Reuters (see [Fact checking the Reuters Fact Checkers](#) below) and the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.

The TNI next agreed to engage with a new verification technology called [Project Origin](#), led by a coalition of the BBC, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and Radio-Canada, Microsoft and The New York Times – with a mandate to identify 'non-authorised' news stories for suppression.

In July 2020, Eric Horvitz, Chief Scientific Officer for Microsoft, remarked about authorising the news:

We've forged a close relationship with the BBC and other partners on Project Origin, aimed at methods and standards for end-to-end authentication of news and information.

Ahmed Razek, [Tackling Misinformation](#), Medium, 3 June 2019

The Inception and Design of Project Origin

In this instance, the proponents of TNI appear to be using the word 'authorise' in two ways, although they do not expressly state it:

- To permit or endorse a work, speech or action etc;
- To be responsible for a work, speech or action etc.

In the latter case, a study -- for example -- can be co-written by many of those who worked on it but the lead researcher is the final author who takes the full responsibility in the same way a project manager is ultimately responsible for the work of his team. The difference is also observed in the case of a ghost-written book, where the writer is not the author whose name appears on the work.

The two concepts are obviously linked.

In this sense, it is a chillingly Orwellian concept. Who decides what is 'authorised' or 'non-authorised' and using what criteria? Students of history will know a variety of institutions have used a variety of excuses for censorship over the years, unreasonably in the vast majority of cases.

It is used in the second sense defined above in the context of the ultimate 'provenance' of a piece of information, as seen here in the paper proposing Project Origin:

The Origin team has been working to define an end-to-end process for the publishing, distribution and presentation of provenance-enhanced media.

This tamper proof indication can be adapted for audio, video, images and text-based digital media.

J Athora et al, [Synthetic Media Risks in News Publishing](#), IBC, 2020

The paper identifies three main ways of dealing with what it calls 'Deep Fake News':

1. **Media Education of Consumers**, which the paper rejects as it might compromise the 'trust' media outlets have built up with their audience over the years (which is a tacit admission that the media organisations involved in the Project are not telling the truth!);
2. **Detection by AI algorithm**, which is rejected because fake news sites can learn the algorithm's bases for detecting 'fake news' and tailor their output to present detection of their fake material;
3. **The Chain of Provenance**, the co-ordination of 'news publishing, social media and technology eco-systems' to identify material from point of publishing to point of presentation elsewhere, the reason behind the Origin Alliance.

The IT technical details I do not pretend to understand, although two browser add-ons – one from Microsoft and the BBC and another to deal with Youtube videos -- will play a role in the final delivery of the 'authentication/authorisation' process to the end-user based on The New York Times' News Provenance Project.

(In researching the Trusted News Initiative, I came across a browser add-on, [called Trusted News, which aims to identify misinformation about Covid-19](#), which does not appear to be associated with the TNI but it seems to work on the same principle of using IT to judge the nature of identified alleged misinformation).

The Flaw in the Project

The keen observer will note that the system behind Project Origin is flawed because it does not examine the primary sources on which a published piece is based, which -- we have observed already in this study -- is the fundamental basis of the unchecked spread of misinformation. In other words, the Project gives higher ranking to a piece of information simply because it is published in media belonging to the Trusted News Initiative network.

Rather than identifying the problem of misinformation and neutralising it, Project Origin amplifies it because the mainstream media is beholden to the very vested interests who are pushing, for example, Big Pharma PR about the mRNA jab and related government diktats like mandatory 'vaccination'.

Remember none of the outlets behind the inception of the Project – the BBC, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Microsoft or the New York Times-- have published the primary source evidence showing the official account of 9/11 is physically impossible, even though it has been in the public domain for the last fifteen years (see Expert analysis of the 9/11 official hypothesis, The Use of Exotic Weapons and The 7/7 bombings above).

Project Origin has therefore acted as an echo chamber of mainstream fake news, which has at the same time censored the truth, coming from independent researchers in the fields of geo-politics, terrorism, virology and medicine, among others. This has become a 'Catch-22' vicious circle. These independent researchers can't get access to mainstream media because Project Origin has marked their information as 'fake news' because it is not in a mainstream news outlet!

This risible situation worthy of a Eugene Ionesco play falls into the tragi-comedy of the 'Theatre of the Absurd'. The Catch-22 element is a contradiction worthy of comedy. Its consequences are utterly tragic for those who have died or been severely harmed after the mRNA jab because they trusted 'the Science' ignorantly disseminated by mainstream media like the BBC. Or those who have taken their lives because they

could no longer live with this kind of gaslighting.

Like with Neil Ferguson's computer models of projected 'Covid-19' deaths (see Professor Neil Ferguson's Wild Projections above), it appears that IT and its algorithms cannot decide truth. Despite their ability to retrieve and crunch massive amounts of data, they cannot synthesise it. That means they can only reproduce what is entered into the databases they search then categorise and calculate from those figures. A human being can apply reason based upon experience, although from what we have seen in the 'pandemic', few in power are capable of performing this basic humane exercise.

The Consequences of Project Origin

By December 2020, the BBC had reported that 'disinformation' from 'anti-vaxers' – which included minimising Covid-19 risks along with impugning the vaccine developers' motives – was spreading online to millions of people, presumably despite the best intentions of Project Origin.

(The BBC is here in any case wrongly using the word 'disinformation', which is in fact what Auntie Beeb is doing – rather than the correct term – 'misinformation' -- see Introduction above).

The evidence that there was no isolated virus causing Covid-19, and that the disease was not super-deadly was already well-established by reference to the rate of spread among the population; the death rate from those who did catch it; and the average and mean ages of death among them.

So impugning the motives of jab manufacturers in bringing to market a novel, largely untested treatment for a disease whose cause was and still is not fully known is a rational, compassionate and reasonable response. In the light of the kind of attacks made on these individuals, it also shows a remarkable moral and intellectual courage.

According to a report by Global Research, an internet publisher of independent academics and others, [the TNI has helped suppress evidence about the following:](#)

- The Source of SARS-2.
- Denial of Early Treatments for Covid, like Ivermectin and hydro- chloroquine.
- The Voices of Dissenting Health Professionals.
- The Record Number of Serious Post-Vaccine Side Effects and Deaths.
- Natural Immunity over Vaccinated Immunity
- Worrying Evidence of Pathogenic Priming also known as antibody dependant

enhancement or ADE.

- The Central Role of Co-Morbidities in Serious Covid Disease

It is not the role of this study to detail and examine this compelling evidence, except to say that the 'authorised' reporting from the TNI has censored concerns about issues related to 'Covid-19' and the mRNA jab and therefore undermined the evidence for adopting the precautionary principle of law.

The TNI has also put out further disinformation which 'threatens human life or disrupts democracy', as it has failed to expose the genocidal policy towards individuals in care homes, who were murdered with Midazolam; and, in general, has failed to supply the people with the kind of reliable information a free society is built upon and to support the freedom of expression necessary to share that evidence.

77th Brigade

Many people have accused the 77th brigade of the UK army of being behind the censorship of 'anti-Covid' campaigns; perverting discussions on the internet; and of trolling those who reasonably question the official line, particularly on social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter.

In 2019, before the 'pandemic' began, Twitter's 'head of editorial' for the Middle East and Africa, Gordon MacMillan, [was outed as an officer in the 77th brigade based on his own LinkedIn profile](#):

I have a strong interest in politics and international affairs and am a reserve officer in the British Army serving in the 77th Brigade.

Some will say it was hardly secret, if he had declared it on his LinkedIn profile but this was not generally known or openly declared on the Twitter platform. We might wonder why Twitter has a head of editorial policy, in the first place -- because it is a platform and not a publisher -- and what MacMillan's actual role might involve.

This is nevertheless evidence that 77th brigade is using the well-known secret service technique of using an 'agent of influence' behind-the-scenes to manipulate the direction of an organisation, in this case to aid the propaganda offensive of an authoritarian government in support of the corporate vested interests who donate funds to them or – more correctly -- bribe them.

But is there more detailed evidence that 77th brigade plays a role in information warfare in the 'Covid-19 pandemic'?

Background

Formerly known as the Security Assistance Group, the 77th Brigade is a British Army formation which became operational in April 2015. It is supported by the Army's Information Activities Group who provide content and production expertise.

The 77th brigade's existence and activities have been confirmed in Parliament. In March 2015, Mark Francois, junior defence minister, confirmed in response to a written parliamentary question:

77th Brigade is the new name for the Security Assistance Group. Its continuing role includes [...] leading on **Special Influence Methods**, including providing information on activities, key leader engagement, operations security and **media engagement**.

[Armed Forces: Information Warfare](#),
Response to Question for Ministry of Defence, 3 March 2015

The brigade's roles and responsibilities are outlined in detail in the Winter-Spring edition of the British Defence Review, an official Army publication, by one of its former commanding officers, Lieutenant Colonel James Chandler. It relies heavily on reservist volunteers – military personnel who are not serving in the regular army but who can be called to serve whenever they are needed – who are otherwise civilians.

According to the Defence Review article, 77th brigade's Web Operations Team delivers 'capability in the virtual space [...] working on a virtually permanent operational footing', even in the UK where its operations are 'not widely discussed or known about':

One area where 77th Brigade breaks new ground is web operations. Stemming from the inspiration of one young officer and a handful of NCOs, the Brigade's Web Operations Team is delivering capability in the virtual space. Designed to provide detailed analysis of internet activity and the ability to engage with friend and foe in the virtual domain, the Web Operations Team assists commanders with an understanding of local sentiment and public opinion. From humble beginnings, the small team now works on an almost permanent operational footing, often contributing to UK operations not widely discussed or known about.

Lieutenant Colonel James Chandler, pp14-18,
[An introduction to 77th Brigade](#),
British Army Review, 177, Winter Spring 2020

So, there can be no doubt that a regiment of the British army does play a shadowy role in policing free speech and influencing the free flow of information. But can this be justified?

If the brigade was diligently checking official claims about the non-existent virus and correcting them, then they might have a case. But if the ignorance of the British army's commanding officer is anything to go by – see immediately below -- then they are engaged in an unlawful conspiracy to suppress the truth, which goes hand-in-hand with creating injustice and the consequences of that.

