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***

This E-book consists of a Preface and Thirteen Chapters.

We are dealing with an exceedingly complex process.

In the course of the last 20 months starting in early January 2020, I have analyzed almost on a daily basis the timeline and evolution of the Covid crisis. From the very outset in January 2020, people were led to believe and accept the existence of a rapidly progressing and dangerous epidemic.

I suggest you first read the Highlights (below), the Preface and Introduction before proceeding with chapters II through XIII

Alternatively you may wish to View the Global Research Video entitled: The 2021 Worldwide Corona Crisis (released in February 2021), which provides a 25 minutes summary.

Each of the thirteen chapters provides factual information as well as analysis on the following topics:

What Is Covid-19, what is SARS-CoV-2, how is it identified, how is it estimated?

The timeline and historical evolution of the Corona Crisis,

The devastating economic and financial impacts,

The enrichment of a social minority of billionaires,
Social engineering and the destabilization of the institutions of civil society

How the lockdown policies trigger unemployment and mass poverty Worldwide,

The devastating impacts on mental health.

The E-book includes analysis of curative and preventive drugs as well as a review of Big Pharma’s Covid-19 “messenger” mRNA vaccine which is an “unapproved” and “experimental” drug affecting the human genome. (It is a dangerous drug. See Chapter VIII)

Also analyzed are issues pertaining to the derogation of fundamental human rights, censorship of medical doctors, freedom of expression and the protest movement.

The last chapter focusses on the unfolding global debt crisis, the destabilization of national governments, the threats to democracy including “global governance” and the World Economic Forum’s “Great Reset” proposal.

This E-Book is made available free of charge with a view to reaching out to people Worldwide. it is accessible in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website Drop Down Menu on the top banner of our home page.

If you wish to make a donation click here to cover the costs of the book (e.g. $10-$20 dollars, that would be much appreciated).

If you want to become Member of Global Research click here

Please help us in this endeavor. Kindly forward to family, friends and colleagues, within your respective communities.

Since its publication in mid-December 2020, the E-Book has been consulted by more than 300,000 readers.

Readers can reach Prof. Michel Chossudovsky at crgeditor@yahoo.com

Videos

click the lower right corner to access full-screen.
The September 2021 video featuring Prof. Michel Chossudovsky provides a broad picture of the ongoing crisis as well analysis of the experimental Covid-19 “vaccine”.

To view the video on Bitchute and/or enter a comment, click the link below:
https://www.bitchute.com/video/uBzx3eYozeXz/

Highlights

We are at the crossroads of one of the most serious crises in World history. We are living history, yet our understanding of the sequence of events since January 2020 has been blurred.

Worldwide, people have been misled both by their governments and the media as to the causes and devastating consequences of the Covid-19 “pandemic”.

The unspoken truth is that the novel coronavirus provides a pretext and a justification to powerful financial interests and corrupt politicians to precipitate the entire World into a spiral of mass unemployment, bankruptcy, extreme poverty and despair.

More than 7 billion people Worldwide are directly or indirectly affected by the corona crisis.

The COVID-19 public health “emergency” under WHO auspices was presented to public opinion as a means (“solution”) to containing the “killer virus”.

If the public had been informed and reassured that Covid is (according to the WHO definition) “Similar to Seasonal Influenza”, the fear campaign would have fallen flat. The lockdown and closure of the national economy would have been rejected outright.

The first stage of this crisis (outside China) was launched by the WHO on January 30th 2020 at a time when there were 5 cases in the US, 3 in Canada, 4 in France, 4 in Germany.

Do these numbers justify the declaration of a Worldwide public health emergency?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of the Americas</th>
<th>United States of America</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Region</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fear campaign was sustained by political statements and media disinformation.

People are frightened. They are encouraged to do the PCR test, which is flawed. A positive PCR test does not mean that you are infected and/or that you can transmit the virus.

The RT-PCR Test is known to produce a high percentage of false positives. Moreover, it does not identify the virus.

From the outset in January 2020, there was no “scientific basis” to justify the launching of a Worldwide public health emergency.
In February, the covid crisis was accompanied by a major crash of financial markets. There is evidence of financial fraud.

And on March 11, 2020: the WHO officially declared a Worldwide pandemic at a time when there were 44,279 cases and 1440 deaths outside China out of a population of 6.4 billion (Estimates of confirmed cases based on the PCR test).

Immediately following the March 11, 2020 WHO announcement, confinement and lockdown instructions were transmitted to 193 member states of the United Nations.

Unprecedented in history, applied almost simultaneously in a large of number countries, entire sectors of the World economy have been destabilized. Small and medium sized enterprises have been driven into bankruptcy. Unemployment and poverty are rampant.

The social impacts of these measures are not only devastating, they are ongoing under what was described as “A Second Wave”. There is no evidence of a “Second Wave”. Amply documented the PCR estimates are flawed.

The health impacts (mortality, morbidity) resulting from the closing down of national economies far surpass those attributed to Covid-19.

Famines have erupted in at least 25 developing countries according to UN sources.

The mental health of millions of people Worldwide has been affected as a result of the lockdown, social distancing, job losses, bankruptcies, mass poverty and despair. The frequency of suicides and drug addiction has increased Worldwide.

“V the Virus” is said to be responsible for the wave of bankruptcies and unemployment. That’s a lie. There is no causal relationship between the (microscopic) SARS-2 virus and economic variables.

It’s the powerful financiers and billionaires who are behind this project which has contributed to the destabilization (Worldwide) of the real economy. And there is ample evidence that the decision to close down a national economy (resulting in poverty and unemployment) will inevitably have an impact on patterns of morbidity and mortality.

Since early February 2020, the Super Rich have cashed in on billions of dollars.

Amply documented it’s the largest redistribution of global wealth in World history, accompanied by a process of Worldwide impoverishment.
The fear campaign has served as an instrument of disinformation.

Media lies sustained the image of a killer virus which initially contributed to destabilizing US-China trade and disrupting air travel. And then in February “V-the Virus” (which incidentally is similar to seasonal influenza) was held responsible for triggering the most serious financial crisis in World history.

And then on March 11, 2020 a lockdown was imposed on 193 member states on the United Nations, leading to the “closure” of national economies Worldwide.
Starting in October 2020, a “second wave” was announced. “The pandemic is not over”.

The fear campaign prevails. And people are now led to believe that the corona vaccine sponsored by their governments is the “solution”. And that “normality” will be restored once the entire population of the planet has been vaccinated.

The SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine

How is it that a vaccine for the SARS-CoV-2 virus, which under normal conditions would take years to develop, was promptly launched in early November 2020? The mRNA vaccine announced by Pfizer is based on an experimental gene editing mRNA technology which has a bearing on the human genome.

Were the standard animal lab tests using mice or ferrets conducted?

Or did Pfizer “go straight to human “guinea pigs.”? Human tests began in late July and early August. “Three months is unheard of for testing a new vaccine. Several years is the norm.”

Our thanks to Large and JIPÉM

This caricature by Large + JIPÉM explains our predicament:

Mouse No 1: “Are You Going to get Vaccinated”,

Mouse No. 2: Are You Crazy, They Haven’t finished the Tests on Humans”
And why do we need a vaccine for Covid-19 when both the WHO and the US Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have confirmed unequivocally that Covid-19 is “similar to seasonal influenza”.

The plan to develop a vaccine is profit driven. It is supported by corrupt governments serving the interests of Big Pharma. The US government had already ordered several hundred million doses and the the EU is to purchase an additional 1.8 billion doses from Pfizer (four times the population of the European Union).

It’s Big Money for Big Pharma, generous payoffs to corrupt politicians, at the expense of tax payers.

In the following chapters, we define the SARS-CoV-2 virus and the controversial RT-PCR test which is allegedly being used to “identify genetic fragments of the virus” as well establish the “estimates” of the so-called “positive cases”.(Chapter III).

In Chapter II, we examine in detail the timeline of events since October 2019 leading up to the historic March 11, 2020 lockdown and confinement.

We assess the broad economic and social consequences of this crisis including the process of Worldwide impoverishment and redistribution of wealth in favour of the Super Rich billionaires.(Chapters IV and V).

The devastating impacts of the lockdown policies on mental health are examined in Chapter VI.

Big Pharma’s vaccination programme which is being imposed on millions of people Worldwide is reviewed in Chapter VIII. Chapter IX recalls the circumstances of the H1N1 Swine Flu pandemic, which turned out to be a scam, sponsored by the WHO.

Chapter X focusses on the “Identification” of the Virus. Was SARS-CoV-2 Isolated?

Chapter XI focusses on the Derogation of Freedom of Expression and the authoritarian policies imposed to ensure social compliance. Chapter XII focuses on Crimes against Humanity and the Nuremberg Code.

Chapter XIII concludes with an analysis of the World Economic Forum’s proposed “Great Reset” which if adopted would consist in scrapping the Welfare State and imposing massive austerity measures on an impoverished population.

This E-Book has been revised and updated since its publication in December 2020. There is a sense of urgency. People Worldwide are being lied to by their governments.

A word on the methodology: our objective is to refute the “Big Lie” through careful analysis consisting of:

- A historical overview of the Covid crisis, with precise data.
- Quotations from official documents and peer reviewed reports. Numerous sources and references are indicated.
- Scientific analysis and detailed review of “official” data, estimates and definitions,
- Analysis of the impacts of WHO “guidelines” and government policies on
economic, social and public health variables.

Our objective is to inform people Worldwide and refute the official narrative which has been used as a pretext and a justification to destabilize the economic and social fabric of entire countries, followed by the imposition of the Covid-19 “vaccine”.

This crisis affects humanity in its entirety: 7.9 billion people. We stand in solidarity with our fellow human beings Worldwide. Truth is a powerful instrument.

I remain indebted to our readers, our authors and the Global Research team.

Michel Chossudovsky, Global Research, December 11, 2020, crgeditor@yahoo.com

(Latest revisions and updates on October 12, 2021, including the addition of three new chapters)

Spread the word. Please forward this text to friends and colleagues.


The preface and Introductory chapter can be crossposted with a link to the complete E-book. If you wish to use or reproduce the text of the E-Book or sections thereof, kindly contact Michel Chossudovsky at crgeditor@yahoo.com
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Introduction

Destroying Civil Society. The Fear Campaign

“It is time for everyone to come out of this negative trance, this collective hysteria, because famine, poverty, mass unemployment will kill and destroy the lives of many more people than SARS-CoV-2!” (Dr. Pascal Sacré)

“I’m seeing patients that have facial rashes, fungal infections, bacterial infections. ... In February and March we were told not to wear masks. What changed? The science didn’t change. The politics did. This is about compliance. It’s not about science...” (Dr. James Meehan)

“One once the Lie Becomes the Truth, there is No Moving Backwards. Insanity prevails. The world is turned upside down.” (Michel Chossudovsky)

“We’re Being Locked-down for an Infection Fatality Rate of Less than 0.2%” (Dr. Richard Schabas)

We are at the crossroads of one of the most serious crises in World history. We are living history, yet our understanding of the sequence of events since January 2020 has been
blurred. Worldwide, people have been misled both by their governments and the media as to the causes and devastating consequences of the Covid-19 “pandemic”.

The unspoken truth is that the novel coronavirus provides a pretext and a justification to powerful financial interests and corrupt politicians to precipitate the entire World into a spiral of mass unemployment, bankruptcy, extreme poverty and despair.

This is the true picture of what is happening. It is the result of a complex decision-making process.

“Planet Lockdown” is an encroachment on civil liberties and the “Right to Life”.

Entire national economies are in jeopardy. In some countries martial law has been declared.

Small and medium sized capital are slated to be eliminated. Big capital prevails.

A massive concentration of corporate wealth is ongoing.

It’s a diabolical “New World Order” in the making.

Red Zones, the facemask, social distancing, the closing down of schools, colleges and universities, no more family gatherings, no birthday celebrations, music, the arts: no more cultural events, sport events are suspended, no more weddings, “love and life” is banned outright.

And in several countries, family Christmas and New Year reunions were illegal.

Closing down the Global Economy is presented to us as a means to combating the Virus. That’s what they want us to believe. If the public had been informed that Covid-19 is “similar to seasonal Influenza”, the fear campaign would have fallen flat...

Image Pakistan Daily Times: Trainee Santas in UK

The Pandemic was officially launched by the WHO on March 11, 2020 leading to the Lockdown and closure of the national economies of 190 (out of 193) countries, member states of the United Nations. The instructions came from above, from Wall Street, the World Economic Forum (WEF), the billionaire foundations.

The March 11, 2020 pandemic was preceded by a WHO Public Health Emergency of
International Concern (PHEIC) on January 30th, 2020 which was followed in February by the destabilization of financial markets. On January 30th there were 83 cases outside China out of a total population of 6.4 billion. In the days preceding the February Financial Crash there were approximately 1000 positive cases outside China. (See our analysis in Chapter II)

This diabolical project based on scanty and flawed estimates is casually described by the corporate media as a “humanitarian” endeavour. The “international community” has a “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P).

In the words of Diana Johnstone, it’s “The Global Pretext”. An unelected “public-private partnership” under the auspices of the World Economic Forum (WEF), has come to the rescue of Planet Earth’s 7.8 billion people. The closure of the global economy is presented as a means to “killing the virus”.

Sounds absurd. Closing down the real economy of Planet Earth is not the “solution” but rather the “cause” of a diabolical process of Worldwide destabilization and impoverishment.

The national economy combined with political, social and cultural institutions is the basis for the “reproduction of real life”: income, employment, production, trade, infrastructure, social services.

Destabilizing the economy of Planet Earth cannot constitute a “solution” to combating the virus. But that is the imposed “solution” which they want us to believe in. And that is what they are doing.

It’s the destruction of people’s lives. It is the destabilization of civil society.

The Lies are sustained by a massive media disinformation campaign. 24/7, Incessant and Repetitive “Covid alerts” in the course of the last 16 months. It is a process of social engineering.

What they want is to hike up the numbers so as to justify the Lockdown. Covid death statistics are ‘fabricated” (See chapter II)

And now there is a so-called “Second Wave”, followed by a “Third Wave”. Millions of covid-Positive tests are now being tabulated.

Covid-19 is portrayed as the “killer Virus”.

Destroying Civil Society

People are frightened and puzzled. “Why would they do this?”

Empty schools, Empty airports, bankrupt grocery stores.
In France “Churches are threatened with Kalashnikovs over Covid-19 outbreak” (April 2020)

The entire urban services economy is in crisis. Shops, bars and restaurants are driven into bankruptcy. International travel and holidays are suspended. Streets are empty. In several countries, bars and restaurants are required to take names and contact information to support effective contact tracing if necessary.

Cultural Lockdown

At the same time, starting in March 2020, the Worldwide closure of national economies was accompanied by a Cultural Lockdown affecting music and artistic events. Empty museums, no more operas, no more symphonies, concert halls are closed down Worldwide. So-called digital stay home platforms were put forth. In the US, museums announced closure on March 12, starting with the New York Metropolitan Museum of Art. In France, the Louvre, Versailles and the Eiffel Tower were closed down on March 13th, 2020.

Free Speech is Suppressed

The lockdown narrative is supported by media disinformation, online censorship, social engineering and the fear campaign.

Medical doctors who question the official narrative are threatened. They lose their jobs. Their careers are destroyed. Those who oppose the government lockdown are categorized as “anti-social psychopaths”:

Peer reviewed psychological “studies” are currently being carried in several countries using sample surveys.

Accept the “big Lie” and you are tagged as a “good person” with “empathy” who understands the feelings of others.

Express reservations regarding social distancing and the wearing of the face mask, and you
will be tagged (according to “scientific opinion”) as a “callous and deceitful psychopath”. (See Chapter IX).

In colleges and universities, the teaching staff is pressured to conform and endorse the official covid narrative. Questioning the legitimacy of the lockdown in online “classrooms” could lead to dismissal.

Several medical doctors who oppose the COVID consensus or the vaccine have been arrested. In December, “Jean-Bernard Fourtillan, a retired university professor known for his opposition to the COVID-19 vaccine was arrested “by law enforcement officers under military command, and forcibly placed in solitary confinement at the psychiatric hospital of Uzès.” Fourtillan is known as “longtime critic of vaccines that use dangerous adjuvants”.

In Belgium, an anesthesiologist was fired after questioning government virus measures. In France, some doctors are facing similar pressure and have denounced the suppression of speech.

Screen Shot: NTD, December 16, 2020

Google, Facebook and Twitter: Marketing the Big Lie

The opinions of prominent scientists who question the lockdown, the face-mask or social distancing are “taken down” by Google:

“YouTube doesn’t allow content that spreads medical misinformation” that contradicts the World Health Organization (WHO) or local health authorities’ medical information about COVID-19, including on methods to prevent, treat or diagnose COVID-19, and means of transmission of COVID-19.” (emphasis added)

They call it “fact checking”, without acknowledging that both the WHO and national al
health authorities contradict their own data and concepts.

Similarly, Twitter has confirmed that “it will remove all posts that suggest there are ‘adverse impacts or effects of receiving vaccinations’ ... Twitter will: “memory-hole any posts that “invoke a deliberate conspiracy” or “advance harmful, false, or misleading narratives’ about vaccines.”

March 11, 2020: Engineered Economic Depression. Global Coup d’Etat?

Destabilizing in one fell swoop the national economies of 190 countries is an act of “economic warfare”. This diabolical agenda undermines the sovereignty of nation states. It impoverishes people Worldwide. It leads to a spiralling dollar denominated global debt.

The powerful structures of global capitalism, Big Money coupled with its intelligence and military apparatus are the driving force. Using advanced digital and communications technologies, the Lockdown and Economic Closure of the global economy is unprecedented in World history.

This simultaneous intervention in 190 countries derogates democracy. It undermines the sovereignty of nation states Worldwide, without the need for military intervention. It is an advanced system of economic warfare which overshadows other forms of warfare including conventional (Iraq-style) theater wars. (See Chapters IV, IX)
“Global Governance” Scenarios. World Government in the Post-Covid Era?