During an official Covid-19 briefing early on in the 'Covid-19 pandemic', the UK army's chief of the defence staff, General Sir Nick Carter, confirmed that 77th Brigade was involved in information warfare relating to 'Covid-19' in support of the Cabinet Office:

We've been involved with the Cabinet Office Rapid Response Unit with our 77th brigade helping to quash rumours from misinformation but also to counter disinformation. Between 3-4,000 of our people have been involved with around 20,000 available the whole time at high readiness.

From 14min, [Dominic Raab leads UK government's daily coronavirus briefing](#), ITV News, Youtube, 22 April 2020

(See The Cabinet Office Rapid Response Unit below)

From 2022 under [the Future Soldier programme](#) the structure of the brigade will change to incorporate [6 Military Intelligence Battalion](#), a reservist unit of the Intelligence Corps into its structure. [According to the corp's website](#), it is tasked with:

providing intelligence to help Commanders make informed decisions as well as providing predictive assessment of our adversaries' intentions. We support the UK's rapid reaction forces – the UK's troops who can be called upon, often at very short notice, to deploy overseas.

77th Brigade's role in disinformation

A month after his appearance with Dominic Raab at the official Covid briefing, Carter reiterated the brigade's role in an interview with The Economist's podcast channel but added a more sinister element:

This may sound pedantic but you have to distinguish between 'disinformation' and 'misinformation'. Of course, misinformation will come from people when they've got scams going – conspiracy theorists, jokers and the rest of it.

What 77th brigade has been doing in support of the Cabinet office has been [to go] after misinformation: finding this misinformation then getting other parts of government or indeed the media to call them out. [...] This is not about propaganda but about getting to the truth of things.

From 7min10, [What can past wars teach us about conquering coronavirus?](#)
The Economist Asks: General Sir Nick Carter, 7 May 2020

There is a distinction here between 'disinformation' and 'misinformation'. 77th brigade does not address the propaganda that we have established is being disseminated by the state and its agents, which includes MPs, and the mainstream media, which has enormous reach. 77th brigade is going after 'misinformation' put out by the people, which does not.

This is also evidence of what most people would normally consider 'conspiracy theory' – shadowy elements of the state monitoring activists and undermining their activities. Yet here we have the head of the British army admitting that a regiment of the British armed forces is conspiring behind the scenes with the media to undermine evidence and probably denigrate the characters of those resisting the 'Covid-19' tyranny in the process, given the attitude he reveals in the interview:

Of course, misinformation will come from people when they've got scams going – conspiracy theorists, jokers and the rest of it.

Remember, we have already convincingly demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt in this paper that the whole 'Covid-19 pandemic' was a hoax from the outset with no basis in evidence whatsoever.

Although Carter denies in the interview that the army has been involved in the dissemination of propaganda, he does not elaborate on how the army determines the difference between truth and falsehood. Earlier in the interview, Carter had accepted the interviewer's proposition that 5G as a possible cause of 'Covid-19' was 'disinformation'.

By this time, the Barcelona University study (see [The Evidence of a Link Before the Hit-Pieces](#) above) had been published and translated detailing a strong correlation and therefore possible causal relationship between 5G and the more peculiar symptoms which have been attributed to 'Covid-19' across the world. It also speaks volumes that the interviewer also clearly believed that this was 'misinformation' as she made no attempt to cross-examine Carter about it (nor did she seek to establish how the army determined the difference between misinformation and truth).

This failure to cross-examine alleged experts has been a hallmark of the 'pandemic' and the failure to establish the truth about false-flag terrorism.

This is again clear evidence that an official charged with responsibility for policing misinformation had no idea of the evidential truth on which the so-called 'misinformation' was based, simply assuming that the government was right and the people wrong, the kind of dangerous mindset that has over the decades seen armies round up innocent individuals and transport them to camps. And worse.

Head of the Army's View on Laboratory Origin of 'SARS-Cov2'

When asked on two occasions about the reported laboratory origins of the 'Covid-19 virus', which was dismissed as 'conspiracy theory' and effectively banned on social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook, Carter replies using almost exactly the same phrase on both occasions:

I've seen no evidence of this being a deliberate act coming from anybody or being a particular mistake from anyone either. [...]

I've personally seen no evidence this comes from any deliberate act or mistake by any government.

From 13mins, [Ibid](#)

Experienced interrogators and interview linguistics analysts will tell you that this indicates a programmed response in which the interviewee is, at best, detracting from the truth or relating a fact that they know to be an outright lie. Clark is not negligent in his dishonesty. In this example at least, he knows he's being dishonest.

In May 2021, a [classified US intelligence document from the time of the Trump administration was leaked to the Wall Street Journal](#). It alleged that three researchers at China's Wuhan Institute of Virology became so ill in November 2019 -- a month before the first cases were identified at the hospital in Wuhan -- that they sought hospital care. This leak is clearly designed to imply that the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' was engineered at the Institute. As we have established above, the SARS-Cov2 particle was made using an insertion from a template so was in that sense of laboratory origin -- while 'SARS-Cov' has been patented in 2007, meaning that in law it was invented -- but this is not genetic engineering as such.

Carter's hesitancy in the interview with the Economist does though indicate that he was aware of the erroneous intelligence indicating that 'SARS-Cov2' had been engineered at the Wuhan Institute of Virology and that he at least was taking it seriously at the time, even though official sources were presumably ensuring it was being branded 'conspiracy theory', given the headlines in the mainstream media (see [A 'Conspiracy Theory' the Mainstream Media did an About-turn on below](#)).

As an ex-intelligence officer, it strikes me as being more likely disinformation to distract from US military research into biowarfare and undermine the Chinese government -- which has denied the report -- which the US intelligence establishment sees as its enemy. In other words, its purpose is political, not factual.

When the head of the British army holds an erroneous belief based on faulty intelligence, it can have devastating consequences. We only have to look at the terrible harm inflicted on the people of Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and Syria over the last

twenty years – founded on the flawed belief that 19 Muslim suicide bombers carried out 9/11 and four more were responsible for the 7/7 attacks. The decisions of senior military have made their charges guilty of waging war, along with them, rather than making them heroes in the defence of others.

This has particular relevance to what is happening right now with regard to Nato and Russia, where it is clear to a seasoned investigator and ex-MI5 officer like myself that false intelligence is being used to stoke up a conflict that could spill over into the third world war with all the suffering and devastation that will bring.

The army – and the army intelligence corps that 77th Brigade is to work with from this year, in particular -- should learn its lesson from the conflicts in the Middle East and the fake pandemic – from which it has the figurative blood of tens of millions on its hands -- and choose to be on the side of the clear-minded elements of the people who have exposed the fraud on all its levels and not on the side of those who have perpetrated it.

Ironically, when Wired reporter Carl Miller was invited to the Brigade's base at Denison Barracks in Hermitage, Berkshire, he noted a sign in one of the foyers. Written in foot-high letters across a whiteboard, it said:

'If everybody is thinking alike then somebody isn't thinking'

Carl Miller, Wired, [Inside the British Army's secret information warfare machine](#), 14 November 2021

When government and media speak so precisely from the same hymn sheet, it is clear they are 'thinking alike'. 77th brigade needs to heed its own adage and do some independent thinking itself. It could start by not feeding the Beast (see immediately below).

The Cabinet Office Rapid Response Unit

[The Rapid Response Unit was set up by the Cabinet Office in April 2018](#). It is 'made up of specialists including analyst-editors, data scientists, media and digital experts. It monitors news and information being shared and engaged with online to identify emerging issues with speed, accuracy and with integrity'.

With such a prestigious, experienced and well-informed team, you might think the Unit would have checked the evidence about 9/11 for example and found at least that the 9/11 Commission had no idea that a 47-storey skyscraper had also fallen symmetrically into its own footprint that day.

At the beginning of the fake pandemic, the RRU was co-ordinating cross-department

initiatives to deal with up to 70 incidents a week of 'false narratives containing multiple misleading claims'. This included direct rebuttal on social media; removing harmful content and ensuring public health campaigns were promoted through reliable sources. The Cell – as it refers to itself – engaged directly with 'disinformation specialists from civil society and academia', sharing its assessments with other countries to protect the UK against malicious information.

It also relaunched the 'Don't Feed the Beast' Campaign from 2019, which featured a green monster trying to distract a woman from the truth on social media:



[Don't Feed The Beast](#), Government Information Film, UK Government Facebook Account, 13 November 2019

It promoted to the public five ways of identifying misleading information:

Source: make sure information comes from a trusted source

Headline: always read beyond the headline

Analyse: check the facts

Retouched: does the image or video look as though it has been doctored?

Error: look out for bad grammar and spelling

Subhajit Banerjee, [How we are fighting the spread of false coronavirus information online](#), Government Communication Service, 16 April 2020

With the exception of the last measure cited above, we have demonstrated that officials have wholly failed to heed their own words, particularly with regard to

doctored images and their provenance (see Expert analysis of the 9/11 official hypothesis and The 7/7 bombings).

When the government talks about a 'trusted source', its generally referring to secondary sources, like its own PR departments and the mainstream media, in particular the BBC. The fact that it does not distinguish here between a primary source, a secondary source and a publisher shows that the powers-the-be are being less than honest about how to establish the truth. Whether that is done consciously or not is hard to say.

I've met many individuals who will not believe anything on Youtube, for example, simply because it is on Youtube because they believe 'Youtube' is an unreliable source. Yet, there is plenty of government and academic information published on Youtube. Does that automatically make that untrue?

If government had been checking the facts – as per its own analysis and advice above -- at the beginning of the so-called pandemic, it would have realised that the research on which the 'Covid-19' diagnostic PCR test was based and the claim by virologists to have 'isolated a new virus' did not conform to the scientific method and was worthless in terms of determining the truth (see The RT-PCR Test created the 'Pandemic' and Detailed Refutation of Existence of SARS-Cov2 above). Even then any basic research of its own data on the government's part would have established that the profile of 'Covid-19 was little different than the seasonal flu in the vast majority of cases, including the age of those who succumbed to it (see Accounting for the Raised Excessive Death Rate above).