The March 11 2020 Lockdown project uses lies and deception to ultimately impose a Worldwide totalitarian regime, entitled “Global Governance” (by unelected officials). In the words of David Rockefeller:

“...The world is now more sophisticated and prepared to march towards a world government. The supranational sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to the national auto-determination practiced in past centuries.” (quoted by Aspen Times, August 15, 2011, emphasis added)

The Global Governance scenario imposes an agenda of social engineering and economic compliance:

It constitutes an extension of the neoliberal policy framework imposed on both developing and developed countries. It consists in scrapping “national auto-determination” and constructing a Worldwide nexus of pro-US proxy regimes controlled by a “supranational sovereignty” (World Government) composed of leading financial institutions, billionaires and their philanthropic foundations. (See Chapter XIII)

Simulating Pandemics

Rockefeller’s “Lock Step Scenario”

The Rockefeller Foundation proposes the use of “scenario planning” as a means to carry out “global governance”.

In the Rockefeller’s 2010 Report entitled “Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development Area” scenarios of Global Governance and the actions to be taken in the case of a Worldwide pandemic are contemplated.

More specifically, the report envisaged (p 18) the simulation of a Lock Step scenario including a global virulent influenza strain.

The Lock Step scenario describes “a world of tighter top-down government control and more authoritarian leadership, with limited innovation and growing citizen pushback.” In “2012” (i.e. two years after the report’s publication), [as part of the simulation] an “extremely virulent and deadly” strain of influenza originating with wild geese brings the world to its knees, infecting 20 percent of the global population and killing 8 million people in just seven months – “the majority of them healthy young adults.” (Helen Buyniski, February 2020)

The 2010 Rockefeller report was published in the immediate wake of the 2009 H1N1 swine flu pandemic.
The Clade X Table Top Simulation

On May 15, 2018, a Toptable Simulation of a pandemic entitled Clade X was conducted under the auspices of the John Hopkins Center for Health Security.

CLADE X EXERCISE

The Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security hosted the Clade X pandemic tabletop exercise on May 15, 2018, in Washington, DC. The purpose of the exercise was to illustrate high-level strategic decisions and policies that the United States and the world will need to pursue in order to prevent a pandemic or diminish its consequences should prevention fail.

Clade X was described by its organizers as “…a day-long pandemic tabletop exercise that simulated a series of National Security Council–convened meetings of 10 US government leaders, played by individuals prominent in the fields of national security or epidemic response”.

Event 201

Clade X was followed by another tabletop simulation entitled Event 201 (also under the auspices of the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security). Event 201 pertained to a coronavirus epidemic entitled nCoV-2019. It was held on October 18, 2019, less than 3 months before SARS-2 was “officially” identified in early January 2020.
Statement about nCoV and our pandemic exercise

In October 2019, the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security hosted a pandemic tabletop exercise called Event 201 with partners, the World Economic Forum and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Recently, the Center for Health Security has received questions about whether that pandemic exercise predicted the current novel coronavirus outbreak in China. To be clear, the Center for Health Security and partners did not make a prediction during our tabletop exercise. For the scenario, we modeled a fictional coronavirus pandemic, but we explicitly stated that it was not a prediction. Instead, the exercise served to highlight preparedness and response challenges that would likely arise in a very severe pandemic. We are not now predicting that the nCoV-2019 outbreak will kill 65 million people. Although our tabletop exercise included a mock novel coronavirus, the inputs we used for modeling the potential impact of that fictional virus are not similar to nCoV-2019.

Screenshot, 201 A Global Pandemic Exercise

The Event 201 Pandemic Exercise. October 18, 2019 also addressed within the simulation how to deal with online social media and so-called “misinformation”. (Listen carefully)

Video

Many features of the 201 “simulation exercise” did in fact correspond to what actually happened when the WHO Director General launched a global public health emergency on January 30, 2020.

In the Event 201 Scenario, a 15% collapse of financial markets had been “simulated”. It was not “predicted” according to the organizers and sponsors of the event, which included the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation as well the World Economic Forum.

It is worth noting that the sponsors of the 201 Event including the WEF and the Gates Foundation have been actively involved from the very outset in coordinating (and financing) the Covid-19 related policies including the PCR-test, the lockdown procedures as well as the mRNA vaccine. The evidence suggests that these policies had been planned and envisaged at a much earlier date.

The Scenario 201 Players
Among the 201 John Hopkins table top scenario “players” were key personalities holding advisory or senior positions in a number of core organizations. Less than 3 months later, the 201 “players” became actively involved in the policy response to the Covid-19 pandemic.

“The following prominent individuals from global business, government, and public health were exercise players tasked with leading the policy response to a fictional outbreak scenario in the Event 201 pandemic tabletop exercise”

The entities directly or indirectly “represented” by the “players” included the WHO, John Hopkins, the Global Alliance on Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI) (Dr. Timothy Grant Evans), US Intelligence, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (Dr. Chris Elias), the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI) (Chairman Jane Halton), the World Economic Forum WEF), the UN Foundation, the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (Stephen Redd), China’s Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (Director Dr. George Fu Gao). Big Pharma (Adrian Thomas), the World Bank and Global Banking, the Airline and Hotel industries. For more details click here.

It is worth noting that China’s CDC Director Dr. George Fu Gao played a central role in overseeing the Covid-19 outbreak in Wuhan in early 2020, acting in close liaison with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, John Hopkins et al. George Fu Gao is an Oxford graduate with links to Big Pharma. He was also for several years a fellow of the Wellcome Trust.

Dr. Stephen Redd (CDC) played a a key role in the 2009 H1N1 vaccination campaign in the US, which turned out to be fake.(See Chapter IX).

nCoV-2019

It is also worth noting that the WHO initially adopted a similar acronym (to designate the coronavirus) to that of the John Hopkins Pandemic Event 201 Exercise (nCoV-2019).

“...The new virus was initially named 2019-nCoV by WHO.”
“On Feb 11, 2020, WHO renamed the disease as coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). That same day, the Coronavirus Study Group (CSG) of the International Committee on Virus Taxonomy posted a manuscript on bioRxiv in which they suggested designating 2019-nCoV as severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) on the basis of a phylogenetic analysis of related coronaviruses” (Lancet)

The selection of the name SARS-CoV-2 is explained in Chapter III in relation to the so-called Drosten report.

Intelligence and “The Art of Deception”

The Covid crisis is a sophisticated instrument of the power elites. It has all the features of a carefully planned intelligence operation using “deception and counter-deception”. Leo Strauss: “viewed intelligence as a means for policymakers to attain and justify policy goals, not to describe the realities of the world.” And that is precisely what they are doing in relation to Covid-19.

“The Global Pretext”

Confirmed by prominent scientists as well as by official public health bodies including the World Health Organization (WHO) and the US Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Covid-19 is a public health concern but it is NOT a dangerous virus.

The COVID-19 crisis is marked by a public health “emergency” under WHO auspices which is being used as a pretext and a justification to trigger a Worldwide process of economic, social and political restructuring. The tendency is towards the imposition of a totalitarian State.

Social engineering is being applied. Governments are pressured into extending the lockdown, despite its devastating economic and social consequences.

There is no scientific basis for implementing the closing down of the global economy as a means to resolving a public health crisis. Both the media and the governments are involved in spreading disinformation.

The fear campaign has no scientific basis. Your governments are LYING. In fact they are lying to themselves.

Chapter II

The Corona Timeline
This chapter provides a detailed Timeline of the Corona Crisis starting in August 2019.

***

August 1, 2019: Glaxo-Smith-Kline (GSK) and Pfizer announce the establishment of a corporate partnership in Consumer Health Products including Vaccines.

September 19, 2019: The ID-2020 Alliance held their Summit in New York, entitled “Rising to the Good ID Challenge”. The focus was on the establishment under the auspices of GAVI (Alliance for Vaccine Identity) of a vaccine with an embedded digital passport. The stated objective was the creation of a global digital data base.

“Digital ID is being defined and implemented today, and we recognize the importance of swift action to close the identity gap,” said Dakota Gruener, executive director of ID2020:

   “With the opportunity for immunization to serve as a platform for digital identity, the program harnesses existing birth registration and vaccination operations to provide newborns with a portable and persistent biometrically-linked digital identity. The program will also explore and assess several leading infant biometric technologies to offer a persistent digital identity from birth ...”

October 18, 2019. Event 201. The 201 Pandemic Simulation Exercise

The coronavirus was initially named 2019-nCoV by the WHO, the same name (with the exception of the placement of the date) as that adopted at the October 18, 2019 201 Simulation exercise under the auspices of the John Hopkins Bloomberg School of Health, Centre for Health Security (an event sponsored by the Gates Foundation and World Economic Forum).(Event 201)

   In October 2019, the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security hosted a pandemic tabletop exercise called Event 201 with partners, the World Economic Forum and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. For the scenario, we modeled a fictional coronavirus pandemic, but we explicitly stated that it was not a prediction.

   Instead, the exercise served to highlight preparedness and response challenges that would likely arise in a very severe pandemic. We are not now predicting that the nCoV-2019 outbreak will kill 65 million people.

   Although our tabletop exercise included a mock novel coronavirus, the inputs we used for modeling the potential impact of that fictional virus are not similar to nCoV-2019. “We are not now predicting that the nCoV-2019 [which was also used as the name of the simulation] outbreak will kill 65 million people.

   Although our tabletop exercise included a mock novel coronavirus, the inputs we used for modeling the potential impact of that fictional virus are not similar to nCoV-2019.”
December 12, 2019 — “The Wuhan Municipal Health Commission claims this date to be the earliest original onset date of the 59 patients with unexplained viral pneumonia. ([Timeline and Early Chronology](#))

December 31, 2019: First cases of pneumonia of unknown cause detected in Wuhan, Hubei Province. reported to the WHO. “A total of 44 cases were reported: 11 patients are severely ill, while the remaining 33 are in stable condition.”

January 1, 2020: Chinese health authorities close the Huanan Seafood Wholesale Market in Wuhan following Western media reports claiming that wild animals sold there may have been the source of the virus. This initial assessment was subsequently refuted by Chinese scientists.

January 7, 2020: The Chinese authorities “identify a new type of virus” which (according to reports) was isolated on 7 January 2020. No specific details were provided regarding the process of isolation of the virus. According to several scientists, the identity as well as the process of the isolation of the virus have not been confirmed. (For further details, see Chapter X). The number of cases is exceedingly low. “44 cases of pneumonia even though viral-specific nucleic acids were found on only 15 patients”. No evidence of an unfolding epidemic in China.


January 22, 2020: WHO. [Members of the WHO Emergency Committee](#) “expressed divergent views on whether this event constitutes a PHEIC [Public Health Emergency of International Concern] or not”. The Committee meeting was reconvened on January 23, 2020, overlapping with the World Economic Forum meetings in Davos (January 21-24, 2020). The small number of cases in China did not justify a PHEIC.

The meeting of the Emergency Committee convened by the WHO Director-General under the International Health Regulations (IHR) (2005) expressed divergent views on whether this event constitutes a PHEIC or not. At that time, the advice was that the event did not constitute a PHEIC, but the Committee members agreed on the urgency of the situation and suggested that the Committee should be reconvened in a matter of days to examine the situation further.

January 21-24, 2020: Consultations at the World Economic Forum, Davos, Switzerland under auspices of the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI) for development of a vaccine program. CEPI is a WEF-Gates partnership. With support from CEPI, Seattle based Moderna will manufacture an mRNA vaccine against 2019-nCoV,

“The Vaccine Research Center (VRC) of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), part of NIH, collaborated with Moderna to design the vaccine.”

The evidence suggests that the 2019 nCoV vaccine project was already underway in 2019. (See Chapter VIII). It was officially announced at Davos, 2 weeks after the January 7, 2020 announcement by the Chinese authorities, and barely a week prior to the official launching of the WHO’s Worldwide Public Health Emergency on January 30.

The WEF-Gates-CEPI Vaccine Announcement precedes the WHO’s Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC).
Dominant financial interests, billionaire foundations and international financial institutions played a key role in launching the WHO Public Health Emergency (PHEIC).

In the week preceding this historic WHO decision. The PHEIC was the object of “consultations” at the World Economic Forum (WEF), Davos (January 21-24). The WHO Director General Dr. Tedros was present at Davos. Were these consultations instrumental in influencing the WHO’s historic decision on January 30th.

Was there a Conflict of Interest as defined by the WHO? The WHO’s largest donor is the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, which together with the WEF and CEPI had already announced in Davos the development of a Covid-19 vaccine prior to the historic January 30th launching of the PHEIC.

The WHO Director General had the backing of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Big Pharma and the World Economic Forum (WEF). There are indications that the decision for the WHO to declare a Global Health Emergency was taken on the sidelines of the World Economic Forum (WEF) in Davos (January 21-24) overlapping with the Geneva January 22 meeting of the Emergency Committee.

The WHO’s Director General Tedros was present at Davos 2020.

January 28, 2020: The US Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) confirmed that the novel corona virus had been isolated. (See Chapter X)

January 30, 2020: The WHO’s Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC)

The first stage of this crisis was launched by the WHO on January 30th. While officially it was not designated as a “Pandemic”, it nonetheless contributed to spearheading the fear campaign.

From the very outset, the estimates of “confirmed positive cases” have been part of a “Numbers Game”.

In some cases the statistics were simply not mentioned and in other cases the numbers were selectively inflated with a view to creating panic.

Not mentioned by the media: The number of “confirmed cases” based on faulty estimates (PCR) used to justify this far reaching decision was ridiculously low.

The Worldwide population outside China is of the order of 6.4 billion. On January 30, 2020 outside China there were:

83 cases in 18 countries, and only 7 of them had no history of travel in China. (see WHO, January 30, 2020).

On January 29, 2020, the day preceding the launching of the PHEIC (recorded by the WHO), there were 5 cases in the US, 3 in Canada, 4 in France, 4 in Germany.
There was no “scientific basis” to justify the launching of a Worldwide public health emergency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of the Americas</th>
<th>United States of America</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Region</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Those low numbers (not mentioned by the media) did not prevent the launching of a Worldwide fear campaign.

January 31, 2020: President Trump’s Decision to Suspend Air Travel with China

On the following day (January 31, 2020), Trump announced that he would deny entry to the US of both Chinese and foreign nationals “who have traveled in China in the last 14 days”. This immediately triggered a crisis in air travel, transportation, US-China trade relations as well as freight and shipping transactions.

Whereas the WHO “[did] not recommend any travel or trade restrictions” the five so-called “confirmed cases” in the US were sufficient to “justify” President Trump’s January 31st 2020 decision to suspend air travel to China while precipitating a hate campaign against ethnic Chinese throughout the Western World.

This historic January 31st decision paved the way towards the disruption of international commodity trade as well as imposition of Worldwide restrictions on air travel. It was eventually instrumental to the bankruptcy of major airlines.

“Fake media” immediately went into high gear. China was held responsible for “spreading infection” Worldwide.

Early February 2020: the acronym of the coronavirus was changed from nCoV-2019 (its name under the October Event 201 John Hopkins Simulation Exercise before it was identified in early January 2020) to SARS-nCoV-2. Covid-19 indicates the disease triggered by SARS-CoV-2


While China reported a total of 75,567 cases of COVID-19, (February 20) the confirmed cases outside China were abysmally low and the statistics based in large part on the the PCR test used to confirm the “Worldwide spread of the virus” were questionable to say the least. Moreover, out of the 75,567 cases in China, a large percentage had recovered. And recovery figures were not acknowledged by the media.
On the day of Dr. Tedros’ historic press conference (February 20, 2020) the recorded number of confirmed cases outside China was 1073 of which 621 were passengers and crew on the Diamond Princess Cruise Ship (stranded in Japanese territorial waters).

From a statistical point of view, the WHO decision pointing to a potential “spread of the virus Worldwide” did not make sense.

On February 20th, 57.9 % of the Worldwide Covid-19 “confirmed cases” were from the Diamond Princess, hardly representative of a Worldwide “statistical trend”. The official story is as follows:

- A Hong Kong based passenger who had disembarked from the Diamond Princess in Hong Kong on January 25 developed pneumonia and was tested positive for the novel coronavirus on January 30.
- He was reported to have travelled on January 10, to Shenzhen on mainland China (which borders on Hong Kong’s new territories).
- The Diamond Princess arrived at Yokohama on February 3. A quarantine was imposed on the cruiser See NCBI study.
- Many passengers fell sick due to the confinement on the boat.
- All the passengers and crew on the Diamond Princess undertook the PCR test.
- The number of confirmed cases increased to 691 on February 23.
Read carefully: From the standpoint of assessing Worldwide statistical trends, the data doesn’t stand up. Without the Diamond Princess data, the so-called confirmed cases worldwide outside China on February 20th 2020 were of the order of 452, out of a population of 6.4 billion.

Examine the WHO Graph below. The blue indicates the confirmed cases on the Diamond Princess (international conveyance) (which arrived in Yokohama on February 3, 2020), many of whom were sick, confined to their rooms for more than two weeks (quarantine imposed by Japan). All passengers and crew took the RT-PCR test (which does not detect or identify Covid-19).

Needless to say, this so-called data was instrumental to spearheading the fear campaign and the collapse of financial markets in the course of the month of February 2020.
February 20th, 2020: At a press conference on Thursday the 20th of February afternoon (CET Time) in a briefing in Geneva, the WHO Director General, Dr Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, said that he was

"concerned that the chance to contain the coronavirus outbreak was “closing” ...

“I believe the window of opportunity is still there, but that the window is narrowing.”

There were only 1076 cases outside China (including the Diamond Press:

The data from China continue to show a decline in new confirmed cases. Once again, we’re encouraged by this trend, but this is no time for complacency.

Outside China, there are now 1076 cases in 26 countries, with a total of seven deaths.

Screenshot, WHO Press Conference, February 20th, 2020
Note: The tabulated data above for February 20, 2020 indicates 1073 cases. 1076 cases in WHO Press Conference)

These “shock and awe“ statements contributed to heightening the fear campaign, despite the fact that the number of confirmed cases outside China was exceedingly low.