It's quite remarkable that all its disinformation specialists; degree-educated civil servants and their experts in academia with their post-graduate-doctoral degrees failed to establish the truth by following their own advice, causing the very grave harm they sought to avoid through their (dis)information campaigns.

The Influence of the Gates Foundation

The Gates Foundation, is by far the largest private contributor to the WHO, [accounting for some 10% of its budget](#), which has also bought into the fake pandemic and the unnecessary requirement for mass vaccination. Over the years, [it has also committed hundreds of millions to Gavi](#), the vaccine alliance, which has played a major role in promoting jabs as the sole way out of the non-existent 'Covid-19 pandemic'.

Given that we have established there is no scientific basis for 'viruses' and the germ theory of transmission, 'vaccines' have no basis as a health treatment. They therefore benefit the enormously wealthy corporations which produce them at the expense of the taxpayers who fund government.

In the initial stages of the pandemic, Gates also personally played a role in promoting Covid-19 and the 'vaccine' to go along with it, appearing frequently in the media in the US and the UK.

We have also already established that the Gates Foundation made significant grants to several research institutions and scientists associated with the faked 'isolation' of the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' (see Grants from the Gates Foundation to the 'discoverers' of the new virus above) and that Gates himself increased his wealth during the pandemic (see Follow the Money: the Main Beneficiaries above -- although not by as much as the nine other wealthiest billionaires).

We have also established that the corporation Microsoft, founded by Bill Gates, has done tremendous harm to the truth and by extension the health of mankind through its support for the Trusted News Initiative and Project Origin (see The Consequences of Project Origin above).

Gates ended [any formal responsibility for Microsoft's management at the start of the pandemic in March 2002](#), after he was linked to an affair with an employee at the company 20 years before, although this may actually have been as a result of his relationship with Jeffrey Epstein, the convicted child abuser.

He has [though donated over \\$35million \(£25.9million\) worth of Microsoft shares to the Gates Foundation](#) over the years through which he might maintain some influence over the corporation. We cannot know what sort of informal influence he still exerts behind the scenes over the company he set up and played a pivotal role in for 35 years.

However, that is not the end of Gates's billions potentially being used to influence editors, journalists and publishers regarding the media they produce.

In November 2021, Mint-Press News [reported the findings of its review](#) of over 30,000 individual grants [from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's website database](#) to media organisations, press associations, journalism training centres and media campaigns across the world.

It established that the fund had provided [\\$3.6 million \(£2.7million\)](#) to the BBC and [\\$12.9 million \(£9.5million\)](#) to The Guardian from a total of \$319 million (£236million) awarded to a range of high-profile media outlets. Both these corporations tout their independence from rich investors as the BBC is funded by the government via the TV licence payer and The Guardian is owned by a trust.

When courting donations before allowing individuals access to its website, The Guardian makes much of this supposed independence. 'We have no shareholders, no billionaire owner and no commercial or political masters' it tells its readers.

(Even without Gates's contributions, the paper still relies upon the commercial world of advertising for its income and was until recently subsidised by the profits made by Autotrader, when it was part of the same group of companies).

The Foundation has also given **\$3.4million** (£2.35million) in direct funding to The Telegraph. Other recipients of Gates's largesse were CNN, NBC, National Public Radio, the Atlantic, New York Public Radio, PBS, and the Texas Tribune, in the US; France's Le Monde; Germany's Der Spiegel; the 'City Bankers' Bible'. The Financial Times; and Qatari-based Al-Jazeera, among others.

Gates also continues to fund:

- a wide network of investigative journalism centres across the world to a total of just over \$38 million (£28.1million);
- press and journalism associations to the tune of at least \$12 million (£8.8million);
- institutes which train journalists to around \$5.5 (£4million);
- and just under a staggering \$100million (£74million) to fund specific media campaigns.

A full list of Mint Press News's review of Gates Foundation donations to media corporations can be found at [this link](#).

The Gates Foundation has also given nearly \$63 million (£46.6million) to charities closely aligned with big media outlets, including nearly **\$53 million** (£39.2million) to BBC Media Action.

Although there is no evidence I can find of specific and explicit occasions on which Gates has used his largesse to influence the output of the media, editors, journalists and broadcasters will be all too aware they are unlikely to keep their jobs if they run articles criticising Gates and his work and will inevitably be more likely to give him favourable coverage. Twenty years ago, The Guardian even wrote an article about Gates, headlined [Saint Bill](#).

As well as funding vaccine research and roll-out programmes, [the Foundation is also part of the World Economic Forum](#). Five of its leading lights, including Bill and his wife Melinda, are contributors to the Forum, which uncritically promotes Gates and his work.

See also [Who is Bill Gates?](#) The Corbett Report, 5 January 2021

The Influence of the World Economic Forum

Event 201

On Friday 18 October 2019, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in partnership with the World Economic Forum hosted Event 201, 'a high-level simulation exercise for pandemic preparedness and response', at The Johns Hopkins University Centre for Health Security in New York. The exercise brought together business, government, security and public health leaders to role play a 'hypothetical' global pandemic scenario.

The WEF press release promoting Event 201 stated:

The world has seen a growing number of epidemics in recent years, with about 200 events annually including Ebola, Zika, MERS and SARS. At the same time, collective vulnerability to the social and economic impacts of infectious disease crises appears to be increasing.

Experts suggest there is a growing likelihood of one of these events becoming a global threat – or an 'Event 201' pandemic – that would pose disruptions to health and society and cause average annual economic losses of 0.7% global GDP, similar in scale to climate change.

[Live Simulation Exercise to Prepare Public and Private Leaders for Pandemic Response](#), WEF, 15 October 2019

As we have already established in this report, diseases billed as grave world pandemics did not come to pass, despite the best laid computer-modelling plans and the sensationalist media headlines and coverage which accompanied them (see The Run-Up to Lockdown above). These touted pandemics led to negligible case numbers and even more negligible deaths, as a percentage of the local and world population.

In its PR for Event 201 (above), the WEF expresses its concern that a future pandemic might lead to a 0.7% loss of world GDP, yet the over-reaction of the UK government to the non-existent pandemic meant the country's GDP shrank by 25% in a few months, ending the year nearly 10% lower than twelve months earlier, the greatest decline in over 200 hundred years (see More Government Debt above).


The 3hour40min 'live virtual experience' centrepiece of the event was designed to give the WEF's 'stakeholders' across the world -- and members of the public -- insight into the difficult high-level policy decisions that would have to be made to contain a severe pandemic.

Using the fictional example of 'Coronavirus Associated Pulmonary Syndrome', , the

simulation uses eerily realistic media coverage of a disease with pretty much the same symptoms observed when 'Covid-19' was diagnosed in Wuhan just two months later. There is even a [mock-television news report that deals with the CAPS pandemic](#). This is particularly suspicious as it reports the threat posed by 'asymptomatic' transmission, a concept that was pushed during the actual fake pandemic which has no scientific basis and never has.

The official reactions in the simulation also mirror the actions taken by the real powers-that-be to deal with the fake pandemic, including dealing with social media 'disinformation' and the ensuing social unrest.

I invite readers to examine the official showreel of footage from the event to come to their own conclusions, rather than be swayed by the 'fact checkers' who just seem to find it all a strange 'co-incidence'.



[Event 201 Pandemic Exercise: Highlights Reel](#), Centre for Health Security, Youtube, 4 November 2019

Background

Founded in 1971 in Geneva, the World Economic Forum is an international lobbying organisation, which aims [to shape global, regional and industry agendas across the world by engaging business, political, academic, and other leaders of society](#). It is funded by its multi-national, partner corporations --generally with a turnover of five billion US dollars or more, like Facebook, Google, Apple and BlackRock -- and public subsidies.

Led by its founder German industrialist Klaus Schwab, the World Economic Forum is mainly known to the general public for its annual meeting at the end of January in Davos, Switzerland. This conference brings together some 3,000 paying members and selected participants to discuss global issues.

Schwab himself has been honoured by many nations and monarchs. In 2006, he was

honoured by the Queen as a [Knight Commander of the Order of St Michael and St George](#).

Values and role of the WEF

The Forum promotes the idea that a globalised world is best managed by a self-selected coalition of multinational corporations, governments and non-governmental organisations. It has used periods of global instability to push its agenda, like the financial crisis of 2008/9 to promote its [Global Redesign](#) and the Covid-19 pandemic to implement its [Great Reset](#) and concepts like the Fourth Industrial Revolution to mobilise its [technocratic, high finance and banking agenda](#), particularly transhumanism, which seeks to solve world problems by turning man into a human-cyborg hybrid.

During the fake pandemic, its 'Build Back Better' slogan adorned the platforms and initiatives of leaders across world and it made no secret of its role in making the most of the false pandemic to expand its influence and agenda to create a 'new world' order:

The fault lines of today's world – most notably: social divides, lack of fairness, absence of cooperation, failure of global governance and leadership and the critical degradation of our natural assets – lie exposed as never before, and many now feel the time for reinvention may have dawned.

A new world could emerge, the contours of which it is incumbent on us to re-imagine and to re-draw. [...]. The immediate post crisis period offers a small window to **build back better by not wasting the \$10 trillion that governments around the world are investing to alleviate the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic.**

[WEF website, July 2020](#)

One year on from the beginning of the pandemic, [it boasted](#):

[Responding to the COVID-19 Crisis](#) and [Boosting Vaccine Confidence](#) are the first two agenda-setting sessions to lead the programme. [...]

As reported by the Forum in early 2020, the world's largest health and pharmaceutical companies began collaborating at incredible speed with governments and international organizations to produce effective treatments, tests and vaccines against Covid-19.

The first announcement of the development of a vaccine for the novel coronavirus was [made during the 2020 Annual Meeting in Davos](#), and work has continued at an unprecedented pace.

Rather than producing 'effective treatments, tests and vaccines' to combat Covid-19, it has allowed its partners to create the myth of a highly contagious, deadly disease rampaging across the world that can only be treated with medical procedures patented by its other partners.

In collaboration with [the Commons Project Foundation](#), it has also launched the [Common Trust Network](#), which has played a major but behind-the-scenes role in using the fake pandemic to promote wholly unnecessary vaccine passports.

The world's largest asset manager, [Black Rock](#)-- with a [portfolio in excess of £5.5 trillion](#) giving it enormous levels of control over governments -- is also a partner of the WEF. The four jab manufacturers, [Pfizer](#), [Moderna](#), [AstraZeneca](#) and [Johnson & Johnson](#), are also partners of the WEF.

[Meta](#), which owns Facebook and Instagram, and Google, owned by Alphabet which also owns Youtube, are also partners of the WEF, as are their CEOs, [Mark Zuckerberg](#) and [Sundar Pichai](#).

These mega corporations have used their platforms to push the 'Covid' agenda, banning individuals even for posting official government data, particularly regarding 'vaccine' damage or in the case of Google pushing informed research far down the search engine rankings, making it extremely difficult for anyone to properly research the issue for themselves (see also Facebook 'Fact-Checking' Scrutinised below).

The WEF's worldwide network

In addition, the leaders in the English-speaking world keenest to push the Covid agenda of draconian restrictions, the experimental 'vaccines'; vaccine passports; and discrimination against the non-jabbed are all affiliated to the WEF:

- [Scott Morrison](#), Prime Minister of Australia;
- [Jacinda Arden](#), Prime Minister of New Zealand;
- [Justin Trudeau](#), the Prime Minister of Canada.

Emmanuel Macron who has heavily pushed the vaccine passport agenda in France, which paves the way for social credit systems and other government control and monitoring measures – despite vehement opposition from the French people -- [is also a member of the WEF](#), as is [Katherine Maher](#), the CEO of Wikipedia.

The influence of the WEF also extends into the Anglican Congregation as the [Archbishop of Canterbury is an active contributor](#) and attendee of the WEF's annual Davos conference.

Part of its programme also seeks to identify the movers and shakers of the future under its [Young Global Leaders](#) initiative, which taps into human rights groups, academia, high finance, industries and governments and NGOs across the world.

Recent WEF developments

In November 2021, around forty [WEF members met in Dubai, UAE to discuss the Great Narrative](#), the sequel to the Great Reset. The WEF's leader, [Klaus Schwab told the conference](#):

Let's use our positive energy really to create a great narrative for humankind in the next two days. [...] We can influence our future, but [...] we can do so only if we have a long-term view, if we think first of the community and only second of ourselves, and if we think globally.

This was part of a theme at this conference, which sought to characterise world leaders who put their own citizens first as self-centred because they didn't comply with the WEF's internationalist agenda, which inevitably sees the vast majority of less well-off people – 'the 90%' -- lose out.

This shows a staggering lack of self-knowledge on the part of Klaus. The WEF counts billionaires and the world richest corporations among its 'partners'. Couldn't these mega-rich businessmen put the community first and donate a fraction of their vast wealth to helping the less well-off? After all, they have helped the circumstances of the poverty of the 90%. Schwab himself was widely reported to be worth around \$1million (£740,000) in 2021 – although I cannot find a primary source for this -- a paltry sum by the standards of the WEF but nevertheless a small fortune to most people.

It has been observed that putting the community above your own rights always seems a good idea until you are the one expected to make the self-sacrifice. It all sounds almost communist or 'communitarian' -- until you consider the other recommendation that came out of the conference: that governments should partner more with businesses. This policy conforms to Mussolini's definition of fascism being the merger of corporate and state power.

Otherwise, the WEF repeated its desire for a 'Great Reset', economically, which it pushed throughout the 'pandemic', which saw the wealth gap between poor and rich open into a chasm, part of a prevailing trend in the West over the last five decades.

The only honest observation at the event was the quote from the beginning of the body of this paper:

The good news is the elites across the world trust each other more

and more, so we can come together and design and do beautiful things together. The bad news is that in every single country they were polling, the majority of people trusted their elite less. So, we can lead, but if people aren't following, we're not going to get to where we want to go.

[Ngairé Woods](#), Professor of Global Economic Governance, University of Oxford

A month later, Schwab and Malleret, the authors of *The Great Reset*, had a further book published called [The Great Narrative](#), which shows no indication that either he or the organisation he represents has learnt much from the past two years. Nor was that the case at The Davos Agenda 2022 virtual event, which took place in January 2022, although the WEF now appears to have turned its focus to the reported threat from ill-defined 'climate change'.

Academic Ignorance

I began this paper by pointing out:

Truth is determined by the reasoned analysis of primary source evidence. [...]

The very fact this is lost on academics whose bread and butter ought to be the objective gathering of data and its informed and rational analysis shows the extraordinary levels of ignorance and bigotry we now live under.

I now demonstrate how academics have been co-opted to play their role in disinformation – or propaganda -- in this assault upon mankind rather than objectively assessing evidence.

In April 2021, a formal peer-reviewed study '[Thought I'd Share First' and Other Conspiracy Theory Tweets from the Covid-19 Infodemic: Exploratory Study](#), was published. It was conducted by eight academics – and reviewed by two others -- with impressive qualifications. Four of them involved in the study have PhDs and the other some form of Masters -- a post-graduate research qualification between a graduate bachelor degree and a PhD.

In their effort to examine how 'misinformation' spread across the social media platform of Twitter, the researchers identified four 'conspiracy theories' relating to 'Covid-19':

- 5G technology is somehow associated with Covid-19.

- Bill and Melinda Gates or the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation funded, patented or otherwise economically benefited from SARS-CoV-2.
- SARS-CoV-2 is human-made or bioengineered and was released (intentionally or accidentally) from a laboratory.
- A Covid-19 vaccine could be harmful because it contained some form of covert technology or in other ways 'not supported by science'.

They are critical of one Tweet for stating: 'Thought I'd share first' with the implication that its author did not bother to check its veracity before posting it on the social media platform:

Misinformation can spread rapidly and without clear direction; this is evidenced by one tweet we uncovered while conducting this research, which shared an article promoting a conspiracy theory with the commentary that the user had not established credibility but rather 'thought I'd share first'.

Dax Gerts et al, '[Thought I'd Share First](#)' and Other Conspiracy Theory Tweets from the COVID-19 Infodemic: Exploratory Study, Journal of Internet Medical Research, 14 April 2021

This Tweet obviously inspires the eye-catching title of the paper. However, it is only referred to by the authors, Gerts et al, on the one further occasion quoted above in the conclusions to the paper. Here, they claim it has been anonymised for reasons of 'privacy', even though a Tweet is obviously a matter of public record.

Without being able to examine the primary source material in this case, no one is any position to consider the accuracy of how it is portrayed. Even then, Gerts et al have confirmed that the information has been disseminated via Twitter with a caveat indicating that its recipients will need to check its veracity for themselves. Because of this warning, the poster of the Tweet cannot be accused of fraud in law (although they would not have indemnified themselves for any action for defamation, should it contain falsehoods about anyone mentioned in it).

But that is not the end of the matter. The 'share first' policy might be justified. Say, for example, it contained a link to some newly published research that the mRNA jab caused heart attacks in children with autism. Its dissemination to concerned parents considering whether to have their autistic child 'vaccinated' might protect the life of a child. Better the parents postpone any decision until the findings can be verified. Without the details of the Tweet, we cannot know.

Of course, the authors have so little self-knowledge and so little of the spirit of enquiry essential to the mindset of the investigator that they fail to realise they commit exactly the same sin, except on a much greater scale. They have shared first without checking whether the 'conspiracy theories' they denounced were in fact true or not, a

classic example of 'confirmation bias'. This is the scientific term for looking for and validating only evidence which supports the view of the writer, researcher, publisher or funder which is much practiced by mainstream journalists and editors and civil servants and politicians.

Any objective assessment of the evidence shows that these academics have made the following errors:

- They assume there is a distinct disease, known as 'Covid-19' when in fact, it is far more likely that the vast majority of cases attributed to it are the flu (see Proof there is no isolated SARS-Cov2 virus above).
- They fail to consider whether the abundant research showing that 5G is harmful to health is a factor in the pandemic or the review of academic literature demonstrating that the roll-out of 5G at least correlates with –and may be the cause of – individuals contracting certain symptoms attributed to 'Covid-19' (see Covid, 5G and Wireless Radiation above).
- They didn't research the increase that Bill Gates made in his personal wealth – up by almost a third from the beginning of the pandemic to the end of 2021 -- giving him a personal fortune of \$137.4billion (Follow the Money: the Main Beneficiaries above).
- Although the laboratory origin theory for 'SARS-Cov2' was initially dismissed as 'conspiracy theory', it has since been supported by mainstream journalists.
- Pfizer at least has fought to [keep the contents of the mRNA vaccine secret](#):

Yet there is one point on which the Pfizer CEO won't budge: his vaccine's secret formula.

- The 'vaccines' developed to counter 'Covid-19' were rushed out without being properly subjected to scientific trials. The totality of their contents is not actually known but independent lab tests have shown they contain graphene, as has other research (see Evidence gathered by UK Citizens 2021 above).

Without first establishing truth, the authors are in no position to come to any conclusions with regard to the identification and spread of misinformation or 'conspiracy theory':

This study demonstrates that identifying and characterising common and long-lived Covid-related conspiracy theories using Twitter data is possible, even when those messages shift in content and tone over time.

[Ibid](#)

Their study instead forms primary evidence in any investigation into the propagation of disinformation or propaganda on behalf of the state, health bodies and

corporations like the pharmaceuticals industry on the part of ill-informed academics.

Social media is of course used to put out misinformation. But how far this is done by bots or useful idiots working on behalf of the shadowy forces behind the scenes can only be established once they are removed from power and their activities can be closely and openly examined.

More seriously, the powers-that-be have used academia to whip up hatred against those opposing the official narrative, implying their activities have helped the spread of the 'virus':

Because belief in Covid-related conspiracy theories predicts resistance to both preventive behaviours and future vaccination for the virus, it will be critical to confront both conspiracy theories and vaccination misinformation to prevent further spread of the virus in the US.