February 20-21, 2020 marks the beginning of the 2020 Financial Crash (See Chapter IV)

Excluding the Diamond Princess, 452 so-called “confirmed cases” Worldwide outside China, for a population of 6.4 billion recorded by the WHO on February 20th, 15 in the US, 8 in Canada, 9 in the UK. (See table right, February 20, 2020). Those are the figures used to justify Dr. Tedros’ warnings: “the window is narrowing”:

A larger number of cases outside China were recorded in South Korea (153 cases according to WHO) and Italy (recorded by national authorities).

WHO data recorded on February 20, 2020. at the outset of the so-called Covid Financial Crash (right)

The statement by Dr. Tedros (based on flawed concepts and statistics), set the stage for the February financial collapse. (See Chapter IV).

February 24: Moderna Inc supported by CEPI announced that its experimental mRNA COVID-19 vaccine, known as mRNA-1273, was ready for human testing.

February 28, 2020: A WHO vaccination campaign was announced by WHO Director General Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus.

More than 20 vaccines are in development globally, and several therapeutics are in clinical trials. We expect the first results in a few weeks.

It is worth noting that the campaign to develop vaccines was initiated prior to decision of the WHO to launch a Global Public Health Emergency. It was first announced at the WEF meeting at Davos (21-24 January) by CEPI.
Early March: China: More than 50% of the infected patients recovered. A total of 49,856 patients had recovered from COVID-19 and were discharged from hospitals in China. (WHO).

What this means is that the total number of “confirmed infected cases” in China was 30,448. (Namely 80,304 minus 49,856 = 30,448 (80,304 is the total number on confirmed cases in China (WHO data, March 3, 2020). No evidence of a pandemic in China.

These developments concerning “recovery” were not reported by the Western media.

March 5, WHO Director General confirms that outside China there are 2055 cases reported in 33 countries. Around 80% of those cases were from three countries (South Korea, Iran, Italy).

March 7: USA: The number of “confirmed cases” (infected and recovered) in the United States in early March was of the order of 430, rising to about 600 (March 8). A rapid rise in covid positive cases was recorded in the the course of month of March.

Compare these figures to those pertaining to Influenza B Virus: The CDC estimated for 2019-2020 “at least 15 million virus flu illnesses... 140,000 hospitalizations and 8,200 deaths. (The Hill)

March 7: China: No Pandemic in China. Reported new cases in China fall to double digit. 99 cases recorded on March 7. All of the new cases outside Hubei province were categorized as “imported infections”(from foreign countries). The reliability of the data remains to be established:

99 newly confirmed cases including 74 in Hubei Province, ... The new cases included 24 imported infections — 17 in Gansu Province, three in Beijing, three in Shanghai and one in Guangdong Province.


The WHO Director General had already set the stage in his February 21st Press Conference.

“the world should do more to prepare for a possible coronavirus pandemic”. The WHO had called upon countries to be “in a phase of preparedness”.

The WHO officially declared a Worldwide pandemic at a time when there were 118,000 confirmed cases and 4291 deaths Worldwide (including China). (March 11, 2020, according to press conference). What do these “statistics” tell you?
The number of confirmed cases outside China (6.4 billion population) was of the order of 44279 and 1440 deaths (figures recorded by the WHO for March 11, (on March 12) (see table right). These are the figures used to justify the lockdown and the closing down of 190 national economies.

(The number of deaths outside China mentioned in Tedros’s press conference was 4291).

In the US, recorded on March 11, 2020, there were according to John Hopkins: 1,335 “cases” and 29 deaths (“presumptive” plus PCR confirmed). No evidence of a pandemic on March 11, 2020.

Immediately following the March 11, 2020 WHO announcement, the fear campaign went into high gear. (The economic and financial impacts are reviewed in Chapter IV)

March 16, 2020: Moderna mRNA-1273 is tested in several stages with 45 volunteers in Seattle, Washington State. The vaccine program started in early February:

“\[\text{We don’t know whether this vaccine will induce an immune response, or whether it will be safe. That’s why we’re doing a trial,}\]” Jackson stressed. “\[\text{It’s not at the stage where it would be possible or prudent to give it to the general population.}\]” (AP, March 16, 2020)

March 18, 20. 2020. Lockdown in the United States

November 8, 2020. The Covid-19 mRNA Vaccine is launched

**Mid to Late December 2020:** Worldwide Implementation of the mRNA vaccine program

January 2021 (onwards): Rising trend in vaccine related deaths and adverse events.

May- June 2021; The Delta Variant and “The Fourth Wave” are announced. The alleged dangers of the Delta Variant are being used to speed up the vaccination program as well as the imposition of the vaccine passport.
Chapter III


How Is It Tested? How Is It Measured?

“Detection of viral RNA may not indicate the presence of infectious virus or that 2019-nCoV is the causative agent for clinical symptoms. The performance of this test has not been established for monitoring treatment of 2019-nCoV infection. This test cannot rule out diseases caused by other bacterial or viral pathogens.” — The Centers For Disease Control and Prevention

“…all or a substantial part of these positives could be due to what’s called false positives tests.” — Michael Yeadon: former Vice President and Chief Science Officer for Pfizer

**

Are we dealing with a dangerous virus. Is it a pandemic?

The fear campaign is relentlessly spearheaded by political statements and media disinformation. A closer examination of official reports from national health authorities as well as peer reviewed articles provides a totally different picture.

SARS-CoV-2 is not a Killer Virus.

According to an early report by the WHO pertaining to China’s epidemic:

The most commonly reported symptoms [of COVID-19] included fever, dry cough, and shortness of breath, and most patients (80%) experienced mild illness. Approximately 14% experienced severe disease and 5% were critically ill. Early reports suggest that illness severity is associated with age (>60 years old) and co-morbid disease. (largely basing on WHO’s assessment of COVID-19 in China)

The World Health Organization says those who become infected generally experience mild illness and recover in about two weeks.

Screenshot The Hill, March 19, 2020

Lies through omission: the media has failed to reassure the broader public. Below is the official WHO definition of Covid-19:

Coronaviruses are a large family of viruses which may cause illness in animals or humans. In humans, several coronaviruses are known to cause respiratory infections ranging from the common cold to more severe diseases such as Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) and Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS). The most recently discovered coronavirus causes coronavirus disease COVID-19.

“The most common symptoms of COVID-19 are fever, dry cough, and tiredness. ... These symptoms are usually mild and begin gradually. Some people become infected but only have very mild symptoms. Most people (about 80%) recover from the disease without needing hospital treatment. Around 1 out of every 5 people who gets COVID-19 becomes seriously ill and develops difficulty breathing.”

“COVID-19 is similar to SARS-1”: According to Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg, pneumonia is "regularly caused or accompanied by corona viruses". Immunologists broadly confirm the CDC definition. COVID-19 has similar features to a seasonal influenza coupled with pneumonia.

According to Anthony Fauci (Head of NIAID), H. Clifford Lane and Robert R. Redfield (Head of CDC) in the New England Journal of Medicine

“...the overall clinical consequences of Covid-19 may ultimately be more akin to those of a severe seasonal influenza (which has a case fatality rate of approximately 0.1%) or a pandemic influenza (similar to those in 1957 and 1968) rather than a disease similar to SARS or MERS, which have had case fatality rates of 9 to 10% and 36%, respectively.”

Dr. Anthony Fauci is lying to himself. In his public statements he says that Covid is “Ten Times Worse than Seasonal Flu”.

He refutes his peer reviewed report quoted above. From the outset, Fauci has been instrumental in waging the fear and panic campaign across America:
The World Health Organization says those who become infected generally experience mild illness and recover in about two weeks.

Covid-19 versus Influenza (Flu) [Virus A and Virus B (and subtypes)] (Bear in mind seasonal influenza is not a coronavirus)

Rarely mentioned by the media or by politicians: [The CDC (which is an agency of the US government) confirms that Covid-19 is similar to Influenza]

“Influenza (Flu) and COVID-19 are both contagious respiratory illnesses, but they are caused by different viruses. COVID-19 is caused by infection with a new coronavirus (called SARS-CoV-2) and flu is caused by infection with influenza viruses. Because some of the symptoms of flu and COVID-19 are similar, it may be hard to tell the difference between them based on symptoms alone, and testing may be needed to help confirm a diagnosis. Flu and COVID-19 share many characteristics, but there are some key differences between the two.”

If the public had been informed and reassured that Covid is “similar to Influenza”, the fear campaign would have fallen flat.

The lockdown and closure of the national economy would have been rejected outright.
Detecting the Virus. Estimating and Tabulating the Numbers. The Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction Test (RT-PCR)

The standard test used to “detect / identify” SARS-2 around the World is The Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction Test (RT-PCR).

The RT-PCR test has been used to estimate and tabulate the number of so-called “confirmed” positive Covid-19 cases. (This is not the only test used. Observations below pertain solely to the standard PCR test).

According to Nobel Laureate Dr. Kary Mullis who invented the RT-PCR test. (Dr. Mullis wrote, on May 7, 2013):

“PCR detects a very small segment of the nucleic acid which is part of a virus itself. The specific fragment detected is determined by the somewhat arbitrary choice of DNA primers used which become the ends of the amplified fragment.”

The PCR-RT developed by Dr. Kary Mullis has been applied in an erroneous way with a view to “estimating” SARS-2 positive cases, in most cases without a medical diagnosis of the patient.

See our observations below on the Drosten RT-PCR Study. As emphasized by Dr. Mullis and confirmed by prominent medical doctors, the PCR test does not “identify the virus”.

Below are the concepts developed by the CDC.

The Test for Covid-19 “Confirmed Cases”

Below are the official definitions and procedures which are contradictory:

“The COVID-19 RT-PCR test is a real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR) test for the qualitative detection of nucleic acid from SARS-CoV-2 in upper and lower respiratory specimens ... collected from individuals suspected of COVID 19 ... [as well as] from individuals without symptoms or other reasons to suspect COVID-19 infection. ...

This test is also for use with individual nasal swab specimens that are self-collected using the Pixel by LabCorp COVID-19 test home collection kit ... The COVID-19 RT-PCR test is also for the qualitative detection of nucleic acid from the SARS-CoV-2 in pooled samples, using a matrix pooling strategy (FDA, LabCorp Laboratory Test Number: 139900)

This test is based on upper and lower respiratory specimens.

The criteria and guidelines confirmed by the CDC pertaining to “The CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Diagnostic Panel” are as follows (Read carefully):

Results are for the identification of 2019-nCoV RNA. The 2019-nCoV RNA is generally detectable in upper and lower respiratory specimens during infection. Positive results are indicative of active infection with 2019-nCoV but do not rule out bacterial infection or co-infection with other viruses. The agent detected may not be the definite cause of
disease. Laboratories within the United States and its territories are required to report all positive results to the appropriate public health authorities.

Negative results do not preclude 2019-nCoV infection and should not be used as the sole basis for treatment or other patient management decisions. Negative results must be combined with clinical observations, patient history, and epidemiological information.

What this suggests is that a positive infection could be the result of co-infection with other viruses. According to the CDC it “does not rule out “bacterial infection or co-infection with other viruses. The agent detected may not be the definite cause of disease.” (CDC)

The following diagram summarizes the process of identifying positive and negative cases: All that is required is the presence of “viral genetic material” for it to be categorized as “positive”. The procedure does not identity or isolate Covid-19. What appears in the tests are fragments of the virus.
How does PCR testing for COVID-19 work?
Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) testing can detect even very small amounts of viral genetic material in a sample by duplicating it many times over through a complex laboratory process called amplification.

1. A test sample is swabbed from the back of the nose and processed to isolate genetic material.

2. Small pieces of specifically engineered genetic material, called primers, are introduced and bind to the isolated viral genetic material, initiating amplification.

3. Fluorescent markers bound to the copies during PCR are released and can be detected when amplification occurs.

Positive result: When there is viral genetic material in the sample, amplification occurs, releasing enough fluorescent markers to be detected.

Negative result: If there is no viral genetic material in the sample, amplification will not occur and no fluorescent markers will be detected.

A positive test does not mean that you have the virus and/or that you could transmit the virus.

A negative test does not mean that you do not have it.

The CDC concepts cited above suggest that the RT-PCR test as applied to estimate the spread of the virus— is dysfunctional. Moreover, an amplification (threshold) in excess of 25 cycles (Ct) will inevitably result in misleading estimates. What the governments want is to inflate the number of positive cases, specifically in the contest of the Second Wave. Amplification has been conducted well in excess of the recommended 25 cycles. (See
analysis below of the Drosten Report and the WHO’s Retraction).

“Presumptive” vs. “Confirmed” Cases

This section deals with testing procedures at the outset of the pandemic in February 2020.

In the US, the CDC data include both “confirmed” and “presumptive” positive cases of COVID-19 reported to CDC or tested under the jurisdiction by CDC since January 21, 2020. The presumptive positive data does not confirm coronavirus infection.

Presumptive testing involves “chemical analysis of a sample that establishes the possibility that a substance is present” (emphasis added). The presumptive test must then be sent for confirmation to an accredited government health lab.” (For further details see: Michel Chossudovsky, Spinning Fear and Panic Across America. Analysis of COVID-19 Data, March 20, 2020)

Similarly in Canada, “A point-of-care test” is a “rapid test done at the time and place of care, such as a hospital or doctor’s office”. It consists in collecting “samples from the nose or throat using swabs”, which are then tested on site, with almost immediate results (in 30 to 60 minutes). But it does not confirm the presence of SARS-CoV-2.

**Serological testing or Antibody Tests for COVID-19**

According to the CDC, Serological tests do not detect the virus itself, “they detect the antibodies produced in response to an infection.” Serological tests are not used for “early diagnosis of COVID-19."

“False Positives” and the Identification of the Virus. Does the PCR Test Identify SARS-CoV-2?

While SARS-CoV-2 –namely the the virus which is said to cause COVID-19 (categorized as a disease), was isolated in a laboratory test in January 2020, the RT-PCR test does not identify/detect the virus. What it detects are fragments of viri. According to renowned Swiss immunologist Dr. B. Stadler

So if we do a PCR corona test on an immune person, it is not a virus that is detected, but a small shattered part of the viral genome. The test comes back positive for as long as there are tiny shattered parts of the virus left. Even if the infectious viri are long dead, a corona test can come back positive, because the PCR method multiplies even a tiny fraction of the viral genetic material enough [to be detected].

The Question is Positive for What?? The PCR test does not detect the identity of the virus, According to Dr. Pascal Sacré,

“These tests detect viral particles, genetic sequences, not the whole virus.

In an attempt to quantify the viral load, these sequences are then amplified several times through numerous complex steps that are subject to errors, sterility errors and contamination.
Positive RT-PCR is not synonymous with COVID-19 disease! PCR specialists make it clear that a test must always be compared with the clinical record of the patient being tested, with the patient’s state of health to confirm its value [reliability]

The media frighten everyone with new positive PCR tests, without any nuance or context, wrongly assimilating this information with a second wave of COVID-19.

While the RT-PCR test was never intended to identify the virus, it nonetheless constitutes from the very outset the cornerstone of the official estimates of Covid-19 “positives”.

WHY then was it adopted?

The WHO Instates the RT-PCR Covid Test in January 2020. The Controversial Drosten Study

F. William Engdahl documented how the RT-PCR Test was instated by the WHO at the outset in January 2020, despite its obvious shortcomings in identifying the 2019-nCoV. The scandal takes its roots in Germany involving “a professor at the heart of Angela Merkel’s corona advisory group”.

On January 23, 2020, Dr. Christian Drosten, and his colleagues of the Berlin Virology Institute at Charité Hospital, together with the head of a Berlin based biotech company, TIB Molbiol Syntheselabor GmbH, published a study entitled, “Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR”.

While Drosten et al’s Eurosurveillance article (undertaken in liaison with the WHO) confirmed that “several viral genome sequences had been released”, in the case of 2019-nCoV, “virus isolates or samples from infected patients were not available ... “:

“The genome sequences suggest presence of a virus closely related to the members of a viral species termed severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS)-related CoV, a species defined by the agent of the 2002/03 outbreak of SARS in humans [3,4].

We report on the the establishment and validation of a diagnostic workflow for 2019-nCoV screening and specific confirmation [using the RT-PCR test], designed in absence of available virus isolates or original patient specimens. Design and validation were enabled by the close genetic relatedness to the 2003 SARS-CoV, and aided by the use of synthetic nucleic acid technology.” (Eurosurveillance, January 23, 2020, emphasis added).

What this statement suggests is that the identity of 2019-nCoV was not required and that “validation” would be enabled by “the close genetic relatedness to the 2003-SARS-CoV.” It also suggests that the WHO did not in January 2020 have in its possession the “virus isolates” required to identify the virus.

The recommendations of the Drosten study (supported and financed by the Gates Foundation) pertaining to the use of the RT-PCR test applied to 2019-nCoV were then transmitted to the WHO. They were subsequently endorsed by the Director General of the WHO, Tedros Adhanom. The identity of the virus was not required despite the fact that it had been confirmed both by the Chinese health authorities (January 7, 2020) and by the
The above also explains the subsequent renaming by the WHO of the 2019-nCoV to SARS-CoV-2.

The Drosten et al article pertaining to the use of the RT-PCR test Worldwide (under WHO guidance) was challenged in a November 27, 2020 study by a group of 23 international virologists, microbiologists et al. “Their careful analysis of the original [Drosten] piece is damning. ...They accuse Drosten and cohorts of “fatal” scientific incompetence and flaws in promoting their test” (Engdahl, December, 2020).

According to Pieter Borger, Bobby Rajesh Malhotra, Michael Yeadon, Clare Craig, Kevin McKernan, et al

In light of all the consequences resulting from this very publication for societies worldwide, a group of independent researchers performed a point-by-point review of the aforesaid publication [Drosten] in which 1) all components of the presented test design were cross checked, 2) the RT-qPCR protocol-recommendations were assessed w.r.t. good laboratory practice, and 3) parameters examined against relevant scientific literature covering the field.