Daniel Romer, [Conspiracy beliefs pose challenges in obtaining public support to prevent coronavirus infection](#), *Social Science & Medicine*, Volume 263, October 2020

However, Romer is happy to whip up his own 'conspiracy theories':

Because the novel coronavirus is highly contagious, the widespread use of preventive measures such as masking, physical distancing, and eventually vaccination is needed to bring it under control.

If by 'conspiracy theory' we mean an idea not based on truth or with minimal evidence to support it which is widely shared unchecked, by appealing to the prejudice of those it is targeted at, then this academic paper is it:

- There is no evidence of a 'highly contagious' disease as should be obvious to anyone paying attention;
- The considered medical literature shows that masks have at best negligible effects on transmission of disease and cause harm to health by cutting off the supply of oxygen to the brain and body, which is common sense. They are also a method of dehumanisation and demoralisation used by totalitarian regimes.
- Not even the manufacturers of the jab have claimed that its administration to individuals can prevent the contraction or transmission of the disease.

Yet, for his ignorance and compliance in the fake pandemic, Romer is allowed an opportunity to air his ignorance and prejudice while pointing the finger at others. Once again, assumptions not facts are used as the basis for faulty reasoning and faulty findings, which can then be used by unscrupulous governments to whip up hatred of minorities – in this case people very reasonably opposing medical measures that are outright dangerous.

Worse still are those who say that 'conspiracy theorists' are demented:

People hold beliefs with varying levels of truth. **False beliefs are common in neurodegenerative disorders, particularly dementia with Lewy bodies and frontotemporal dementia.** In neurodegenerative and psychiatric disorders, false beliefs range from accusations of theft, delusions of grandeur, to misidentification of people. [...]

False beliefs about Covid-19 are also more likely to occur in someone who has faulty systems for monitoring and evaluating scientific information.

Bruce L Miller MD, [Science Denial and COVID Conspiracy Theories](#), JAMA Network, 2 November 2020

Talk about hypocrisy. This is a man who has no understanding of the importance of checking the primary evidence before sounding off or any understanding of the scientific method, especially with regard to controls. Ironically, he has shown he has false beliefs about the fake pandemic derived from faulty methods of evaluating scientific evidence, the very thing he is accusing others of. The lack of self-knowledge born of a closed mind is truly staggering but not obviously unique to author Bruce Miller, as we have seen in this paper.

If he is expressing an opinion rather stating a result of research, he should have the intellectual ability to understand the difference between the two and know that opinions created without evidence and analysis are worthless in scientific terms and dangerous to good conduct.

Has it never crossed the minds of these academics that their time would be better spent ensuring that power does not disseminate disinformation or propaganda to the people? History has shown us this type of prejudice and ignorance inevitably leads to persecution and suffering on a grand scale, as for example, under the Nazi regime in Germany or the Communist regime in the Soviet Union; that there is by reason a connection between the failure to establish truth and the commission of serial injustice. Academic research has often provided succour to tyrants, mobs and psychopaths in their desire to subjugate man, as in the case of the -pre WWII academic support for eugenics, which influenced Hitler.

Does it never cross their minds that articles contradicting official propaganda are shared so widely and spread so quickly precisely because people understand that the published material at least has an element of truth about it?

Like journalists, politicians and members of the legal profession, academics exhibit an intellectual superiority derived solely from their status as academics -- unjustifiable given the extraordinary fall in educational standards in the US over the last 50 years and in England over the last 30 years --rather than the quality of their research. This is

just another form of middle-class snobbery.

In the final reckoning, they have abandoned critical thinking for groupthink, a trait that academics and others often accord to 'conspiracy theorists'.

12. Fact Checking the Fact Checkers

Every record has been destroyed or falsified, every book rewritten, every picture has been repainted, every statue and street building has been renamed, every date has been altered. And the process is continuing day by day and minute by minute. History has stopped. Nothing exists except an endless present in which the Party is always right.

George Orwell, 1984

In the past, fact checking meant trying to independently verify the facts in an article and no more. Now fact checking consists of a kind of Orwellian overview, making assessments of the thrust of an article, deciding whether the article itself is broadly true or false, a process that is obviously subject to abuse in the best of circumstances, let alone in the world of falsehood, in which this paper has now demonstrated we live.

In many cases the organisations carrying out the checks are funded by the same vested interests who stand to lose out from the truth of what the original articles expose.

Often the fact checkers do not examine primary sources but simply repeat the conclusions of secondary sources and publishers or the opinions of 'authority' figures in their field, without establishing the evidence on which these opinions are based. Many of the individuals in the political class do not understand the difference between a primary and secondary source and how they work in relation to the truth, which has allowed these fake 'fact-check' assessments to have a devastating effect on the truth and the subsequent failure of policies based on untruths.

Although they do not actually remove material like the Party does in 1984, multiple 'fact-checks' often obscure the truth, coming up higher in the Google search rankings – presumably as the result of the search engine's partnership with the Trusted News initiative and Project Origin (see The Trusted News Initiative above). This makes it much difficult to find the original source of a claim. Of course, many people are happy to simply accept these fake checks and, in my experience, often use them in arguments. However, they have become a key weapon in the armoury of the shadowy interests and their plan to subjugate mankind.

A 'Conspiracy Theory' the Mainstream Media did an About-turn on

There has been much mainstream debate recently about the origins of the 'SARS-Cov2

virus', focusing on whether the US National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases -- led by Tony Fauci and part of the National Institute of Health -- funded 'gain of function' or bioweapon research at the Wuhan Institute of Virology, situated not far from the wet-market where the first individuals displaying symptoms of 'Covid-19' worked.

Due to the evidence emerging, even the mainstream media has been forced to deal with the issue after many months of branding the matter a 'conspiracy theory' – with all the denouncement of the heretics that entails:

Ignore the conspiracy theories: scientists know Covid-19 wasn't created in a lab

Peter Daszak, [The Guardian](#), 9 June 2020

Scientists demolish 'Wuhan lab' conspiracy theory of coronavirus origins

Andre Damon, [World Socialist Website](#), 9 July 2021

Misconception: The Origins of Covid-19

Jessica McDonald, [Factcheck.org](#), October 26, 2021

Why misinformation about COVID-19's origins keeps going viral

Monique Brouillette and Rebecca Renner, [National Geographic](#), 19 September 2020

Tucker Carlson guest airs debunked conspiracy theory that Covid-19 was created in a lab

Daniel Funke, [Politifact](#), 16 September 2020

Politifact's original verdict on the last example above was 'pants on fire' as in 'liar, liar, pants on fire'. I will not dwell on what this reveals about the website's attitude towards important facts and what this attitude implies about what the organisation really thinks of its readership. – they are individuals likely to be swayed by childish name calling. The organisation has now marked this 'fact-check' as 'archived'.

It is nevertheless still accessible on the site, although there is a caveat, demonstrating that it has to be has been forced to reconsider this issue as a result of the overwhelming evidence. Even the [BBC was forced to reassess the issue](#) and consider the evidence for the claim.

Of course, neither position adopted above is true, as we have established in this paper (see Evidence of a man-made origin for 'SARS-Cov2' above). The lab origin is the official studies which cobble together bits of RNA then splice it with existing templates.

I now examine some glaring examples of disinformation put out by organisations connected to the Trusted News Initiative and Project Origin, the BBC, Reuters and Facebook, and examine two prominent examples of 'fact checks' to show that they are in fact a form of disinformation, using the usual techniques of selective evidence and misinformation.

BBC Panorama's Dangerous Disinformation

The BBC's adherence to Project Origin and the Trusted News Initiative may explain why it produced a piece of extraordinary propaganda under the BBC's once prestigious Panorama brand (see The Trusted News Initiative above).

In February 2021, the BBC aired a Panorama documentary [Vaccines: The Disinformation War](#), which failed to mention, for example, that the novel 'vaccines', in the case of Pfizer, had not been tested on animals and were still in human trials until 2023.

This did not stop the BBC's 'Disinformation Czar', Marianna Spring, from making a series of ad hominem attacks on 'anti-vaxers'. As usual with these smear pieces, there was little attempt to examine evidence or interview qualified experts dissenting from the official line for their informed analysis of evidence often not seen, heard or considered by mainstream media and government.

The programme, for example, did not mention that the 'vaccines' had been developed and introduced at indecent speed, which did not allow time for proper testing or that the entire mRNA treatment had never been used on humans beings before.

Despite this, she lobbied Facebook and other social media outlets to ban these doctors and health practitioners, which they did. It is an extraordinary comment on our times that a journalist who should believe in the freedom to share and express ideas as the best way to determine the truth and compassionate policy required to do justice should brazenly advertise her role in censorship.

The fact that no one else in the BBC stopped her or responded to the many complaints made to the programme shows that we live under institutional ignorance on the part of a self-styled liberal middle class -- which has not earned its status through education but through the very opposite: not questioning received information.

At one point, Spring put the notion to members of the public that 'anti-vaxers' were claiming that the pandemic simply didn't exist – as has been amply proven in this paper – without presenting the evidence or allowing proponents of the idea to state their case. The anti-vaxers she did interview were uninformed laypeople, who exist in all movements and walks of life, who could not in many cases eloquently state their

argument – a tactic we have often seen employed by the shadowy forces who really rule over society.

This was also a repeat of the strategy the BBC [used against critics of the official story regarding 9/11](#), in its Conspiracy Files coverage of the event, which has allowed the [US and UK to wage war on the Middle East murdering, maiming and displacing millions of individuals](#) without consequence for their actions. Given that the BBC was specifically sent [a documentary which disproved many of the claims made in BBC coverage](#) -- which I wrote drawing on my expertise of counterterrorism from my time in MI5 -- Auntie Beeb has no excuse for her ignorance.

'Spot it; you got it!' is the pithy expression of the spiritual adage that the faults you find in others are merely a reflection of your own faults, popularly known as 'the pot calling the kettle black'. The BBC was oblivious to the fact that it was guilty of the very crime of which it accused others: disseminating misleading and fraudulent disinformation or propaganda, just like the academics whose work we cited earlier (see Academic Ignorance above).