The published RT-qPCR protocol for detection and diagnostics of 2019-nCoV 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 fulfills the requirements for an acceptable scientific publication. Further, serious conflicts of interest of the authors are not mentioned. Finally, the very short timescale between submission and acceptance of the publication (24 hours) signifies that a systematic peer review process was either not performed here, or of problematic poor quality. We provide compelling evidence of several scientific inadequacies, errors and flaws. (November 27, 2020 Critique of Drosten article, emphasis added)

The results of the PCR Test applied to SARS-2 are blatantly flawed. Drosten et al recommended the use of a 35-45 amplification threshold cycle (Ct), which was endorsed by the WHO in January 2020 and retracted one year later. (See our analysis on the WHO’s Corrigendum and Mea Culpa at the end of this chapter).

The RT-PCR Test. CDC “Estimates” of So-called Covid-19 “Positive Cases”. How is the Data Tabulated?

Below is a screen shot of the CDC form entitled Human Infection with 2019 Novel Coronavirus Case Report Form to be filled in by authorized medical/ health personnel

Note the categorization, bearing in mind that neither the “Probable Case” nor the (RT-PCR) “Lab-confirmed case” are “confirmed”. Moreover, there is no way to identify the SARS-CoV-2 virus in a PCR lab test (as stated above).
In the US, the probable (PC) and the lab confirmed cases (CC) are lumped together. And the total number (PC + CC) constitutes the basis for establishing the data for COVID-19 infection. It's like adding apples and oranges.

The total figure (PC+CC) categorized as “Total cases” is meaningless. It does not measure positive COVID-19 Infection.

Most of the “presumptive tests” are undertaken by private clinics or commercial clinics.

In the UK, according to a Daily Telegraph May 21, 2020 report: “samples taken from the same patient are being recorded as two separate tests in the Government’s official figures”.

Tens of thousands of coronavirus tests have been double-counted, officials admit

Two samples taken from the same patient are being recorded as two separate tests in the Government's official figures

By Mason Boycott-Owen and Paul Nuki, GLOBAL HEALTH SECURITY EDITOR, LONDON
21 May 2020 - 9:00pm

This is only one example of data manipulation.

In the US, clinics are paid ($$$) to hike up the number of Covid-19 admissions. A probable case does not require a lab exam: “Meets vital records criteria with no confirmatory lab testing” (see form above)

COVID-19 Recovery Rates

The CDC Data tabulates both “confirmed” and “presumptive” positive cases since January 21, 2020. Yet what it fails to make public is that among the confirmed and presumptive cases, a large number of Americans have recovered. But nobody talks about recovery. It does not make the headlines.

The Falsification of Death Certificates in the U.S.

At the outset of the pandemic, the CDC had been instructed to change the methodology
regarding Death Certificates with a view to artificially inflating the numbers of “Covid deaths”. According to H. Ealy, M. McEvoy et al

“The 2003 guidelines for establishing death certificates had been cancelled. “Had the CDC used its industry standard, Medical Examiners’ and Coroners’ Handbook on Death Registration and Fetal Death Reporting Revision 2003, as it has for all other causes of death for the last 17 years, the COVID-19 fatality count would be approximately 90.2% lower than it currently is.” (Covid-19: Questionable Policies, Manipulated Rules of Data Collection and Reporting. Is It Safe for Students to Return to School? By H. Ealy, M. McEvoy, and et al., August 09, 2020

![Image of a pie chart showing US fatalities with 1+ comorbidity](image)

**US Fatalities with 1+ Comorbidity**

Data Sources: Each US Health Department Thru Jul 12th (N=44,562)

- At least 1 Comorbidity
- Unknown Comorbidity
- No Comorbidity

**Data Note**: 7 of 53 US State Health Departments & DC are not reporting this metric. NY, PA, MA, GA, UT, OK, IA reporting.

**CDC Deaths Attributed to COVID-19. Comorbidities**

A December 2020 CDC report confirms that 94% of the deaths attributed to Covid have “comorbidities”, (i.e. deaths due to other causes).

For 6% of the deaths, COVID-19 was the only cause mentioned. For deaths with conditions or causes in addition to COVID-19, on average, there were 2.6 additional conditions or causes per death. The number of deaths with each condition or cause is shown for all deaths and by age groups.
On March 21, 2020 the following specific guidelines were introduced by the CDC regarding Death Certificates (and their tabulation in the National Vital Statistics System (NVSS))

COVID-19: The “Underlying Cause of Death” and the CDC’s “More Often Than Not” Clause

Will COVID-19 be the underlying cause of death? This concept is fundamental.

The underlying cause of death is defined by the WHO as “the disease or injury that initiated the train of events leading directly to death”.

What the CDC is recommending with regards to statistical coding and categorization is that COVID-19 is expected to be the underlying cause of death “more often than not.”

The CDC combines these two criteria. “underlying cause of death”, more often than not.

Will COVID-19 be the underlying cause of death?

“The underlying cause depends upon what and where conditions are reported on the death certificate. However, the rules for coding and selection of the underlying cause of death are expected to result in COVID-19 being the underlying cause more often than not.”

The above directive is categorical.

Below are CDC concepts and justifications

The Certifier is not allowed to report coronavirus without identifying a specific strain. And the guidelines recommend that COVID-19 must always be indicated.

Will COVID-19 be the underlying cause?

The underlying cause depends upon what and where conditions are reported on the death certificate. However, the rules for coding and selection of the underlying cause of death are expected to result in COVID-19 being the underlying cause more often than not.

What happens if certifiers report terms other than the suggested terms?

If a death certificate reports coronavirus without identifying a specific strain or explicitly specifying that it is not COVID-19, NCHS will ask the states to follow up to verify whether or not the coronavirus was COVID-19.

As long as the phrase used indicates the 2019 coronavirus strain, NCHS expects to assign the new code. However, it is preferable and more straightforward for certifiers to use the standard terminology (COVID-19).

(Screenshot of CDC report)

The certifier cannot depart from the CDC criteria. Covid-19 is imposed. Read carefully the CDC criteria below:

“What happens if certifiers report terms other than the suggested terms?

If a death certificate reports coronavirus without identifying a specific strain or explicitly specifying that it is not COVID-19, NCHS will ask the states to follow up to verify whether or not the coronavirus was COVID-19.
As long as the phrase used indicates the 2019 coronavirus strain, NCHS expects to assign the new code. However, it is preferable and more straightforward for certifiers to use the standard terminology (COVID-19).

What happens if the terms reported on the death certificate indicate uncertainty?

If the death certificate reports terms such as “probable COVID-19” or “likely COVID-19,” these terms would be assigned the new ICD code. It is not likely that NCHS will follow up on these cases.

If “pending COVID-19 testing” is reported on the death certificate, this would be considered a pending record. In this scenario, NCHS would expect to receive an updated record, since the code will likely result in R99. In this case, NCHS will ask the states to follow up to verify if test results confirmed that the decedent had COVID-19.

... COVID-19 should be reported on the death certificate for all decedents where the disease caused or is assumed to have caused or contributed to death. Certifiers should include as much detail as possible based on their knowledge of the case, medical records, laboratory testing, etc."

There are no loopholes. These CDC directives have contributed to categorizing Covid-19 as the recorded “cause of death”. Two fundamental concepts prevail throughout:

1. The “underlying cause of death”
2. The “More Often than Not” Clause which falsifies the Cause of Death

And these criteria are imposed despite the fact that the RT-PCR test used to corroborate the “cause of death” provides misleading results.

In practice, as outlined above: “probable COVID-19” or “likely COVID-19,” will be considered as the “underlying cause of death” without the conduct of a PCR test and without performing an autopsy.

Case Study: Flawed “Estimates” of the Cause of Death in Quebec

The criteria establishing the “underlying” Cause of Death in the US are based on “the more often than not” clause (see above) established nationally by the CDC.

In Canada, the criteria differ from one province to another. Categorizing the cause of death in Canada’s Province of Quebec has been the object of gross manipulation.

According to a directive from Quebec’s Ministry of Health (April 2020):

“If the presumed cause of death is Covid-19 (with or without a positive test) an autopsy should be avoided and death should be attributed to Covid-19 as the probable cause of death. In addition, deaths whose probable cause is Covid-19 are considered natural, and are not subject to a coroner’s notice.” (emphasis in the original document).

The directive does not allow the counting of co-morbidities. Applied on April 16, 2020, this directive was conducive to an immediate sharp increase in the number of deaths attributed to Covid-19:
44.9% of total deaths in Quebec were attributed to Covid-19 (week of 11-18 April 2020) (see table below).

According to Montreal’s La Presse, “April [2020] was the deadliest month” . But did La Presse consult the directives of the Ministry of Health?

Below are the (daily) causes of death for Quebec corresponding to the week of April 12 to 18, 2020 (immediately following the government directive) measured according to the criteria issued by the Ministry of Health.

**Moyenne des décès quotidiens au Québec**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mortalité quotidienne</th>
<th>COVID-19 (moyenne quotidienne depuis une semaine)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumeurs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maladies du cœur</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumopathies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabète sucré</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chutes</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicides</td>
<td>0,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Véhicules à moteur</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: INSPQ, année 2018 pour les maladies, 2016 pour les chutes, accidents de véhicule, suicides et homicides

Are these figures the result of the so-called deadly pandemic? Or are they the result of the Ministry of Health’s “guidelines” based on erroneous criteria?

- “presumed” case pertaining to Covid,
- “With or without a positive test”,
- “probable” cause of death,
- “Autopsy should be avoided” in the case of Covid-19.
- “ Deaths of which the probable cause is Covid-19, are considered natural, and are not the object of a notice to the coroner “

According to Mr. Paul G. Brunet, of the Council for the protection of the sick (CPM):

“... We realized through the denunciations by some of the doctors that people did not die from COVID, but from dehydration, malnutrition, abandonment, laments Mr. Brunet. So what did the thousands of people in CHSLDs [old persons nursing homes] and private residences really die of?” (quoted in La Presse, translated from French)
Test, Test, Test

In the immediate wake of the official launching of the pandemic and the Worldwide lockdown on March 11, 2020, Covid testing went into high gear. The number of Covid positive cases in early March 2020 was ridiculously low. (44,279 on March 11, Worldwide outside China according to the WHO, see Chapter II).

The RT-PCR Test is known to produce a high percentage of false positives. People are frightened. They are encouraged to do the PCR test, which increases the number of fake positives. And governments have been deliberately involved in increasing the PCR tests with a view to inflating the number of so-called Covid-19 positive cases.

These inflated Covid positive “estimates” (from the PCR test) are then tabulated and used to sustain the fear campaign. The hype in Covid-19 deaths is based on flawed and biased criteria, which are then used to justify the various lockdown policies including social distancing, the face mask, etc.

According to Dr. Pascal Sacré in an article entitled: The COVID-19 RT-PCR Test: How to Mislead All Humanity. Using a “Test” To Lock Down Society:

This misuse of RT-PCR technique is used as a relentless and intentional strategy by some governments, supported by scientific safety councils and by the dominant media, to justify excessive measures such as the violation of a large number of constitutional rights, the destruction of the economy with the bankruptcy of entire active sectors of society, the degradation of living conditions for a large number of ordinary citizens, under the pretext of a pandemic based on a number of positive RT-PCR tests, and not on a real number of patients.

The RT-PCR tests do not prove infection:

“Today, as authorities test more people, there are bound to be more positive RT-PCR tests. This does not mean that COVID-19 is coming back, or that the epidemic is moving in waves. There are more people being tested, that’s all.”

This procedure of massive data collection is there to provide supportive (faulty) “estimates” (False positives) to justify the application of a lockdown coupled with second and third Worldwide waves of economic and social destabilization. (See Chapters IV and X).

Starting in November 2020, these flawed PCR estimates were used to support the Covid-19 vaccination campaign (Chapter VIII).

The WHO’s Retraction. “We Made a Mistake”. Recommends rRT-PCR “Re-Testing”

The Real Time Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction (rRT-PCR) test was adopted by the WHO on January 23, 2020 as a means to detecting the SARS-COV-2 virus, following the recommendations of the Virology research group (based at Charité University Hospital, Berlin), supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. (See our analysis above on the Drosten Study)
Exactly one year later on January 20th, 2021, the WHO retracts. They don’t say “We Made a Mistake”. The retraction is carefully formulated. (See the WHO’s retraction notice dated January 20, 2021)

While the WHO does not deny the validity of their misleading January 2020 guidelines, they nonetheless recommend “Re-testing” (which everybody knows is an impossibility).

The contentious issue pertains to the number of amplification threshold cycles (Ct). According to Pieter Borger, et al

The number of amplification cycles [should be] less than 35; preferably 25-30 cycles. In case of virus detection, >35 cycles only detects signals which do not correlate with infectious virus as determined by isolation in cell culture...(Critique of Drosten Study)

The World Health Organization (WHO) tacitly admits one year later that ALL PCR tests conducted at a 35 cycle amplification threshold (Ct) or higher are INVALID. But that is what they recommended in January 2020, in consultation with the virology team at Charité Hospital in Berlin.

If the test is conducted at a 35 Ct threshold or above (which was recommended by the WHO), segments of the SARS-CoV-2 virus cannot be detected, which means that ALL the so-called confirmed “positive cases” tabulated in the course of the last 14 months are invalid.

According to Pieter Borger, Bobby Rajesh Malhotra, Michael Yeadon, et al, the Ct > 35 has been the norm “in most laboratories in Europe & the US”.

The WHO’s Mea Culpa

Below is the WHO’s carefully formulated “Retraction”. The full text with link to the original document is in annex to this chapter:

“WHO guidance Diagnostic testing for SARS-CoV-2 states that careful interpretation of weak positive results is needed (1). The cycle threshold (Ct) needed to detect virus is inversely proportional to the patient’s viral load. Where test results do not correspond with the clinical presentation, a new specimen should be taken and retested using the same or different NAT technology. (emphasis added)

WHO reminds IVD users that disease prevalence alters the predictive value of test results; as disease prevalence decreases, the risk of false positive increases (2). This means that the probability that a person who has a positive result (SARS-CoV-2 detected) is truly infected with SARS-CoV-2 decreases as prevalence decreases, irrespective of the claimed specificity.”

“Invalid Positives” is the Underlying Concept

This is not an issue of “Weak Positives” and “Risk of False Positive Increases”. What is at stake is a “Flawed Methodology” which leads to invalid estimates.

What this admission of the WHO confirms is that the estimate of covid positive from a PCR test (with an amplification threshold of 35 cycles or higher) is invalid. In which case, the WHO recommends retesting: “a new specimen should be taken and retested...”.
The WHO calls for “Retesting”, which is tantamount to “We Screwed Up”.

That recommendation is pro-forma. It won’t happen. Millions of people Worldwide have already been tested, starting in early February 2020. Nonetheless, we must conclude that unless retested, those estimates (according to the WHO) are invalid.

From the outset, the PCR test has routinely been applied at a Ct amplification threshold of 35 or higher, following the January 2020 recommendations of the WHO. What this means is that the RT-PCR methodology as applied Worldwide has in the course of the last 12-14 months led to the compilation of faulty and misleading Covid statistics.

And these are the statistics which are used to measure the progression of the so-called “pandemic”. Above an amplification cycle of 35 or higher, the test will not detect the virus. Therefore, the official “covid numbers” are meaningless.

It follows that there is no scientific basis for confirming the existence of a pandemic.

Which in turn means that the lockdown / economic measures which have resulted in social panic, mass poverty and unemployment (allegedly to curtail the spread of the virus) have no justification whatsoever.

According to scientific opinion:

“If someone is tested by PCR as positive when a threshold of 35 cycles or higher is used (as is the case in most laboratories in Europe & the US), the probability that said person is actually infected is less than 3%, the probability that said result is a false positive is 97%” (Pieter Borger, Bobby Rajesh Malhotra, Michael Yeadon, Clare Craig, Kevin McKernan, et al, Critique of Drosten Study)

3. The number of amplification cycles (less than 35; preferably 25-30 cycles);

In case of virus detection, >35 cycles only detects signals which do not correlate with infectious virus as determined by isolation in cell culture [reviewed in 2]; if someone is tested by PCR as positive when a threshold of 35 cycles or higher is used (as is the case in most laboratories in Europe & the US), the probability that said person is actually infected is less than 3%, the probability that said result is a false positive is 97% [reviewed in 3]

As outlined above, “the probability that said result is a false positive is 97%”: It follows that using the >35 cycles detection will indelibly contribute to “hiking up” the number of “fake positives”.

Despite the WHO January 2021 Retraction, the PCR test is being used extensively to hike up the numbers with a view to sustaining the fear campaign, justifying the ongoing lockdown policies as well as the implementation of the Covid vaccine.

Ironically, the flawed numbers based on “invalid positives” are in turn being manipulated to ensure an upward trend in Covid positives.
Moreover, those PCR tests are not routinely accompanied by a medical diagnosis of the patients who are being tested.

And now, national health authorities have issued (fake) warnings of a “Third Wave” as part of their propaganda campaign in support of the Covid-19 Vaccine.

The WHO confirms that the Covid PCR test procedure as applied is invalid. There is absolutely no scientific basis for implementing the Covid Vaccine.

Both the WHO and the scientific assessment of Pieter Borger, et al (quoted above) confirm unequivocally that the tests adopted by governments to justify the lockdown and the destabilization of national economies are INVALID.

Concluding Remarks. Invalid Data and the “Numbers’ Game”

It should be understood that these “invalid estimates” based on a faulty PCR methodology (which the WHO has now acknowledged) are the “numbers” quoted relentlessly 24/7 by the media in the course of the “First Wave” and “Second Wave”, which have been used to feed the fear campaign and “justify” ALL the policies put forth by the governments:

- lockdown,
- closure of economic activity,
- restrictions on social gatherings, family reunions, weddings, funerals
- closure or partial closure of schools, colleges and universities
- closure of cultural and sports events
- closure of museums
- confinement leading to job losses,
- the triggering of poverty and mass unemployment,
- bankruptcies
- social distancing,
- face mask,
- curfew,
- the vaccine.
- the health passport

And Now we have entered a so-called “Third Wave”.