However, the corporation's sin is much greater and far more extensive because millions who do not have the time to research the news themselves still rely on its output for credible information, particularly on its flagship channel, BBC1, at prime time, especially in the case of a once-prestigious brand like Panorama. 'Anti-vaxers' rarely command an audience of millions and do not have the (misplaced) prestige that the BBC still has as a result of its reputation garnered in the past.

It was absolutely apparent that Spring had done none of her own research or checked facts and had no understanding of what she was presenting or the dangers her disinformation posed to public health and individual livelihoods, liberties and rights.

Shortly after the programme was broadcast, I complained to the BBC pointing out some of the truths about the pandemic and vaccines-- like many of thousands of others -- but did not even receive a reply. Rationalism, integrity and objective dictates that the BBC should have addressed this evidence and, where validated, should have broadcast it in another edition of Panorama.

On 8 February 2022, Spring appeared on the BBC News channel to once again sound off about 'conspiracy theories' and their proponents, despite [the irrefutable evidence that has emerged about the harm being done by the jab](#) (see The Criminal Investigation above). She is either irredeemably ignorant and intellectually incapable or is subject to the kind of mind control which we have established – through evidence considered in this study -- is feasible (see Rockefeller Mind Control via Wifi and Viruses above). Either way, she should not be allowed the opportunity to spout the kind of ill-informed bile used to whip up hatred against minorities, who in this case happened to be exposers of mainstream lies.

At no point did the BBC News's (female) interviewer seek to cross-examine Spring about the evidence on which she based her assessments, let alone try to put herself in the shoes of the 'anti-vaxers' and play the 'Devil's Advocate'. How far this is based on the IT behind Project Origin 'authorising' information is impossible to say. In any case, it does not absolve an individual of their duty to verify the facts through independent research.

This refusal to cross-examine politicians and journalists, among others, has though led in recent times to the BBC espousing sickening propoganda about Russia's supposed intention to invade Ukraine, which puts every man, woman and child across the world at risk of harm from World War Three.

Fact checking the Reuters Fact Checkers

When you tell the badly informed that the virus has not been 'isolated' in the naturally understood sense of the word, they will reply that this claim has been debunked by a fact check performed by the long-standing news agency, Reuters. So let's take a look at this article.

The original Reuters article

Published on 30 March 2021, under the headline: '[Fact Check-SARS-CoV-2 has been isolated and its complete genome has been sequenced](#)' -- but unattributed to a specific author -- it purports to have checked the facts but any examination of the piece proves that it does nothing of the sort. It instead uses the techniques of the straw man argument -- attributing an easily disprovable statement to an opponent then exposing the fact it's obviously not true -- selective evidence and a failure to actually check primary sources rather than simply giving a link to them to fraudulently prop up the official story about the 'SARS-Cov2virus' causing 'Covid-19'.

The Reuters article draws much of its counter-information -- although selectively -- from an article headlined '[Koch's Postulates, Covid and Misinformation rabbit holes](#)', written by Siouxsie Wiles, an associate professor at the University of Auckland's Department of Molecular Medicine and Pathology.

In this case though, the Reuters article does accurately reflect what David Crowe, a Canadian writer, said with regard to 'isolation of the virus' -- which is actually true with regard to isolation and a virus being the cause of the 'pandemic' -- as we have already established in this paper. Crowe was quoted as saying:

'You can tell a virologist is lying when they use the word 'isolation', he said. 'There's innumerable papers that say we isolated the virus,

but let me describe how they did it... They took a nasal swab and they processed it somehow; like you have to add antibiotics to kill bacteria and things like that. So you process it and add it to a cell culture.

'They observed cells dying in the cell culture and they wrote: 'We have isolated the virus.' Clearly, it's not specific. Even if you have identified a virus, you haven't identified a specific virus. So then they searched around for RNA and they found a long string of RNA which looked like what had previously been called coronavirus. But nobody has ever purified a coronavirus'.

The Reuters team then baldly states:

However, the first argument relating to isolation is not true.

Although the source article by Wiles berates critics of the official science for 'using isolation in the every-day sense of the word, rather than the definition that is relevant', Reuters does not address this pertinent issue which goes to the heart of the virus fraud: virologists do not use the word 'isolate' like the rest of us (see Detailed Refutation of Existence of SARS-Cov2 above).

How Orwellian is it to dismiss individuals for using words in their natural sense rather than a perverse specialist sense, designed to mislead? Either way, the failure to mention this represents the selective use of evidence, one of the key tactics of the those who maliciously seek to undermine the truth and therefore justice.

Reuters then provides links to two studies, [here](#) and [here](#) -- which employ the usual methodology and make the same erroneous claims about the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' having been proved to cause 'Covid-19' and fail to use a control so cannot provide the scientific proof the Reuters article is claiming; and a link to [a study which compares methods](#) of 'isolation'.

Again, we have evidence of unproven rumours echoing around the chambers of academic publishing. The third study cited above study states:

SARS-Cov2 was detected according to the real-time PCR protocol established by Corman et al

As we have already established, this paper did:

- Did not detect the 'SARS-Cov2' virus because it did not have an example of 'the virus' to compare with its findings;
- Was not peer-reviewed and later discredited in terms of methodology and findings;
- Did not use controls.

A fourth link refers to an article which [makes reference to the McMaster University study](#) -- which we have already noted has not produced a peer-reviewed paper on their findings – and [research going on at the Vaccine and Infectious Disease Organisation based at the University of Saskatchewan](#) in Canada, which doesn't even claim to have 'isolated the virus':

Researchers also ordered ingredients to build their own synthetic version of the coronavirus, using genome sequencing information from China.

It does though reveal how 'coronavirus' genomes are made in the laboratory.

The Reuters article then publishes three links to the genomic sequencing of the RNA in silico, which we have also dealt with above (see Genomic Sequencing above).

Reuters goes on to state:

Meanwhile, the second argument, that coronaviruses have never been purified, shows a misunderstanding of how viruses work – and does not prove they do not exist.

It then quotes Wiles, the associate professor at the University of Auckland's Department of Molecular Medicine and Pathology, saying they reference an 'outdated microbiological theory' of Koch's postulates. Yet, the failure to meet Koch's postulates is mentioned by the research scientists and virologists who authored the Na Zhu et al paper, in one of the first studies which claimed to have 'isolated the virus' (see Detailed Refutation of Existence of SARS-Cov2 above) and was the headline in the Nature magazine study claiming to have 'isolated the original SARS-Cov virus' (see Proof there was no isolated SARS-Cov virus above).

Of course, the Reuters team would have known this, it had bothered to check the primary sources.

Analysis of the initial claims by Reuters

In any case, the failure to meet Koch's postulates is not a point made in the original criticism of 'virus isolation' on the part of Canadian writer, David Crowe, that prompted the Reuters disinformation piece which we are now examining. This is a classic example of the 'straw man' technique. 'Fact checks' often use the 'straw man' argument of inventing or misrepresenting what an individual said to then knock it down, making it look like the individual in question is a gullible idiot ready to indiscriminately jump on any dubious information which supports their deluded case. But that is of course what Reuters is doing here.

In any case, this is a straw man argument because anyone who has done any basic

research knows that River's, not Koch's Postulates, are better applied to viruses. In the source article for the piece, Wiles does list four postulates based on River's six postulates. However, neither Wiles nor Reuters seeks to apply them to the 'isolation' or existence of the 'SARS-Cov2 virus' and how it might be said to cause 'Covid-19'. Wiles then goes on to state:

As I've pointed out, viruses need a host cell to replicate in which is why samples are combined with another "source of genetic material". This is just biology.

And as for using isolation in the every-day sense of the word, rather than the definition that is relevant to the question being asked? Well, that's just bloody ridiculous and a clear sign these requests for evidence are not being made in good faith.

Siouxie Wiles, [Koch's postulates, Covid and misinformation rabbit holes](#), Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences, University of Auckland, 16 November 2020

This is an admission that the particles virologists purport to be 'viruses' cannot be isolated in the true sense of the world. As discussed at length above, if the 'viral material' cannot be isolated from other genetic material, then can be no certainty that it causes the symptoms observed in the diseased host. That's just reason! The fact that Wiles thinks this is 'bloody ridiculous' speaks volumes about modern 'professors' and 'science' and their ability to think rationally and constructively. The Reuters authors of the 'fact check' chose not to point this out.

Without reason, Wiles also seeks to dismiss the idea that 'viruses' are exosomes without examining [the evidential comparison that Dr Andrew Kaufman made earlier in 2020](#) (see What SARS-Cov2 actually appears to be above).


Neither Wiles nor Reuters addresses the failure to apply the scientific method with regard to a control, making any claim to isolation without reasonable basis. Dr Stefan Lanka's work had been first published in 2015 regarding how a control using a sample from an uninfected individual produced the same observable data as from an infected individual and again in 2020 as a result of Lanka's court case. There is no excuse for ignorance.

The fraud of the images of 'SARS-Cov2'


The Reuters article then links to 'pictures' of the 'SARS-Cov2 virus', from the US National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. The news agency does not mention these are doctored images. By that, I mean they have been changed in '[content or appearance of \(a document or picture\) in order to deceive](#)'. Images from an electron microscope are grainy, greyscale-style two-dimensional images.

One of the NIAID images does look like that, although it has still been 'touched up', like photos of ageing actresses or models in glossy magazines (below, left). But the rest have been colourised and otherwise enhanced (see below, top and bottom right) using digital imaging software, a fact that is only apparent when you realise that clicking on an [image opens a webpage in which the following is admitted below the image](#):

Image captured and colorized at NIAID's Rocky Mountain Laboratories (RML) in Hamilton, Montana. Credit: NIAID



The fake pandemic was propped up on the back of a similar 'poster-boy' image (below) which appeared ubiquitously. The fact that it was a computer-generated image was virtually never mentioned:



In other words, the image has been doctored to give the impression to the layman that it is an actual real-world image of the 'virus' at the heart of the pandemic because visual data has an enormous and immediate influence over the vast majority of people who have neither the time nor intellectual ability to consider written material.