But where’s the data? How are the tests being conducted?

What is the underlying methodology in relation to the amplification cycles (Ct) threshold? How are the estimates of positive cases being conducted and tabulated?

---

**Annex to Chapter III**

Full text of the WHO directive dated January 20, 2021
Nucleic Acid Testing (NAT) Technologies that Use Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) for Detection of SARS-CoV-2

WHO Information Notice for IVD Users 2020/05

Product type: Nucleic acid testing (NAT) technologies that use polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for detection of SARS-CoV-2

Date: 13 January 2021

WHO-identifier: 2020/5, version 2

Target audience: laboratory professionals and users of IVDs.

Nucleic Acid Testing (NAT) Technologies that Use Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) for Detection of SARS-CoV-2

Product type: Nucleic acid testing (NAT) technologies that use polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for detection of SARS-CoV-2

Date: 13 January 2021

WHO-identifier: 2020/5, version 2

Target audience: laboratory professionals and users of IVDs.

Purpose of this notice: clarify information previously provided by WHO. This notice supersedes WHO Information Notice for In Vitro Diagnostic Medical Device (IVD) Users 2020/05 version 1, issued 14 December 2020.

Description of the problem: WHO requests users to follow the instructions for use (IFU) when interpreting results for specimens tested using PCR methodology.

Users of IVDs must read and follow the IFU carefully to determine if manual adjustment of the PCR positivity threshold is recommended by the manufacturer.

WHO guidance Diagnostic testing for SARS-CoV-2 states that careful interpretation of weak positive results is needed (1). The cycle threshold (Ct) needed to detect virus is inversely proportional to the patient’s viral load. Where test results do not correspond with the clinical presentation, a new specimen should be taken and retested using the same or different NAT technology.

WHO reminds IVD users that disease prevalence alters the predictive value of test results; as disease prevalence decreases, the risk of false positive increases (2). This means that the probability that a person who has a positive result (SARS-CoV-2 detected) is truly infected
with SARS-CoV-2 decreases as prevalence decreases, irrespective of the claimed specificity.

Most PCR assays are indicated as an aid for diagnosis, therefore, health care providers must consider any result in combination with timing of sampling, specimen type, assay specifics, clinical observations, patient history, confirmed status of any contacts, and epidemiological information.

Actions to be taken by IVD users:

1. Please read carefully the IFU in its entirety.
2. Contact your local representative if there is any aspect of the IFU that is unclear to you.
3. Check the IFU for each incoming consignment to detect any changes to the IFU.
4. Provide the Ct value in the report to the requesting health care provider.

Notes


---

Chapter IV

Engineered Economic Depression

There are essentially four distinct phases in the engineered destabilization of the global economy.

- The first phase was launched in late January, when the Trump administration announced (Jan 31, 2020) that it will deny entry to foreign nationals “who have traveled in China in the last 14 days”. This immediately triggered a crisis in air travel and transportation. China-US trade as well as the tourism industry were affected.
- The second phase was initiated on February 20th, following WHO Director General’s Dr. Tedros warning that a pandemic was imminent, which served to trigger the beginning of the 2020 Corona Financial crash.
- The third Phase was launched with the March 11, 2020 lockdown leading to the closing down of of 190 national economies, with devastating social consequences and
- A fourth phase was initiated in October-November 2020 coinciding with the so-called “Second Wave”.
- A “Third Wave” was launched in early 2021.
The Disruption of US-China Trade

Trump’s decision on January 31, 2020 was taken immediately following the announcement by the WHO Director General of a Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC) (January 30, 2020). In many regards, this was an act of “economic warfare” against China.

And then, following Trump’s January 31st 2020 decision to curtail air travel and transportation to China, a campaign was launched in Western countries against China as well against ethnic Chinese. The Economist reported that “The coronavirus spreads racism against and among ethnic Chinese”

“Britain’s Chinese community faces racism over coronavirus outbreak”

According to the South China Morning Post (Hong Kong):

“Chinese communities overseas are increasingly facing racist abuse and discrimination amid the coronavirus outbreak. Some ethnic Chinese people living in the UK say they experienced growing hostility because of the deadly virus that originated in China.”

And this phenomenon happened all over the U.S.

US-China Trade. America’s Dependence on “Made in China”

What the Trump administration failed to comprehend is that the United States is heavily dependent on commodity imports from China.

The unspoken truth is that America is an import led economy (resulting from offshoring) with a weak manufacturing base, heavily dependent on imports from the PRC. Despite America’s financial dominance and the powers of the dollar, there are serious failures in the structure of America’s “Real Economy” which have been exacerbated by the corona crisis.

US imports from China have declined significantly as a result of the “pandemic”, the impacts on US retail trade are potentially devastating. This process of disruption
affecting production, supply lines, international transport started in early February 2020, following Trump’s declaration on January 31st 2020.

Political and geopolitical factors played a key role including the anti-Chinese campaign launched in February 2020 as well threats by the Trump administration, claiming that China was responsible for “spreading the virus”.

The impacts on bilateral US-China trade were devastating: US commodity imports from China declined by 28.3% (average over first three months of 2020 in relation to first 3 months of 2019).

Following the March 11, 2020 lockdown and closure of the global economy, the decline of US imports from China in March 2020 were of the order of US imports from China in March 2020 were of the order of 36.5% (in relation to March 2019). The decline in China’s exports to the US recorded in April and May were of the order 7.9% to 8.5% in relation to April-May 2019.

Moreover, according to figures quoted by _the Financial Times_ (largely attributable to the deep-seated financial crisis which started in February 2020), the value of (announced) Chinese direct investment projects into the US had fallen by about 90%: $200 million in the first quarter of 2020, down from an average of $2 billion per quarter in 2019.

“Chinese direct investment into the US stood at $5bn, a slight drop from $5.4bn in 2018 and well off a recent peak of $45bn in 2016, when Chinese companies were much more free to acquire US counterparts”

While the US economy had entered into a deep-seated crisis (starting in February 2020 with the financial crash), China’s economy had recovered: China’s overall exports Worldwide (dollars) in April 2020 rose by 3.5% (in relation to April 2019).

What has transpired is a major redirection of China’s exports to the European Union (EU) and the rest of the World, which inevitably affects “Made in China” retail trade throughout the US.

The geopolitical implications are far-reaching, while the real economy in the US is in a shambles, China has now become the EU’s largest trading partner.

**The February 2020 Corona Financial Crash**

Speculative trade and financial fraud played a key role. On Thursday the 20th of February afternoon in Geneva, (CET Time) the WHO Director General, Dr Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus held a press conference. I am “concerned”, he said, “that the chance to contain the coronavirus outbreak” is “closing” ...

“I believe the window of opportunity is still there, but that the window is narrowing.”

These “shock and awe” statements contributed to triggering panic, despite the fact that the number of confirmed cases outside China was exceedingly low: 1076 cases outside China, for a population of 6.4 billion. (Excluding the Diamond Princess, there were 452 so-called “confirmed cases” Worldwide. See Chapter II)
The statement by Dr. Tedros (based on flawed concepts and statistics), set the stage for the February financial collapse triggered by inside information, foreknowledge, derivative trade, short-selling and a galore of hedge fund operations.

COVID-19 was narrowly identified as the catalyst of the financial crash.

Who was behind this catalyst?

Who was behind the fear campaign which contributed to triggering chaos and uncertainty on financial markets?

The small number of confirmed cases outside China (1076) did not in any way confirm the spread of a Worldwide epidemic. But this did not prevent the markets from plummeting.

The markets had been manipulated. Whoever had foreknowledge (inside information) of the WHO Director General’s February 20th, 2020 statement would have reaped significant monetary gains.

Was there a conflict of interest (as defined by the WHO)? The WHO receives funds from the Gates Foundation. Bill Gates has “60% of his assets invested in equities [including stocks and index funds]”, according to a September 2019 CNBC report.

The stock market crash initiated on February 20th referred to as the 2020 Coronavirus Crash (February 20-April 7, 2020), was categorized as:

“the fastest fall in global stock markets in financial history, and the most devastating crash since the Wall Street Crash of 1929.”

The cause of the financial crash was (according to “analysts”) V. The Virus, namely, the “massive spread” of the epidemic outside China. But that was an outright lie: there were only 1076 cases Worldwide for a population of 6.4 billion outside China. (see Chapter III). Media disinformation played a key role in spearheading the fear campaign

Insider Trading and Financial Fraud

The possibility of financial fraud and “inside trading” (which is illegal) was casually dispelled by financial analysts and media reports.

Without the human hand, there is no causal relationship between a microscopic virus and the complex gamut of financial variables.
The “killer virus” fear campaign coupled with Dr. Tedros’ timely “warnings” of the need to implement a Worldwide pandemic indelibly served the interests of Wall Street’s institutional speculators and hedge funds. The financial crash led to a major shift in the distribution of money wealth. (See analysis in Chapter V)

In the week following the February 20-21 WHO announcement, the Dow Jones collapsed by 12% (CNBC, February 28, 2020). According to analysts, the plunge of the DJIA was the result of the Worldwide spread of the virus. A nonsensical statement in contradiction with the (small) number of WHO Covid positive estimates (1076 outside China recorded on February 20, 2020), most of which were based on the faulty PCR test.

On Monday, February 24th upon the reopening of stock markets, there was an unprecedented plunge in the Dow Jones attributable to the “impending dangers” that “Covid was spreading Worldwide creating uncertainties in financial markets”.

“Stocks fell sharply on Monday (February 24) as the number of coronavirus cases outside China surged, stoking fears of a prolonged global economic slowdown from the virus spreading. The Dow Jones Industrial Average closed 1,031.61 points lower, or 3.56%, at 27,960.80.” (CNBC) (emphasis added)
Also on February 24th, Trump requested a $1.25 billion emergency aid.

**February 24: Stock market tumbles, Trump claims control**

Trump asks for a $1.25bn in emergency aid after the Dow Jones Industrial Average tumbles 1,000 points on coronavirus fears.

He tweets that the virus “is very much under control” and the stock market “starting to look very good to me!”

According to the BBC, *Worldwide stock markets saw sharp falls* “because of concerns about the economic impact of the virus”, suggesting that the Virus was “the invisible “hand” responsible for the decline of financial markets.

COVID-19 was narrowly identified as the catalyst of the financial crash.

Who was behind the fear campaign which contributed to triggering chaos and uncertainty on financial markets coupled with bankruptcies and a massive redistribution of money wealth?


On March 11, 2020: the WHO officially declared a Worldwide pandemic at a time when there were 118,000 confirmed cases and 4291 deaths Worldwide (including China). (March 11, 2020, according to press conference). What do these “statistics” tell you?

The number of confirmed cases outside of China (6.4 billion population) was of the order of 44279 and 1440 deaths (figures recorded for March 11 by the WHO, (on March 12, 2020). (See Chapter III).
The “science” behind this Worldwide lockdown decision was based on “a mathematical model by Dr. Neil Ferguson of Imperial College, London, as a means to avoiding a “predicted” 600,000 deaths in the U.K.

Ferguson’s “model” (which borders on ridicule) was used by the financial establishment as a justification to trigger economic and social chaos Worldwide. Ferguson’s endeavors were generously funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

Immediately following the March 11, 2020 WHO announcement, the fear campaign went into high gear. As in the case of the February 20-21 crash, the March 11 statement by the WHO Director General had set the stage.

Stock markets crashed worldwide. On the following morning, the Dow (DJIA) plummeted by 9.99% (A decline of 2,352.60 to close at 21,200.62). Black Thursday, March 12, 2020 was “the Dow’s worst day” since 1987. Financial fraud was the trigger. A massive transfer of financial wealth had taken place in favor of America’s billionaires. (see chapter V)

“Stay at Home” confinement instructions were transmitted to 193 member states of the United Nations. Politicians are the instruments of powerful financial interests. Was this far-reaching decision justified as a means to combating the Virus?

The decision was based on a flawed lockdown model designed by Imperial College London.

Unprecedented in history, applied almost simultaneously in a large number countries, entire sectors of the World economy were destabilized. Small and medium sized enterprises were driven into bankruptcy. Unemployment and poverty are rampant.

In several developing countries, famines have erupted. (See analysis below). The social impacts of these measures are devastating. The health impacts (mortality, morbidity) of these measures including the destabilization of the system of national health care (in numerous countries) far surpass those attributed to Covid-19.

Economic Warfare

The instructions came from above, from Wall Street, the World Economic Forum, the billionaire foundations. This diabolical project is casually described by the corporate media as a “humanitarian” public health endeavor. The “international community” has a “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P). An unelected “public-private partnership” under the auspices of the World Economic Forum (WEF), has come to the rescue of Planet Earth’s 7.8 billion people. The closure of the global economy was presented as a means to “killing the virus”.

Sounds absurd. Closing down the real economy of Planet Earth is not the “solution” but
rather the “cause” of a process of Worldwide destabilization and impoverishment, which in turn will inevitably have an impact on patterns of morbidity and mortality. In this regard, what must be addressed is the causal relationship between economic variables (i.e. purchasing power) and the state of health of the population.

The national economy combined with political, social and cultural institutions is the basis for the “reproduction of real life”: income, employment, production, trade, infrastructure, social services.

Destabilizing the economy of Planet Earth cannot constitute a “solution” to combating the virus. But that was the imposed “solution” which they want us to believe in. And that is what they are doing.

The Lockdown and the Process of Engineered Bankruptcy

There is an important relationship between the “Real Economy” and “Big Money”, namely the financial establishment.

What is ongoing is a process of concentration of wealth, whereby the financial establishment, (i.e. the multibillion dollar creditors) are slated to appropriate the real assets of both bankrupt companies as well as State assets.

The “Real Economy” constitutes “the economic landscape” of real economic activity: productive assets, agriculture, industry, goods and services, trade, investment, employment as well social and cultural infrastructure including schools, hospitals, universities, museums, etc. The real economy at the global and national levels is being targeted by the lockdown and closure of economic activity.

The lockdown instructions transmitted to national governments have been conducive to the destabilization of “the national economic landscape”, which consists of an entire economic and social structure. The “stay at home” lockdown prevents people from going to work. From one day to the next, it creates mass unemployment (Worldwide). In turn, the lockdown is coupled with the closure of entire sectors of the national economy.

The lockdown immediately contributes to the disengagement of human resources (labor) which in turn brings productive activity to a standstill.

The channels of supply and distribution are frozen, which eventually leads to potential shortages in the availability of commodities. In turn, several hundred million workers Worldwide lose their jobs and their earnings.

While national governments have set up various “social safety nets” for the unemployed, the payment of wages and salaries by the employer is disrupted which in turn leads to a dramatic Worldwide collapse of purchasing power.

It’s a payments crisis. Wages and salaries are not paid. Impoverished households are unable to purchase food, pay their rent or monthly mortgage. Personal and household debts (including credit card debts) go fly high. It’s a cumulative process.

This globalization of poverty leads to a decline in consumer demand which then backlashes
on the productive system, leading to a further string of bankruptcies. Inevitably, the structure of international commodity trade is also affected.

Global Indebtedness

The Global Money financial institutions are the “creditors” of the real economy which is in crisis. The closure of the global economy has triggered a process of global indebtedness. Unprecedented in World history, a multi-trillion bonanza of dollar denominated debts is hitting simultaneously the national economies of 193 countries.

The creditors will also seek to acquire ownership and/or control of “public wealth” including the social and economic assets of the State through a massive indebtedness project under the surveillance of creditor institutions including the IMF, the World Bank, the regional development banks, etc.

Under the so-called “New Normal” Great Reset put forth by the World Economic Forum (WEF), the creditors (including the billionaires) are intent upon buying out important sectors of the real economy as well as taking over bankrupt entities (See Chapter IX)

Crisis of the Global Economy. The Evidence

In the sections below we review the dramatic impacts of the closure of the global economy focussing on bankruptcies, global poverty, unemployment, the outbreak of famines as well as education.

Most of the figures quoted below are from UN, government and related sources, which tend to underestimate the seriousness of this ongoing global crisis, which is literally destroying people’s lives.

Indebtedness in all sectors of economic activity Worldwide is the driving force.

What is presented below is but the tip of the iceberg. Much of the data corresponds to the first 6-8 months of 2020. The devastating impacts of the Second Wave lockdown which are ongoing are yet to be assessed:

Bankruptcies

The wave of bankruptcies triggered by the closure of the World economy affects both Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (SME) as well as large Corporations. The evidence suggests that small and medium sized enterprises are literally being wiped out.

According to a survey by the International Trade Centre, quoted by the OECD, pertaining to SMEs in 132 countries:

two-thirds of micro and small firms report that the crisis strongly affected their business operations, and one-fifth indicate the risk of shutting down permanently within three months. Based on several surveys in a variety of countries, McKinsey (2020) indicates that between 25% and 36% of small businesses could close down permanently from the disruption in the first four months of the pandemic. (OECD Report, emphasis added)

According to Bloomberg:
“Over half of Europe’s small and medium-sized businesses say they face bankruptcy in the next year if revenues don’t pick up, underscoring the breadth of damage wrought by the Covid-19 crisis.

One in five companies in Italy and France anticipate filing for insolvency within six months, according to a McKinsey & Co. survey in August of more than 2,200 SMEs in Europe’s five largest economies.

The surveys tend to underestimate the magnitude of this unfolding catastrophe. The numbers are much larger than what is being reported.

In the US, the bankruptcy process is ongoing. According to a group of academics in a letter to Congress:

“we anticipate that a significant fraction of viable small businesses will be forced to liquidate, causing high and irreversible economic losses. “Workers will lose jobs even in otherwise viable businesses. ...”

A run of defaults looks almost inevitable. At the end of the first quarter of this year, U.S. companies had amassed nearly $10.5 trillion in debt — by far the most since the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis began tracking the figure at the end of World War II. “An explosion in corporate debt,” Mr. Altman said” (NYT, June, 16, 2020).

With regard to small businesses in the US:

almost 90% of small businesses experienced a strong (51%) or moderate (38%) negative impact from the pandemic; 45% of businesses experienced disruptions in supply chains; 25% of businesses has less than 1-2 months cash reserves.” (OECD)

The results of a survey of over 5 800 small businesses in the United States:

... shows that 43% of responding businesses are already temporarily closed. On average, businesses reduced their employees by 40%. Three-quarters of respondents indicate they have two months or less in cash in reserve. ... (OECD)

In a 2020 survey:

“half of all US small business owners in the entire country believe that they may soon be forced to close down for good. Not even during the Great Depression of the 1930s did we see anything like this”

Global Unemployment

A massive Worldwide contraction in employment is ongoing. In an August 2020 report, the International Labour Organization (ILO) confirms that:

The COVID-19 crisis has severely disrupted economies and labour markets in all world regions, with estimated losses of working hours equivalent to nearly 400 million full-time jobs in the second quarter of 2020, most of which are in emerging and developing countries...(ILO, 2020a). ...

Among the most vulnerable are the 1.6 billion informal economy workers, representing
half of the global workforce, who are working in sectors experiencing major job losses or have seen their incomes seriously affected by lockdowns.

The COVID-19 crisis is disproportionately affecting 1.25 billion workers in at-risk jobs, particularly in the hardest-hit sectors such as retail trade, accommodation and food services, and manufacturing (ILO, 2020b). Most of these workers are self-employed, in low-income jobs in the informal sector... Young people, for example, are experiencing multiple shocks including disruption to education and training, employment and income, in addition to greater difficulties in finding jobs.

The ILO does not in any way explain the political causes of mass unemployment, resulting from actions taken by national governments, allegedly with a view to resolving the Covid pandemic. Moreover, the ILO tends to underestimate both the levels as well as the dramatic increase in unemployment.

Governments are under the control of global creditors. What is contemplated for the post-Covid era is the implementation of massive austerity measures including the cancellation of workers’ benefits and social safety nets.

Unemployment in the U.S.

In the US, “more than 30 million people, over 15% of the workforce, have applied for unemployment benefits... ” (CSM, May 6, 2020).

Announced in early December 2020: “More than 10 million Americans are projected to lose their unemployment benefits the day after Christmas [2020] unless Congress acts to extend key pandemic-related programs – a prospect that as of now looks uncertain at best.” (US News and World Report)

The cliff edge looms as coronavirus cases surge around the country and applications for unemployment benefits rise with states and localities reimposing virus-related restrictions. The lapse is also set to occur as protections for renters, student loan borrowers and homeowners expire – a potential devastating confluence of events for both individuals, whose savings have been ravaged by the pandemic, and the economy at large, which is gradually clawing its way back from the coronavirus-induced recession.

When the programs lapse at the end of December [2020], an estimated 12 million people could lose jobless benefits, according to the Century Foundation. (US News and World Report)

During the most severe Main Street economic collapse in US history — with over one-fourth of working-age Americans jobless — an additional calamity looms:

According to Census Bureau estimates, 30 to 40 million Americans face possible
eviction in 2021 for lack of income to pay rent or service mortgages.

Without federal aid or an extended rent moratorium, a calamity of biblical proportions may unfold in the coming months. Stephen Lendman

Unemployment in the European Union (EU)

“Unemployment across the whole of the European Union is expected to rise to nine percent in 2020, in the wake of the Coronavirus pandemic and subsequent lockdowns enforced by national governments”.

According to official EU figures:

Greece, Spain and Portugal ... have once again seen large rises in youth unemployment since the start of the pandemic. Greece saw a surge from 31.7 percent in March [2020] to 39.3 percent in June [2020], while Spain and Portugal had similar increases, from 33.9 percent to 41.7 percent and 20.6 percent to 27.4 percent, respectively.

Unemployment in Latin America

In Latin America, the average unemployment rate was estimated at 8.1 per cent at the end of 2019. The ILO states that it could rise by a modest 4 to 5 percentage points to 41 million unemployed.

In absolute numbers, these rates imply that the number of people who are looking for jobs but are not hired rose from 26 million before the pandemic to 41 million in 2020, as announced by ILO experts.

These estimates of the ILO and the World Bank are misleading. According to the Inter American Development Bank (IDB), the increase in unemployment for the Latin American region was of the order of 24 million in 2020, with jobs losses in Colombia of the order of 3.6 million, Brazil, 7.0 million and Mexico 7.0 million.

Even these figures tend to underestimate the dramatic increase in unemployment. And the situation is likely to evolve in course of the Second Wave lockdown which has triggered a renewed wave of bankruptcies.

According to a Survey conducted by the Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI) the increase in unemployment in Mexico was of the order of 12.5 million in April 2020, i.e. in the month following the March 11, 2020 lockdown and closure of the national economy.

The Outbreak of Famines

According to the World Food Programme (WFP) “690 million people do not have enough to eat. while 130 million additional people risk being pushed to the brink of starvation.” (November 2020 statement).

These figures are questionable. Both the FAO and the WFP have failed to address the central role of the lockdown and closure of national economies as a “shock mechanism” which simultaneously triggers mass poverty coupled with the destabilization of agricultural production in both developing and developed countries, in all major regions of the World.
The underlying causality is simply not addressed. Climate and Conflict analysis take precedence:

“We are seeing a catastrophe unfold before our very eyes. Famine – driven by conflict, and fuelled by climate shocks and the COVID-19 hunger pandemic – is knocking on the door for millions of families,” (David Beasley, Executive director of the WFP)

Famines have erupted in at least 25 developing countries according to the FAO (The study does not include most of Asia and Latin America, Europe, the Middle East and North America):

“The UN’s Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and World Food Programme (WFP) identifies 27 countries that are on the frontline of impending COVID-19-driven food crises, as the pandemic’s knock-on effects aggravate pre-existing drivers of hunger.

No world region is immune, from Afghanistan and Bangladesh in Asia, to Haiti, Venezuela and Central America, to Iraq, Lebanon, Sudan and Syria in the Middle East to Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Mozambique, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe in Africa.

The joint analysis by FAO and WFP warns these “hotspot countries” are at high risk of – and in some cases are already seeing – significant food security deteriorations in the coming months, including rising numbers of people pushed into acute hunger.”

FAO-WFP early warning analysis of acute food insecurity hotspots
July 2020

The COVID-19 pandemic has potentially far-reaching and multifaceted indirect impacts on societies and economies, which could last long after the health emergency is over. These could aggravate existing instabilities or crises, or lead to
new ones with repercussions on food security, nutrition and livelihoods.

With over two billion people, or 62 percent of all those working worldwide, employed in the informal economy according to ILO data, millions of people face a growing risk of hunger. Earnings for informal workers are estimated to decline by 82 percent, with Africa and Latin America to face the largest decline (ILO 2020). (FAO, p. 6)

Famine and Despair in India

The social and economic impacts of the March 11, 2020 lockdown in India were devastating triggering a wave of famine and despair. “Millions of people who have lost income now face increased poverty and hunger, in a country where even before the pandemic 50 percent of all children suffered from malnourishment”

In late November 2020, the largest general strike in the country’s history was carried out against the Modi government with more than 200 million workers and farmers. According to the Mumbai University and College Teachers’ Union:

This strike is against the devastating health and economic crisis unleashed by COVID-19 and the lockdown on the working people of the country. This has been further aggravated by a series of anti-people legislations on agriculture and the labour code enacted by the central government. Along with these measures, the National Education Policy (NEP) imposed on the nation during the pandemic will further cause irreparable harm to the equity of and access to education.

According to Left Voice:

“The pandemic has spread from major cities such as Delhi, Mumbai, and other urban centers to rural areas where public health care is scarce or non-existent. The Modi government has handled the pandemic by prioritizing the profits of big business and protecting the fortunes of billionaires over protecting the lives and livelihoods of workers.”

“Food Insecurity” in the U.S.

Undernourishment and so-called “food insecurity” are not limited to developing countries.

The terminology is not quite the same. “Famine” in America which today is a reality is rarely mentioned. Neither is the lockdown acknowledged as a mechanism which has triggered so-called “food Insecurity”.

The US Department of Agriculture defines “Food insecurity” as “a household-level economic and social condition of limited or uncertain access to adequate food”. “Hunger” is defined as “an individual-level physiological condition that may result from food insecurity”. “Famine” does appear in the USDA glossary.

Recent estimates by Feeding America suggest that one in seven Americans representing 45 million people in 2020, including 15 million children experienced “food insecurity”: 
Before the start of the pandemic, the overall food insecurity rate had reached its lowest point since it began to be measured in the 1990s, but those improvements were being upended by the pandemic.

According to Stephen Lendman:

“Around one in four US households experienced food insecurity this year [2020]— over 27% of households with children.

A Northwestern University Institute for Policy Research study estimates the number of food insecure households with children at nearly 30%. Black families are twice as food insecure as their white counterparts. Latino households are also disproportionately affected.”

Education: The Impacts on Our Children

The very foundations of civil society are threatened. **UNICEF estimates that 1.6 billion children and adolescents were affected** by the closure of schools Worldwide.

“As the COVID-19 pandemic has spread across the globe, a majority of countries have announced the temporary closure of schools, impacting more than 91 per cent of students worldwide... Never before have so many children been out of school at the same time...

Colleges and universities are also paralysed. Students are denied the right to education. While **UNESCO confirms that more than one billion learners are affected**, it offers no concrete solution or critique. The official narrative of the so-called “public / private partnership” imposed on national governments has been adopted at face value.

School closures were carried out in 132 countries. See diagram below (UNESCO, May 2020).
The Macro-Economic Implications: Supply, Demand and The Fiscal Crisis of the State

The above review of the economic and social impacts points to a complex process. Large sectors of the World population have been precipitated into poverty and despair.

I will conclude this chapter with some simple concepts which describe the nature of this Worldwide crisis.

The Lockdown has triggered a process of Worldwide economic destabilization which directly affects both “Supply” and “Demand” relations. It’s the most serious economic crisis in World history affecting simultaneously more than a 150 countries.

“Supply” pertains to the production of goods and services, namely the activities of the “Real Economy”.

“Demand” pertains to the ability of consumers given their purchasing power to acquire goods and services.

Both supply and demand relations are in jeopardy.

Worldwide, large sectors of industry, agriculture and urban services stand idle. The lockdown policies initiated in March 2020 have triggered bankruptcies and unemployment, which in turn have been conducive to a process of disengagement of human resources (labor) and productive assets from the economic landscape.

The freeze of air-travel, the contraction in international commodity trade in the course of 2020-2021 has also contributed to a massive decline in production and investment.

The Crisis in International Commodity Trade

The crisis in container trade has also led to major shortages in the availability of staple food commodities such as rice, sugar, soya beans, etc. which in turn has triggered inflationary hikes at the retail level. India, which is the second largest exporter of sugar experienced a collapse of approximately 80% in its sugar exports.

Shortage in the Production of Semi-conductors

The automobile industry experienced a decline in production of 15% in 2000. The decline in 2021 is significant, largely affecting production in Japan, South Korea and China.

This decline has been accentuated by a shortage in the availability of semi-conductors:

“Automakers, which rely on dozens of chips to build a single vehicle, have been particularly hard hit, forced to halt production lines globally as they await chip supplies. The debacle is likely to cost the auto industry $450 billion in global sales ... In September 2021 Toyota was forced to slash production at 14 factories in Japan over a lack of semiconductors. Some of the cuts will continue into October due to a lack of components from Southeast Asia, Toyota has said.” (Washington Post, September 2021)
Semiconductors constitute a strategic commodity, used in a variety of sectors including electronics, medical devices, electronic and communications networks etc.

There are indications of possible manipulations, which have led to artificial shortages of semiconductors affecting a number of key sectors of the global economy.

There are geopolitical implications. The World’s largest semiconductor producer is Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company (TSMC).

Supply and Demand Relations

On the supply side, a massive contraction in the production and availability of goods and services (commodities) is unfolding. Entire sectors of the global economy are “not producing”: scarcities of certain commodities and services have emerged.

On the demand side, mass unemployment and poverty triggered by the lockdown policies has contributed to an unprecedented collapse in purchasing power (of families and households Worldwide), which in turn has led to the collapse in the demand for goods and services. Poverty is rampant: large sectors of the World population do not have money to buy food and essential consumer goods.

Contraction of production (supply) coupled with the collapse of purchasing power (demand) is conducive to a deep-seated Worldwide economic depression coupled with inflationary pressures.

In turn, the collapse in purchasing power resulting from mass unemployment has led to a mounting personal debt crisis including the inability to meet monthly rent and mortgage payments. This process eventually leads to a confiscation of real assets.

In the US, 68 percent of those who were behind on rent (May 2021 figures) had become unemployment as a result of the lockdown.

These developments are casually blamed on the “pandemic’s economic fallout” without analyzing how the failed lockdown policies have triggered economic chaos and unemployment Worldwide.

The Fiscal Crisis of the State

State funded public sector activities including health, education, culture, sports and the arts are also in jeopardy. Meanwhile, in the U.S., the Biden administration has favored a massive increase in military and security related expenditure as well as biotechnology with generous handouts to Big Pharma.

Since the onset of the corona crisis, the public debt in country after country has gone fly high largely precipitated by economic chaos.

Bankrupt companies no longer pay taxes. Unemployed workers (without earnings) no longer pay taxes. Tax dollars are no longer coming into the coffers of the State.

The increase in global unemployment and poverty coupled with bankruptcies have led to an unprecedented fiscal crisis. In turn, government revenue has been redirected to funding
corporate handouts.

An unpayable multi-trillion dollar public debt is unfolding Worldwide, coupled with a process which we might describe as “global insolvency”.

The creditors of the state are “Big Money”. Ultimately they call the shots.

What is unfolding is the “privatization of the State” including the “Welfare State”.

Chapter V
The Enrichment of the Super Rich

The Appropriation and Redistribution of Wealth

“V the Virus” is said to be responsible for the wave of bankruptcies and unemployment. That’s a lie. There is no causal relationship between the virus and economic variables.

The decision-making process must be addressed. It’s the powerful financiers and billionaires who are behind this project which has contributed to the destabilization (Worldwide) of the real economy.

Since early February 2020, the Super Rich have cashed in on billions of dollars. Between April and July (four months) the total wealth held by billionaires around the world has grown from $8 trillion to more than $10 trillion.

There are three distinct phases, which are directly related to the corona crisis, each of which is marked by major shifts in the distribution of global wealth.

1. The financial crisis initiated on February 20th, was conducive to a dramatic redistribution of money wealth and ownership of financial assets. Foreknowledge, inside information and speculative trade played a key role. Was there foreknowledge and/or inside information of WHO’s Dr. Tedros February 20th Statement? (see Chapter IV)
2. The March 11 lockdown and closing down of the national economies of 190 UN member states, which triggered corporate as well as SME bankruptcies Worldwide. The March 11 event was also marked by the plunge of stock markets worldwide, starting on Black Thursday March 12, 2020. (See Chapter IV)
3. The third stage of billionaire enrichment pertains to the implementation of the
so-called “Second Wave” lockdown which consisted in triggering a renewed wave of bankruptcies.

The redistribution of wealth in favor of the billionaire class is confirmed by an IPS study pertaining to the closing down of the global economy.

At the global level, billionaires were big winners during the Covid-19 pandemic.

According to a UBS 2020 Report, the roughly 2,189 global billionaires have an estimated wealth of $10.2 trillion.

This is an estimated increase of $1.5 trillion during the 2020 pandemic based on both UBS and Forbes billionaire data from 2019.

The UBS report raises the question: are the billionaires “innovators” or “disruptors”?

When the storm passes, a new generation of billionaire innovators looks set to play a critical role in repairing the damage. Using the growing repertoire of emerging technologies, tomorrow’s innovators will digitize, refresh and revolutionize the economy.

Let us be under no illusions these corrupt billionaires are “impoverishers”.

“Financial Weapons of Mass Destruction” (FWMD)

While the UBS and Forbes report (quoted above) fail to explain how the Covid-19 pandemic contributed to this massive redistribution of wealth, they nonetheless confirm that: “collective billionaire wealth has grown at its fastest rate over any period over the past decade.”

In fact it is the largest redistribution of global wealth in World history. It is predicated on a systematic process of Worldwide impoverishment. It is an act of economic warfare.

The billionaires were not only the recipients of generous “government stimulus packages” (i.e. handouts), the bulk of their financial gains from the outset of the Covid fear campaign in early February 2020 was the result of insider trading, derivative trade and the manipulation of both financial and commodity markets.

Warren Buffett rightfully identifies these speculative instruments (supported by sophisticated algorithms) as “Financial Weapons of Mass Destruction”.
On March 18, 2020, U.S. billionaires had combined wealth of $2.947 trillion. By October 8th, 2020 their wealth had surged to $3.8 trillion. A monetary increase of $850 billion, a rise of their combined wealth of the order of more than 28 percent. (see IPS study)

This estimate does not account for the increase in wealth during the period preceding March 18, which was marked by a series of stock market crashes. (See Michel Chossudovsky, Economic Chaos and Societal Destruction, November 7, 2020)

And commencing in late 2020, the billionaire class is involved in sustaining a Second Wave Lockdown involving the partial closure of the World economy.

The table below identifies the increase in personal wealth of the five richest US billionaires (March 18- June 17, 2020). (Not outlined in the Table is the wealth of US billionaires which increased by another $266 billion from June to October 2020).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>March 18 Net Worth ($ Billions)</th>
<th>June 17 Real Time Worth ($ Billions)</th>
<th>Wealth Growth in 3 Months ($ Billions)</th>
<th>% Growth in 3 Months</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Bezos</td>
<td>$113.0</td>
<td>$156,751</td>
<td>$43,751</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>Amazon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Gates</td>
<td>$98.0</td>
<td>$109,472</td>
<td>$11,472</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Zuckerberg</td>
<td>$54.7</td>
<td>$86,766</td>
<td>$32,066</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Buffett</td>
<td>$67.5</td>
<td>$71,929</td>
<td>$4,429</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>Berkshire Hathaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Ellison</td>
<td>$59.0</td>
<td>$69,003</td>
<td>$10,003</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>Oracle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$392.2</td>
<td>$493,921</td>
<td>$101,721</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL OTHERS</td>
<td>$2,555.3</td>
<td>$3,037,459</td>
<td>$482,159</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$2,947.5</td>
<td>$3,531,379</td>
<td>$583,879</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPS

Billionaire Wealth Growth (March 2020 – March 2021) Resulting From the Implementation of the March 2020 Lockdown

Chuck Collins (in an incisive study published by Inequality.org) estimates billionaire wealth growth over a full year, based on Forbes data compiled in this report by ATF and IPS).