This doctored image constitutes fraud in law partly because there is no isolated virus, let alone one looking like this. And partly because this artistic invention has been used to promote the 'Covid-19 threat' and the need for lockdowns and other draconian infringements of rights and liberties as the only way to successfully deal with the 'pandemic'.

Summary of the Reuters 'fact check'

In summary, the Reuters 'fact check' fails to check the facts because it:

- accepts the findings of secondary sources like discredited academic papers rather than examining the primary evidence the findings are based on;
- deliberately selects evidence designed to support the official account of 'SARS-Cov2' but neglects to mention the failures of scientists to apply the basis of the scientific method, like controls;
- quotes the opinions of Associate Professor Siouxsie Wiles as an 'authority' without checking her evidence or quizzing her about her claims;
- uses the 'straw man' technique to discredit a critic of officialdom;
- fraudulently publishes a link to so-called 'images' of the virus without

mentioning they have been doctored.

In other words, it neatly encapsulates in one article how the media has perpetrated the 'Covid-19' fraud.

James Smith, the chairman of the Thomson Reuters Foundation -- the charity supported by the news agency -- [is a director of Pfizer](#). He was president, Chief Executive Officer or a Director of Reuters from 2012 until his retirement in 2020. He also serves on the board of the [Partnering Against Corruption Initiative and is a member of the International Business Council](#). Both bodies belong to the WEF, which has enormously benefited from the fake pandemic to advance its cause (see The Influence of the World Economic Forum above).

The reporting above and Smith's conflict of interest is at odds with the principles of the Reuters Trust:

- That Reuters shall at no time pass into the hands of any one interest, group, or faction;
- That the integrity, independence, and freedom from bias of Thomson Reuters shall at all times be fully preserved;
- That Reuters shall supply unbiased and reliable news services to newspapers, news agencies, broadcasters, and other media subscribers and to businesses, governments, institutions, individuals, and others with whom Reuters has or may have contracts;
- That Thomson Reuters shall pay due regard to the many interests which it serves in addition to those of the media;

Reuters is also implicated in the 9/11 attacks as the admitted source [of the claim that World Trade Centre Building 7 had collapsed 20 mins or so before it did](#), reported by the BBC and other media outlets. Prior knowledge of a crime is routinely taken as evidence of involvement.

So what do you expect from a news agency which appears to have lost its place in a script for the events of the day of 9/11 and released a report of an event that had not then happened only for it to actually happen less half an hour later?

Facebook Censorship and Big Pharma Propaganda

Having examined the output of two of the members of the Trusted News Initiative, the BBC and Reuters, let us now turn our attention to one of its other influential members, social media site Facebook, now known as 'Meta'.

In June 2021, the emails of Dr Tony Fauci, director of the National Institute of Allergy

and Infectious Diseases, were released following a Freedom of Information request. They revealed that very early on in the 'pandemic', 15 March 2020, the CEO of Facebook, Mark Zuckerberg, sent his plans for the social media site to create a 'coronavirus information hub', which was to be prioritised on the site, which has '200+ million Americans and 2.5 billion people worldwide' to ensure that authoritative information was put out about the putative 'pandemic'.

This isn't public yet, but we're building a Coronavirus Information Hub that we're going to put at the top of Facebook for everyone (200+ million Americans, 2.5 billion people worldwide) with two goals: (1) make sure people can get authoritative information from reliable sources and (2) encourage people to practice social distance and give people ideas for doing this using internet tools. This will be live within the next 48 hours.

This has [prompted an enquiry by the US Congress into whether Zuckerberg was persuaded by Fauci to censor claims that 'SRS-Cov2' may have come from a lab](#), while raising concerns that a social media site --which in theory, at least, is supposed to allow its users to freely communicate information and ideas -- was conspiring with an arm of the US federal government.

Finally, [REDACTED] (b) (4)

Natalie Bettendorf and Jason Leopold, [Anthony Fauci's Emails Reveal The Pressure That Fell On One Man](#), BuzzFeed News, 2 June 2021.

Part of the Zuckerberg email is redacted but it appears to make an offer, which is further mentioned in an email to Fauci, dated 16 March 2020, which is also redacted:


But an even bigger deal is his offer [REDACTED] (b) (4)
[REDACTED] The sooner we get that offer up the food-chain the better. I gave Bill Hall a heads-up about this opportunity and he is standing by to discuss this with HHS and WH comms, but I didn't want him to do anything without you being aware of the offer. Is it OK if I hand this aspect off to Bill to determine who the best point of contact would be so the Administration can take advantage of this offer, soonest?

Some have speculated that Zuckerberg offered to fund a 'vaccination' programme. Whether that is true or not, the email also establishes that from the outset that Zuckerberg was behind the powers-that-be's efforts to respond to the fake 'pandemic', which -- as we have seen was based on propaganda rather than evidence from the beginning (see The Run-Up to Lockdown above).

Facebook regularly tells posters to its social media platform that people who repeatedly share 'false information' might have their posts moved lower in its news feed or they might be suspended or banned from the platform, particularly with

regard to information concerning the faked pandemic and 'vaccines'. It has therefore played a major role in suppressing the truth, likely basing its assessments on information 'authorised' by the Project Origin software of the Trusted News Initiative, (see The Trusted News Initiative above).

Facebook also attaches the following notice to posts which mention the 'vaccines' and the policy of mass vaccination:



This is clearly a lie as, in the case of Pfizer, the trial data will not be available until 2023, while failing to take into account that there simply wasn't time for the 'vaccine' manufacturers to develop and test for safety a treatment between the time of 'Covid-19' being first reported and the roll-out of the 'vaccine' programme.

It directly contradicts the conclusions of the doctors who make up the [Canadian Covid Care Alliance](#). Their forensic analysis of the Pfizer trial data released in September 2021 has unequivocally demonstrated that the jab does more harm than good.

Facebook also funds [Full Fact Check](#) -- although the exact amounts are unknown -- to police posts made on the social media site, which it claims are 'disinformation'. FFC claims in its defence that Facebook's funding does not compromise its editorial independence yet the above notice is clear evidence that the FFC has chosen not to verify the claims in it. Lead Stories, another Facebook 'independent' fact checker boasts of its partnership with the social media giant, which is a contradiction in terms; you cannot be a partner and be independent and therefore impartial.

Facebook 'Fact-Checking' Scrutinised

In November 2021, Lead Stories launched a wholly unjustified attack on a peer-reviewed article in The British Medical Journal which detailed a whistle-blower's evidence of shoddy and fraudulent practices regarding the trials for the Pfizer jab.

Background

On 3 November 2021, Howard Kaplan, a retired dentist from Israel, posted [a link to a BMJ investigation article in a private Facebook group](#). The investigation reported [poor clinical trial research practices occurring at Ventavia](#), a contract research

company helping to carry out the main Pfizer Covid-19 vaccine trial.

According to the BMJ's article, Brook Jackson, a former worker at Pfizer contractor, Ventavia, had blown the whistle on the company falsifying data, unblinding patients and employing inadequately trained vaccinators at three of the 153 sites where Pfizer trials were conducted.

The BMJ relied on copies of reports submitted by Jackson. She provided the journal with dozens of internal company documents, photos, audio recordings, and email. Jackson also told The BMJ that, during the two weeks she was employed at Ventavia in September 2020, she repeatedly informed her superiors of poor laboratory management, patient safety concerns and data integrity issues:

In a recording of a meeting in late September 2020 between Jackson and two directors, a Ventavia executive can be heard explaining that the company wasn't able to quantify the types and number of errors they were finding when examining the trial paperwork for quality control.

'In my mind, it's something new every day', a Ventavia executive says. 'We know that it's significant.'

Paul D Thacker, [Covid-19: Researcher blows the whistle on data integrity issues in Pfizer's vaccine trial](#), British Medical Journal, 02 November 2021

In an email from September 2020, the contract research organisation with which Pfizer partnered on the trial, ICON, reminded Ventavia of the need to address all queries within 24 hours before highlighting over 100 outstanding queries older than three days in yellow. Examples included two individuals who had reported severe reactions to the jab who had not been contacted to detail the adversity they were experiencing.

In her 25 September email to the US Food and Drug Administration -- which approves medical treatments like vaccines -- Jackson wrote that Ventavia had enrolled more than 1,000 participants at three sites. (The full study enrolled around 44,000 participants across 153 sites that included numerous commercial companies and academic centres).

She then listed the concerns she had witnessed, which included:

- Participants placed in a hallway after injection and not being monitored by clinical staff;
- Lack of timely follow-up of patients who experienced adverse events;
- Protocol deviations not being reported;
- Vaccines not being stored at proper temperatures;

- Mislabelled laboratory specimens;
- Targeting of Ventavia staff for reporting these types of problems.

Several other employees backed up her account. Despite all this, neither Pfizer, nor the FDA ever audited or investigated the research company; and Pfizer never disclosed the problems in its Emergency Use Application for the 'vaccine' -- which constitutes fraud -- and has hired Ventavia to run four more Covid-19 clinical trials.

The article brought record internet traffic to bmj.com and was widely shared on Twitter, helping it achieve [the second highest Altmetric score of all time across all biomedical publications](#). But a week after his original posting, Kaplan woke up to a message from Facebook, stating that:

Independent fact-checkers say this information could misled people

A link at the bottom of the post sent readers to a 'fact-check' article on the Lead Stories website.

In one private Facebook group of people who had long-term neurological adverse events after 'vaccination', group administrators received a message from Facebook informing them that the post linking to *The BMJ's* investigation was 'partly false'.

Lead Stories' Response

Soon, several BMJ readers were alerting the journal to Facebook's censorship. Although Lead Stories failed to identify any errors in The BMJ's investigation, the article carried the title: '[Fact Check: The British Medical Journal Did NOT Reveal Disqualifying and Ignored Reports of Flaws in Pfizer COVID-19 Vaccine Trials](#)'. It began:

Did the British Medical Association's news blog reveal flaws that disqualify the results of a contractor's field testing of Pfizer's Covid-19 vaccine, and were the problems ignored by the Food & Drug Administration and by Pfizer? **No, that's not true:**

The first paragraph wrongly described The BMJ as a 'news blog' and was accompanied by a screenshot of the investigation article with a stamp over it stating 'Flaws Reviewed'. Lead Stories did not mention that the investigation was externally peer-reviewed, despite this being stated in the BMJ article, and had published its article under a URL that contained the phrase 'hoax-alert'.