March 18 is used as the unofficial beginning of the crisis because by then most federal
and state economic restrictions responding to the virus were in place. March 18 was also the date that Forbes picked to measure billionaire wealth for the 2020 edition of its annual billionaires’ report, which provided a baseline that ATF and IPS compare periodically with real-time data from the Forbes website. PolitiFact has favorably reviewed this methodology.
### TABLE 2
**U.S. BILLIONAIRES WITH THE GREATEST PERCENT OF WEALTH GROWTH IN ONE YEAR**
March 10, 2020 - March 10, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soni Kim</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$7.7</td>
<td>$6.7</td>
<td>673.0%</td>
<td>online retailing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Gilbert</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
<td>$48.2</td>
<td>$41.7</td>
<td>641.5%</td>
<td>Quicken Loans</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Garcia, II</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
<td>$19.0</td>
<td>$16.6</td>
<td>666.7%</td>
<td>used cars</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elon Musk</td>
<td>$24.8</td>
<td>$192.1</td>
<td>$167.3</td>
<td>658.3%</td>
<td>Tesla, SpaceX,</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Armstrong</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
<td>850.0%</td>
<td>cryptocurrency</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby Murphy</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>$12.0</td>
<td>$10.1</td>
<td>531.9%</td>
<td>Snapchat</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Spiegel</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>$11.2</td>
<td>$9.3</td>
<td>489.5%</td>
<td>Snapchat</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Dorsey</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
<td>$12.9</td>
<td>$10.3</td>
<td>396.2%</td>
<td>Twitter, Square</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Wood</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>$5.3</td>
<td>333.3%</td>
<td>Roku</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Green</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>300.0%</td>
<td>digital advertising</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$445.5</td>
<td>$2,857.5</td>
<td>$2,412.0</td>
<td>548.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL OTHERS</strong></td>
<td>$2,903.0</td>
<td>$3,976.6</td>
<td>$1,073.6</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$3,947.5</td>
<td>$4,263.5</td>
<td>$3,116.0</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3
**ONE-YEAR U.S. BILLIONAIRE WEALTH GROWTH BY INDUSTRY**
March 10, 2020 - March 10, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Net Worth Mar. 10, 2020 ($ Billions)</th>
<th>Net Worth Mar. 10, 2021 ($ Billions)</th>
<th>1 Year Wealth Growth ($ Billions)</th>
<th>1 Year % Wealth Growth</th>
<th>Number of Billionaires Per Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$833</td>
<td>$1,397</td>
<td>$564</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Investments</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>$943</td>
<td>$226</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$227</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td>312.6%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion &amp; Retail</td>
<td>$303</td>
<td>$403</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media &amp; Entertainment</td>
<td>$191</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>$218</td>
<td>$271</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified</td>
<td>$104</td>
<td>$136</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>$107</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>$142</td>
<td>$167</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling &amp; Casinos</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$(25)</td>
<td>-48.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,947.5</td>
<td>$4,263.5</td>
<td>$1,316.0</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Forbes data analyzed by Americans for Tax Fairness and Institute for Policy Studies, March 10, 2021
Personal Enrichment of Big Pharma CEOs

The Forbes Report underscores the enrichment of the CEO’s of both Western and Chinese Big Pharma conglomerates involved in the Covid vaccine as well as in the lucrative sale (Worldwide) of face masks and medical supplies.

These include Moderna CEO Stéphane Bancel and BioNTech cofounder Uğur Şahin.

China’s Big Pharma is a full-fledged partner in this process of enrichment. The CEOs of several China based pharmaceutical companies include Tianjin’s CanSino Biologics, Inco, Shenzhen’s Contec Medical Systems, Sansure Biotech, which makes Covid-19 tests, as well as China’s vaccine conglomerate Sinovac..

Among China’s Big Pharma multibillionaires is Li Jianquan, president of Chinese medical products manufacturer Winner Medical. Several of the products related to the Covid pandemic, including the face mask are produced by Winner Medical.

Li Jianquan’s has net worth of 6.8 billion. (For details see Forbes Report).

For the complete list of billionaires in 2020-2021, consult the Forbes list

Billionaire Wealth is Not the Result of Economic Growth

This Enrichment of a social minority is not based on the creation of “New Wealth” resulting from real economic growth. Quite the opposite. It is the result of an engineered global economic depression.

The process of billionaire enrichment feeds on economic and social chaos. It relies heavily on the “fear campaign” and the Worldwide destabilization of both financial markets and the real economy.

It has been instrumental in triggering an unprecedented process of redistribution of income and wealth. Large sectors of the World population have been driven into extreme poverty.

Billionaire enrichment involves the acquisition of economic and financial assets at rock bottom prices, the takeover of bankrupt enterprises in major sectors of economic activity, the manipulation of markets (bonds, equities, commodities, currency markets, etc.) including the use of speculative instruments, derivative trade, involving “foreknowledge” and “inside information”. (See Chapter IV)

The US Public Debt Goes Fly High

The enrichment of the billionaire class has also contributed to the destabilization of the State.

The private appropriation of wealth has precipitated a global debt crisis. In country after country the public debt has skyrocketed.

In the US the federal budget deficit hit an all-time high of $3.1 trillion in the 2020 budget year (September), more than three times the size of the 2019 budget year deficit of $984 billion.
It was the US government’s largest annual shortfall in dollar terms, surpassing the previous record of $1.4 trillion set in 2009. ... The 2020 deficit, in terms of its relationship to the economy, represented 15.2 percent of total gross domestic product (GDP), the sum of all the goods and services produced by the country. That was the highest level since 1945, when the US was borrowing heavily to finance World War II. (Al Jazeera)

The Trump administration’s 2020 budget year was marked by a 47.3 percent surge in spending to $6.55 trillion, largely used to finance corporate bailouts and handouts as well as the multibillion dollar social safety nets resulting from the Covid financial crash in February and in the March 2020 lockdown, which was conducive to the partial closure of the US economy.

In early 2021, the Biden administration initiated an unprecedented expansion in the US public debt with a view to funding the handouts to the financial establishment, the military, intelligence and national security apparatus as well as Big Pharma.

These generous handouts and social safety nets are there to enforce compliance and acceptance of Covid policies. They are eventually slated to be abolished and replaced by the most drastic austerity measures in US history.

“The Second Wave”. Another Lockdown

The Second Wave is a Lie. It is presented to public opinion as a means to combating the virus and saving lives.

That is what the governments are telling us. The fear campaign has gone into high gear, applied simultaneously in different regions of the world.

Test, Test, the objective of which is to push up the numbers of so-called positive cases.

If you live alone in the UK, you can set up a “Support Bubble (see image)

Needless to say: at the outset of this Second Wave, the global economy is already in a state of chaos. While the reports fail to reveal the depth and seriousness of this global crisis, the evidence (which is still tentative and incomplete) speaks for itself.

The rationale of the Second and Third Waves is to prevent and postpone the complete reopening of the national economy, coupled with the enforcement of social distancing, the wearing of the face mask, etc.
The intent is to trigger a second wave and third wave of bankruptcies.

The targets are the service economy, the airlines, the tourist industry, etc. Maintaining strict restrictions on air travel is tantamount to spearheading major airlines into bankruptcy. It is also an impediment to international business transactions including commodity trade and investment.

The Second and Third Waves are intent upon enabling the billionaires to “pick up the pieces”, acquiring ownership of entire sectors of economic activity at rockbottom prices.

The money they appropriated in the course of the financial crisis (through outright manipulation) will be used to buy out bankrupt corporations as well as bankrupt governments.

The financial establishment has instructed governments to implement what is tantamount to a second bankruptcy program using as a pretext and a justification that the number of Covid positive cases has increased.

The second and third waves extending into Summer of 2021 are conducive to a further process of appropriation and concentration of wealth.

Concurrently, there is a tendency towards totalitarian forms of government.

At the outset of the Second Wave, the process of postponing the reopening of the global economy has indelibly contributed to wiping out (regional and local) small and medium sized enterprises worldwide, while also precipitating the bankruptcy of entire sectors of the World economy including airlines, hotel chains and the tourist industry.

This in turn will lead to the appropriation of real assets by powerful financial interests. This appropriation of real assets by the Super-Rich is ongoing.

The Global Travel and Tourism Economy

Prior to the corona crisis, travel and tourism represented a major share of the global economy: approximately 10 percent of Global GDP with an estimated workforce of more than 320 million jobs worldwide.

Travel and tourism which includes airlines, airport facilities, land transportation, hotels, see resorts, restaurants, museums, concert halls, parks, and a variety of urban services has been precipitated into process of global bankruptcy resulting in mass unemployment.

The economic and social impacts are devastating particularly in countries which have a
sizeable tourist economy (e.g. Italy, France, Switzerland, Thailand, Vietnam, Mexico, Cuba, The Dominican Republic, Peru, Panama, among others).

The estimated loss of jobs in the tourism industry is estimated to be of the order of 100 million Worldwide (November 2020 report, see also IMF report, pdf).

Job Losses in the US

According to the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) a “staggering 9.2 million jobs could be lost in the U.S ... if barriers to global travel remain in place”. The WTTC estimates that more than half of all jobs supported by the sector in the U.S. in 2019 are slated to be lost, Between 10.8 million and 13.8 million jobs within the Travel and Tourism sector “are at serious risk”.

The Airlines

While most of the bankruptcies triggered by the lockdown are smaller regional airlines, a large number of national flag carriers have also been precipitated into a de facto bankruptcy situation, including Aero-Mexico, Avianca, South African Airlines among others. According to a report: “43 commercial airlines have failed since January 2020,... completely ceasing or suspended operations”. There is also a backlash on the production of civilian aircraft.

The plight of Travel and Tourism was triggered by the lockdown decisions as well as restrictions on air travel.

Trump’s suspension of air travel to China on January 31st, 2020 based of 5 confirmed Covid-19 positive cases in the U.S. played a key role in setting the stage of the Air Travel and Tourism crisis.

The lockdown has also undermined the largest transport infrastructure project in Europe, namely the underground tunnel between the UK and continental Europe. The Eurostar is currently in a situation of de facto bankruptcy.

All of these disruptions in international travel are presented to public opinion as a means to combating the killer virus. It’s a big lie.

Bankrupt hotel chains and major airlines in all likelihood will be “picked up” at rock bottom prices by the multibillionaires.

Bankruptcy and the Demise of the Family Farm

The ongoing demise of the family owned agriculture has been exacerbated by the lockdown policies.

Bill Gates is using the money appropriated during the financial crisis to extend his corporate control in a variety of economic activities, “buying devalued assets at fire-sale prices” including the acquisition of farmland (See F William Engdahl on Neo-feudalism).

According to The Land Report, (February 2021), Bill and Melinda Gates are now America’s largest farm owners to the detriment of family farming, which over the years has been driven into bankruptcy.
The Gates portfolio consists of “242,000 acres of American farmland and nearly 27,000 acres of other land” across Louisiana, Arkansas, Nebraska, Arizona, Florida, Washington and 18 other states.” (See the analysis by F. William Engdahl)

See the map below indicating a total of 268,984 acres accruing to the Gates. This is tantamount in the de facto expropriation of thousands of family farms over a vast area of the United States.

This process spearheaded by mounting debts and bankruptcies commenced prior to the pandemic and will in all likelihood continue under the so-called “New Normal”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bill &amp; Melinda Gates</td>
<td>242,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Offutt Family</td>
<td>190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stewart &amp; Lynda Rasnick</td>
<td>190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fanjul Family</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Boswell Family</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: 2020 LAND REPORT 100
Concluding Remarks

The fear campaign has once again gone into high gear.

Official statistics based on faulty and manipulated estimates of so-called “confirmed” Covid positive cases constitute the basis for justifying these diabolical lockdown measures which have been conducive to the concentration of global wealth coupled with the impoverishment of vast sectors of the World population.

“V the virus” is presented as the Threat. But the Virus has no direct impact on key economic variables.

What is at stake is unprecedented: It’s a complex decision-making process. It’s a global neoliberal agenda carried out by corrupt governments on behalf of the multibillionaires and the financial establishment. (For further details see Chapter X)

Common sense tells us that the closure of the global economy destroys people’s lives.

Disrupting the fear campaign as well as media disinformation constitutes the first step towards reversing the tide.
Chapter VI

The Impacts on Mental Health

“There has been another cost that we’ve seen, particularly in high schools. We’re seeing, sadly, far greater suicides now than there are deaths from COVID. We’re seeing far greater deaths from drug overdose,” (Dr. Robert Redfield, former director of the CDC, July 14, 2020).

* 

The corona virus mental health predicament of several million people Worldwide is the result of

- social engineering including confinement, isolation, social distancing and the mask,
- the incessant 24/7 fear campaign waged by the media and the governments,
- the spike in unemployment, mass poverty and despair triggered by the Worldwide destabilization of national economies.

Psychiatrists have addressed the “negative impacts” on mental health pertaining to the factors mentioned above. Confirmed by peer reviewed reports, the lockdowns have also been conducive to triggering depression, uncertainty, and anxiety.

“There is concern the Coronavirus Disease (COVID)-19 pandemic is having a negative impact on the mental health of the general population through a range of suggested mechanisms: fear, uncertainty, and anxiety; social distancing/isolation; loneliness; and economic repercussions”

The overall picture of the impacts of the corona crisis on mental health is yet to be fully addressed. Our analysis will focus on the following issues for which data is available:

1. the dramatic increase in suicides Worldwide in countries where the lockdown was imposed,
2. the increase in mortality attributable to drug overdose (cocaine, opioids),
3. the rise in alcoholism resulting from a hike in alcohol consumption.

Worldwide Rise in Suicides

The frequency of suicides has increased in numerous countries. The complete data and tendencies remain to be firmly established. US data on suicides in 2020 (CDC) are not yet available. In 2019, suicides were the 10th leading cause of death in the US, 47,511 Americans died by suicide. In 2019, there were an estimated 1.38M suicide attempts. (See AFSP statistics). A word of caution. Official statistics on suicide as a cause of death are unreliable.
Suicides in the US

A CDC sponsored peer reviewed report (Mark É. Czeisler, Rashon I. Lane, Emiko Petrosky, et al) suggests that the loss of employment and purchasing power by “vulnerable” social and low income groups often triggers a wave of depression and anxiety, which results in “suicide ideation” (thinking about different ways to die). The authors confirm that:

Symptoms of anxiety disorder and depressive disorder increased considerably in the United States during April-June of 2020 [in the immediate aftermath of the mid March 2020 lockdown], compared with the same period in 2019 (1,2). ....

The percentage of respondents who reported having seriously considered suicide in the 30 days before completing the survey (10.7%) was significantly higher among respondents aged 18-24 years (25.5%), minority racial/ethnic groups (Hispanic respondents [18.6%], non-Hispanic black [black] respondents [15.1%]), self-reported unpaid caregivers for adults (30.7%), and essential workers (21.7%).

Another study confirms that: Social distancing/isolation and loneliness* resulting from the lockdown policies are factors which may contribute to suicide:

“Secondary consequences of social distancing may increase the risk of suicide,” researchers noted in an April 10 paper published by the American Medical Association. “It is important to consider changes in a variety of economic, psycho-social, and health-associated risk factors.” (See FEE)

Essentially, researchers warned, forced isolation could prove to be “a perfect storm” for suicide. (emphasis added)

The central issue—which is not always addressed by the peer reviewed reports— is how the engineered loss of employment and purchasing power coupled with confinement leads to depression and despair.
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Anxiety and depression resulting from unemployment and loss of income is a Worldwide phenomenon, unprecedented in World history. Country by country, one can observe similar tendencies. Low income developing countries such as India are experiencing a situation of total despair affecting large sectors of an impoverished population.

Suicides in India

The lockdown in India has been conducive to a spike in suicides which is a consequence of:
“severe hardship ... as entire livelihoods have come undone, amid an escalating job crisis”.

“It should come as little surprise then that the spectre of suicide has raised its ugly head, with spikes in reports of people, who see no change in fortune on the horizon, taking their own lives.”

The Brookings Institute has also addressed the role of the corona crisis in triggering suicides in India:

Anecdotal evidence for India, meanwhile, suggests increases in rural suicides. India instituted one of the world’s strictest lockdowns amidst high rates of poverty. ... Lockdowns resulted in millions of more Indians entering poverty and exacerbated one of the highest suicide rates in the world. The additional numbers of suicides are estimated to be well into the thousands.

Suicides in Japan

Within a different context, the developed high income countries are also experiencing an unprecedented rise in suicides. In Japan, a significant increase in the number of suicides was recorded in the wake of the lockdown:

“Far more Japanese people are dying of suicide, likely exacerbated by the economic and social repercussions of the pandemic, than of the COVID-19 disease itself. ... Provisional statistics from the National Police Agency show suicides surged to 2,153 in October alone, marking the fourth straight month of increase.”

The above report confirms that suicides among women in Japan increased dramatically: in October 2020 (compared to October of the previous year) female suicides had increased by 83% (in comparison to male suicides which increased by 22% over the same time period).

Deaths Resulting from Drug Overdose

The main drug opioid categories (CDC) are as follows:

- illegal heroin,
- synthetic opioids such as fentanyl,
- so-called “pain relievers” including oxycodone (OxyContinÂ®), hydrocodone (VicodinÂ®),
- codeine,
- morphine,
- etc.

The drugs listed above are “chemically related and interact with opioid receptors on nerve cells in the body and brain” (CDC).