Lead Stories went on to quote the opinions of medical professionals and Pfizer's claim that the matter had been investigated but provided no detail. It failed to investigate any of the claims made against Pfizer or the FDA, allowing them to make unsubstantiated statements in their defence. By this time, Pfizer had released data

from its trial of the jab, which showed that the jab was less than safe, later examined in detail by the [Canadian Covid Care Alliance](#).

BMJ's response and Lead Stories' failure to correct

Fiona Godlee and Kamran Abbasi, editors of The BMJ, contacted Lead Stories, asking it to remove its article. The author of the article, Dean Miller, replied to say that Lead Stories was not responsible for Facebook's actions. The BMJ response went on:

We have also contacted Facebook directly, requesting immediate removal of the 'fact checking' label and any link to the Lead Stories article, thereby allowing our readers to freely share the article on your platform.

There is also a wider concern that we wish to raise. We are aware that The BMJ is not the only high-quality information provider to have been affected by the incompetence of Meta's [Facebook's] fact checking regime. To give one other example, we would highlight the treatment by Instagram (also owned by Meta) of Cochrane, the international provider of high-quality systematic reviews of the medical evidence.

Rather than investing a proportion of Meta's substantial profits to help ensure the accuracy of medical information shared through social media, you have apparently delegated responsibility to people incompetent in carrying out this crucial task.

Fiona Godlee and Kamran Abbasi, editors of The BMJ, [Rapid Response, Open letter from The BMJ to Mark Zuckerberg](#), 2 November 2021

Some seven weeks later, Lead Stories responded to the BMJ's letter. It did not address the specific concerns set out in it and sought to malign the journal's original article by association with a viral story which had turned out to be untrue, claiming the Pfizer CEO had been arrested, which The BMJ had nothing to do with and had not reported. Lead Stories did not concern itself with the truth or otherwise of the BMJ original article or its implications for the sanctity of medical research and the effect that might have on:

- the health of the individuals who had the mRNA jab;
- the detail of the informed consent for the procedure.

The online 'fact check' site seemed more concerned that the article had gone viral.

It then went on to quibble about an editorial decision relating to the headline -- but not the content or accuracy of the article -- then sought to damn the BMJ claiming that it had not provided 'context' to Brook's whistle-blowing. In this instance, context

would mean primarily drawing attention to the fact that Pfizer had falsified data, [used poorly designed trials](#) and bribed doctors in the past.

To Lead Stories, 'context' meant damning Brook on the basis of social media posts in the past:

The Brook Jackson Twitter account agreed with leading Covid misinformation-spreader Robert F. Kennedy Jr.'s criticism of the Sesame Street episode in which Big Bird encourages kids to get a COVID-19 vaccine. "Shocking, actually." she wrote in a [November 9, 2021, response](#) to a Kennedy tweet blasting Sesame Street (archived [here](#)).

Elsewhere on Twitter, the Brook Jackson [account wrote to a vaccine-hesitant person that vaccination makes sense if a person is in a high-risk category](#).

When the US 5th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled against a federal employee vaccine mandate, she tweeted "HUGE!" and not with a frowny emoji. [...]

By talking to Ventavia, we contributed context BMJ.com missed [Ventavia said the whistleblower had not worked on the Pfizer trial](#), but Lead Stories set that straight by [embedding in its story a copy of a letter, provided by Jackson](#) in which she was expressly welcomed to the Pfizer trial team. **That's what we mean by context.**

Dean Miller, [Lead Stories' Response To BMJ Open Letter Objecting To A Lead Stories Fact Check](#), Lead Stories, 18 December 2021

This is desperate stuff. Let me set the record straight:


- First, Robert Kennedy has written an extremely well-researched book on [Tony Fauci, Bill Gates and Big Pharma's attack on public health and democracy itself](#) as part of his work for [Children's Health Defence](#), an alliance of doctors who have marshalled evidence against the experimental jab.
- Second, using a well-loved character from a popular kid's educational TV show to induce young children not old enough to consent in law to use 'pester-power' to persuade their parents to allow them to have an experimental medical treatment is wholly unethical.
- Third, advising the informed use of any medical treatment is wise, particularly where that treatment's side effects are unestablished because it is still in trials.
- Fourth, supporting the principle of consent for medical treatment is in line with the Nuremberg Principles created to prevent Nazi-style enforced medical procedures. It is the very cornerstone of being a compassionate human being.

- Fifth, although Lead Stories did publish documentary evidence that Ventavia had lied about Brook not working on the Pfizer trial -- designed to undermine the very fabric of her whistle-blowing -- it did not draw attention to this within the original piece and did not seek to quiz Ventavia about it. (Lead Stories did though mention the documentary evidence in its response to The BMJ's letter).

In general, Lead Stories uses two of the most often used arrows in the quiver of the scoundrel: the ad hominem attack and guilt by association, although it clearly backfires in this case as Robert F Kennedy's reputation for telling the truth has never been called into question by those who have done their own research into the evidence he has marshalled.

In any case, the ad hominem attack has no place in the quest for truth because truth is determined by the quality of evidence and analysis an individual brings to the debating table.

Until 23 January 2022, when I was writing this piece, anyone trying to access the original Facebook post could still see Facebook's censorship of the post (below). It has since been replaced by a message stating: 'This content isn't available right now'.



Facebook admits its 'fact checks' are 'opinion', not fact

Facebook has though destroyed its self-proclaimed 'fact-check' function in a submission to a court of law.

In September 2021, John Stossel -- a veteran television journalist who worked at ABC News for more than 25 years before hosting a weekly news show on Fox Business --

issued a writ for defamation against Facebook after Facebook's 'fact checkers' labelled climate change information that Stossel posted as 'false and misleading'.

The complaint says that Stossel's video 'explored a scientific hypothesis' that while climate change undoubtedly contributes to forest fires, it was not the primary cause of the 2020 California fires. In the writ, Stossel says [he never made the claim that 'Forest fires are caused by poor management; not by climate change'](#), which was in Facebook's 'fact-check'.

On a separate occasion, Facebook added a 'partly false'/'factual inaccuracies' label to a video which questioned claims made by those Stossel refers to as 'environmental alarmists' called 'Are We Doomed?' Stossel claims the Facebook 'fact-check' didn't actually challenge any facts in the video, arguing that the company's fact-check process is nothing more than a pretext to defame users with impunity.

The lawsuit goes on to allege that Stossel was given no meaningful avenue to contest these unilateral decisions about the truth of his journalism. Meanwhile, his viewership plummeted due to both Facebook's censorship and the reputational harm caused by the false labels. In April 2021, ad revenue generated by his videos dropped almost in half, from approximately \$10,000 (£7,400) per month to \$5,500 (£4,000) per month.

Stossel's lawsuit seeks \$2million (£1.5million) in damages for these losses and loss of reputation as a journalist.

John Stossel v Facebook, [Action for Damages](#), US District Court, Northern District of California, San Jose Division, 22 September 2021

In an earlier response to Stossel's charges about the fact-check rating on the 'Government-Fuelled Fires' video, Climate Feedback, which performs 'fact checking for Facebook wrote:

Stossel complains that we should not have rated his post using a claim review of a quote that does not appear in his video. **This is a misunderstanding of how fact-checking partners operate on Facebook.**

Given that many pieces of content posted on Facebook can separately make the same claim, **it is not necessary to create a separate claim review article for each post we rate.**

It is, of course, necessary that the claim we reviewed is representative of the claim in each post we rate, which is true in this case.

Scott Johnson, [Responding to Stossel TV video on our rating process](#), Climate Feedback, 8 October 2020

In other words, the 'fact-check' is not actually checking the facts in the article under consideration, yet is still providing an assessment of the truth in an article. This comment reveals the duplicity and irrationality at the heart of the 'fact-checking' industry.

In its legal response to Stossel's defamation claim, Facebook states in reply that the company cannot be sued for defamation because its 'fact check':

labels themselves are neither false nor defamatory; to the contrary, they constitute protected opinion are mere statements of opinion rather than factual assertions.

Opinions are protected free speech, while false assertions of fact can be subject to a libel claim:

“ Beyond this threshold Section 230 problem, the complaint also fails to state a claim for defamation. For one, Stossel fails to plead facts establishing that Meta acted with actual malice—which, as a public figure, he must. For another, Stossel's claims focus on the **fact-check articles written by Climate Feedback**, not the labels affixed through the Facebook platform. The labels themselves are neither false nor defamatory; to the contrary, **they constitute protected opinion**. And even if Stossel could attribute Climate Feedback's separate webpages to Meta, the challenged statements on those pages are likewise neither false nor defamatory. Any of these failures would doom Stossel's complaint, but the combination makes any amendment futile.

[John Stossel v Facebook, Writ Response by Facebook](#), US District Court, Northern District of California, San Jose Division, 8 March 2021, Page 2, Line 8

An opinion is: 'Coffee is better than tea' or 'The policies of the Green Party are the best way forward' or 'Jimmy Carr is funny even though he can be offensive'. It is a reflection of taste and personal choice. The law rightly does not concern itself with such piffling matters. Essentially calling a journalist a fraud for disputing climate propaganda is of course libellous. Facebook's admission sets a precedent for others to sue the corporation because this defence does not protect it from a claim for libel or defamation.

If Facebook's 'fact checks' are opinions, they should be labelled as such. Otherwise, the corporation commits the criminal offence of fraud.

Since then, Facebook has lost more than a quarter of its market cap or value while CEO Mark Zuckerberg personally lost nearly \$30billion, the second-largest single-day loss in history, (see Follow the Money: the Main Beneficiaries above).

In the absence of governments performing their duty with regard to law, this appears to be a tiny bit of 'poetic justice'.