Recorded in 2020, the corona crisis has contributed to a significant increase in both opioid and cocaine sales. According to the CDC:
Synthetic opioids ([categorized by the CDC as] primarily illicitly manufactured fentanyl) appear to be the primary driver of the increases in overdose deaths, increasing 38.4 percent from the 12-month period leading up to June 2019 compared with the 12-month period leading up to May 2020. …

Overdose deaths involving cocaine also increased by 26.5 percent. … Overdose deaths involving psychostimulants, such as methamphetamine [produced by GSM], increased by 34.8 percent. The number of deaths involving psychostimulants now exceeds the number of cocaine-involved deaths. (CDC December 2020 Report) (emphasis added)

The US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported in December 2020 “that the pandemic may have contributed to “a rise in deadly drug overdoses”. While the data is incomplete, the CDC report confirms a sizeable increase in the number of deaths attributable to drug overdose (related to consumption of cocaine and opioids):

Drug overdoses were linked to more than 81,000 people’s deaths between June 2019 and May 2020, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, jumping 18 percent compared to the previous 12-month period. Such deaths rose 20 percent or more in 25 states and the District of Columbia, the report said. (PBS report)

The CDC graph based on both the predicted as well reported values (ie. numbers) of deaths attributed to drug overdoses reveals the that the monthly count started to accelerate in February 2020.

In April, 2020, 2,146 people died of opioid overdose, followed by 3,388 deaths in May, 2020 marking the largest monthly increases since 2015 when the federal government began collecting this data. (quoted in PBS report)

The following graph indicates the US monthly data. In the months prior to the corona crisis (July 2019 to January 2020), the monthly drug overdose death count was substantially below 1000.

The hike starts in February (coinciding with the financial crash). Following the mid-March lock down, drug overdose deaths go fly high.
In May 2020 the overdose death count was in excess of 3000, i.e. a more than three fold increase in relation to the drug overdose deaths recorded prior to the corona crisis. In the US, the recorded monthly drug overdose deaths in 2020 have more than tripled.

![Graph based on CDC data quoted above, Source PBS](image)

Based on data published in May 2021 by the CDC, the increase in deaths attributable to drug overdose increased by 18,228 from February 2020 to October 2020 (inclusive) over a nine month period.

Opioid Related Deaths in Ontario

The tendency in Canada is consistent with that observed in the US. A dramatic increase in opioid related deaths was recorded in Ontario following the March 17, 2020 lockdown emergency which was coupled with mass unemployment following the closing down of economic activity:

The number of opioid-related deaths increased quickly in the weeks following the state of emergency declaration in Ontario on March 17, 2020. Overall, there was a 38.2% increase in opioid-related deaths in the first 15 weeks of the COVID-19 pandemic (695 deaths; average of 46 deaths weekly) compared to the 15 weeks immediately prior (503 deaths; average of 34 deaths weekly).
The following graph provides a clearcut picture of the dramatic rise in opioid overdose emergency visits in Ottawa starting from January 2020 through December 2020.
The Production and Trade in Opioids

According to UN sources, Afghanistan currently produces 94% percent of the World’s opium supply, which is transformed into heroin, morphine as well pharmaceutical opioids. The heroin trade is protected. US military presence in Afghanistan plays a key role. It’s a multibillion dollar operation involving both the Drug Cartels (illegal heroin) and (indirectly) Big Pharma which is involved in the sale and distribution of pharmaceutical opioids.

Several Big Pharma’s companies involved in the marketing of the Covid-19 vaccine including Pfizer, and Johnson and Johnson are also involved in the highly profitable and (legal) sale of pharmaceutical opioids, which in the course of the corona crisis (2020-2021) have become one of the main sources of drug overdose.

Corrupt Big Pharma Companies

Local communities across America took a stance against the Pharma Giants in regards to opioids. In 2019-20, a multibillion dollar opioid settlement was reached with Purdue Pharma on behalf of thousands of US cities and counties.

“In October [2020], Oxycontin-maker Purdue admitted to enabling the supply of drugs “without legitimate medical purpose”, paying doctors and others illegal kickbacks to prescribe the drugs, among other claims. It agreed to pay $8.3bn.” (BBC, February 4, 2021)

At the height of the corona crisis (November 2020):

“Four major Big Pharma distributors (Johnson & Johnson, McKesson, Cardinal Health, Amerisource Bergen) involved in the production (J & J) and distribution of prescription opioids “reached a tentative $26 billion settlement with counties and cities that sued
them for damages”.

The settlement was referred to as the “Opioid Epidemic”. What relationship to the corona crisis? In a bitter irony, Johnson and Johnson which has been the object of prescription opioids class action law suit is also a major distributor of the Covid-19 vaccine.

These same Big Pharma distributors benefited from the spike in the sales of opioids resulting from the lockdown, which in turn contributed to a significant increase in drug overdose deaths in the course of 2020-2021. (see graph above)

In a bitter irony, the spike in drug overdose has led to increased profits for Big Pharma”.

While Big Pharma is the object of a multibillion dollar civil lawsuit on the fraudulent distribution of prescription opioids, several of these corrupt companies are now entangled in promoting the Covid-19 vaccine initiative. According to Bloomberg, “more than 400,000 Americans have died over the last two decades from [drug] overdose”.

And now, since the onslaught of the corona crisis in February 2020, monthly deaths resulting from drug overdose have more than tripled (see graph above).

Alcoholism

Drug abuse and alcoholism are often related.

“Drug and alcohol abuse have increased with COVID, and so has suicide. Help hotlines are flooded and certain statistics — online alcohol sales increased in the U.S. by over 200% — paint a dark picture.”

“And addiction is skyrocketing. says addiction therapist Cindi Brand, who worked formerly with CAMH.

The pandemic has increased all forms of anxiety and stress even ... Social distancing means people with addiction issues “can’t possibly get the help they need right now,” she says. (emphasis added).

Increase in Sales of Alcohol

An upward trend in alcoholism during the corona crisis in the US is confirmed by a significant increase in the sale of alcohol. According to a Nielsen study, the stay at home orders in March 2020 resulted in “a 54% increase in national sales of alcohol for the week ending March 21, 2020, compared with 1 year before; online sales increased 262% from 2019.”

A RAND corporation sample survey study conducted with the support of the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) consisted in comparing adults’ drinking habits in 2019 with those prevailing during the corona crisis (2020):

“American adults have sharply increased their consumption of alcohol during the shutdown triggered by the coronavirus pandemic, with women increasing their heavy
drinking episodes (four or more drinks within a couple of hours) by 41%” (RAND Corporation study)

A national survey found that the overall frequency of alcohol consumption increased by 14% among adults over age 30, compared to the same time last year. The increase was 19% among all adults aged 30 to 59, 17% among women, and 10% among for non-Hispanic white adults. (Rand Corporation)

While the Rand Corporation study on drinking habits reveals an increase in the consumption of alcohol, the results must interpreted with caution. The recorded increase in the actual sale of alcohol (54%) was significantly higher than the estimated increase in drinking, based on the Rand sample survey. Concurrently, however, under the lockdown, consumption of alcohol has largely been taking place in homes, rather than in (closed) bars and restaurants.

According to Michael Pollard, lead author of the study at RAND: “People’s depression increases, anxiety increases, [and] alcohol use is often a way to cope with these feelings.”

Chapter VII

“There is No Cure”

Suppression of Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ), A Cheap and Effective Drug

There is an ongoing battle to suppress Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ), a cheap and effective drug for the treatment of Covid-19. The campaign against HCQ is carried out through slanderous political statements, media smears, not to mention an authoritative peer reviewed “evaluation” published on May 22nd by The Lancet, which was based on fake figures and test trials.

The study was allegedly based on data analysis of 96,032 patients hospitalized with COVID-19 between Dec 20, 2019, and April 14, 2020 from 671 hospitals Worldwide. The database had been fabricated. The objective was to kill the Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) cure on behalf of Big Pharma.

While The Lancet article was retracted, the media casually blamed “a tiny US based company” named Surgisphere whose employees included “a sci-fi writer and adult content model” for spreading “flawed data” (Guardian). This Chicago based outfit was accused of having misled both the WHO and national governments, inciting them to ban HCQ. None of those trial tests actually took place.
While the blame was placed on Surgisphere, the unspoken truth (which neither the scientific community nor the media have acknowledged) is that the study was coordinated by Harvard professor Mandeep Mehra under the auspices of Brigham and Women’s Hospital (BWH) which is a partner of the Harvard Medical School.

When the scam was revealed, Dr. Mandeep Mehra who holds the Harvey Distinguished Chair of Medicine at Brigham and Women’s Hospital apologized:

I have always performed my research in accordance with the highest ethical and professional guidelines. However, we can never forget the responsibility we have as researchers to scrupulously ensure that we rely on data sources that adhere to our high standards.

It is now clear to me that in my hope to contribute this research during a time of great need, I did not do enough to ensure that the data source was appropriate for this use. For that, and for all the disruptions – both directly and indirectly – I am truly sorry. (emphasis added)

Mandeep R. Mehra, MD, MSC (official statement on BWH website)

But that “truly sorry” note was just the tip of the iceberg. Why?

The Studies respectively on Gilead Science’s Remdesivir and on Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) Were Conducted Simultaneously by Brigham and Women’s Hospital (BWH)

While *The Lancet* report (May 22, 2020) coordinated by Dr. Mandeep Mehra was intended “to kill” the legitimacy of HCQ as a cure of Covid-19, another important (related) study was being carried out (concurrently) at BWH pertaining to Remdesivir on behalf of Gilead
Dr. Francisco Marty, a specialist in Infectious Disease and Associate Professor at Harvard Medical School was entrusted with coordination of the clinical trial tests of the antiviral medication Remdesivir under Brigham’s contract with Gilead Sciences Inc:

Brigham and Women’s Hospital began enrolling patients in two clinical trials for Gilead’s antiviral medication remdesivir. The Brigham is one of multiple clinical trial sites for a Gilead-initiated study of the drug in 600 participants with moderate coronavirus disease (COVID-19) and a Gilead-initiated study of 400 participants with severe COVID-19.

... If the results are promising, this could lead to FDA approval, and if they aren’t, it gives us critical information in the fight against COVID-19 and allows us to move on to other therapies.”

While Dr. Mandeep Mehra was not directly involved in the Gilead Remdesivir BWH study under the supervision of his colleague Dr. Francisco Marty, he nonetheless had contacts with Gilead Sciences Inc: “He participated in a conference sponsored by Gilead in early April 2020 as part of the Covid-19 debate” (France Soir, May 23, 2020) URL

What was the intent of his (failed) study? To undermine the legitimacy of Hydroxychloroquine?

According to France Soir, in a report published after The Lancet Retraction:

The often evasive answers produced by Dr Mandeep R. Mehra, ... professor at Harvard Medical School, did not produce confidence, fueling doubt instead about the integrity of this retrospective study and its results. (France Soir, June 5, 2020) URL

Was Dr. Mandeep Mehra in conflict of interest? (That is a matter for BWH and the Harvard Medical School to decide upon).

Who are the Main Actors?

Dr. Anthony Fauci, advisor to Donald Trump, portrayed as “America’s top infectious disease expert” has played a key role in smearing the HCQ cure which had been approved years earlier by the CDC as well as providing legitimacy to Gilead’s Remdesivir.

Dr. Fauci has been the head of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) since the Reagan administration. He is known to act as a mouthpiece for Big Pharma.

Dr. Fauci launched Remdesivir in late June (see details below). According to Fauci, Remdesivir is the “corona wonder drug” developed by Gilead Science Inc. It’s a $1.6 billion dollar bonanza.

Gilead Sciences Inc: History

Gilead Sciences Inc is a Multibillion dollar bio-pharmaceutical company which is now
involved in developing and marketing Remdesivir. Gilead has a long history. It has the backing of major investment conglomerates including the Vanguard Group and Capital Research & Management Co, among others. It has developed ties with the US Government. In 1999 Gilead Sciences Inc, developed Tamiflu (used as a treatment of seasonal influenza and bird flu). At the time, Gilead Sciences Inc was headed by Donald Rumsfeld (1997-2001), who later joined the George W. Bush administration as Secretary of Defense (2001-2006). Rumsfeld was responsible for coordinating the illegal and criminal wars on Afghanistan (2001) and Iraq (2003).

Rumsfeld maintained his links to Gilead Sciences Inc throughout his tenure as Secretary of Defense (2001-2006). According to CNN Money (2005): “The prospect of a bird flu outbreak ... was very good news for Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld [who still owned Gilead stocks] and other politically connected investors in Gilead Sciences”.

Anthony Fauci has been in charge of the NIAID since 1984, using his position as “a go between” the US government and Big Pharma. During Rumsfeld’s tenure as Secretary of Defense, the budget allocated to bio-terrorism increased substantially, involving contracts with Big Pharma including Gilead Sciences Inc. Anthony Fauci considered that the money allocated to bio-terrorism in early 2002 would:

“accelerate our understanding of the biology and pathogenesis of microbes that can be used in attacks, and the biology of the microbes’ hosts — human beings and their immune systems. One result should be more effective vaccines with less toxicity.” (Washington Post report)

In 2008, Dr. Anthony Fauci was granted the Presidential Medal of Freedom by president George W. Bush “for his determined and aggressive efforts to help others live longer and healthier lives.”
The 2020 Gilead Sciences Inc Remdesivir Project

We will be focussing on key documents (and events)

Chronology

February 21: Initial Release pertaining to NIH-NIAID Remdesivir placebo test trial

April 10: The Gilead Sciences Inc study published in the NEJM on the “Compassionate Use of Remdesivir”

April 29: NIH Release: Study on Remdesivir (Report published on May 22 in NEJM)

May 22, The BWH-Harvard Study on Hydroxychloroquine coordinated by Dr. Mandeep Mehra published in The Lancet

May 22, Remdesivir for the Treatment of Covid-19 — Preliminary Report, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, New England Journal of Medicine, (NEJM)

June 5: The (fake) Lancet Report (May 22) on HCQ is Retracted.

June 29, Fauci announcement. The $1.6 Billion Remdesivir HHS Agreement with Gilead Sciences Inc URL

April 10: The Gilead Sciences Inc. study published in the NEJM on the “Compassionate Use of Remdesivir”

A Gilead sponsored report was published in New England Journal of Medicine in an article entitled “Compassionate Use of Remdesivir for Patients with Severe Covid-19”. It was co-authored by an impressive list of 56 distinguished medical doctors and scientists, many of whom were recipients of consulting fees from Gilead Sciences Inc.
Gilead Sciences Inc. funded the study which included several staff members as co-authors.

**Compassionate Use of Remdesivir for Patients with Severe Covid-19**

Jonathan Green, M.D., Norio Ohmagari, M.D., Ph.D., Daniel Shin, M.D., George Díaz, M.D., Erika Asperges, M.D., Antonella Castagna, M.D., Torsten Feldt, M.D., Gary Green, M.D., Margaret L. Green, M.D., M.P.H., François-Xavier Lescluse, M.D., Ph.D., Emanuele Nicasiri, M.D., Reitano Oda, M.D., et al.

The testing included a total of 61 patients [who] received at least one dose of remdesivir on or before March 7, 2020; 8 of these patients were excluded because of missing postbaseline information (7 patients) and an erroneous remdesivir start date (1 patient) ... Of the 53 remaining patients included in this analysis, 40 (75%) received the full 10-day course of remdesivir, 10 (19%) received 5 to 9 days of treatment, and 3 (6%) fewer than 5 days of treatment.

The NEJM article states that “Gilead Sciences Inc began accepting requests from clinicians for compassionate use of remdesivir on January 25, 2020”. From whom, From Where? According to the WHO (January 30, 2020) there were 86 cases in 18 countries outside China of which 5 were in the US, 5 in France and 3 in Canada.

Several prominent physicians and scientists have cast doubt on the Compassionate Use of Remdesivir study conducted by Gilead, focussing on the small size of the trial. Ironically, the number of patients in the test is less that the number of co-authors: “53 patients” versus “56 co-authors”

Below we provide excerpts of scientific statements on the Gilead NEJM project (Science Media Centre emphasis added) published immediately following the release of the NEJM article:

“‘Compassionate use’ is better described as using an unlicensed therapy to treat a patient because there are no other treatments available. Research based on this kind of use should be treated with extreme caution because there is no control group or randomisation, which are some of the hallmarks of good practice in clinical trials. Prof Duncan Richard, Clinical Therapeutics, University of Oxford.

“It is critical not to over-interpret this study. Most importantly, it is impossible to know the outcome for this relatively small group of patients had they not received remdesivir. Dr Stephen Griffin, Associate Professor, School of Medicine, University of Leeds.

“The research is interesting but doesn’t prove anything at this point: the data are from a small and uncontrolled study. Simon Maxwell, Professor of Clinical Pharmacology and Prescribing, University of Edinburgh.

“The data from this paper are almost uninterpretable. It is very surprising, perhaps even unethical, that the New England Journal of Medicine has published it. It would be more appropriate to publish the data on the website of the pharmaceutical company that has sponsored and written up the study. At least Gilead have been clear that this has not been done in the way that a high quality scientific paper would be written. Prof Stephen Evans, Professor of Pharmacoepidemiology, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine.

“It’s very hard to draw useful conclusions from uncontrolled studies like this particularly with a new disease where we really don’t know what to expect and with
wide variations in outcomes between places and over time. One really has to question the ethics of failing to do randomisation – this study really represents more than anything else, a missed opportunity.” Prof Adam Finn, Professor of Paediatrics, University of Bristol.

To review the complete document of Science Media Centre pertaining to expert assessments click here

April 29: The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Study on Remdesivir.

On April 29th following the publication of the Gilead Sciences Inc Study in the NEJM on April 10, a press release of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) on Remdesivir was released. The full document was published on May 22, by the NEJM under the title:


The study had been initiated on February 21, 2020. The title of the April 29 Press Release was:

“Peer-reviewed data shows remdesivir for COVID-19 improves time to recovery”

It’s a government sponsored report which includes preliminary data from a randomized trial involving 1063 hospitalized patients. The results of the trial labelled Adaptive COVID-19 Treatment Trial (ACTT) are preliminary, conducted under the helm of Dr. Fauci’s National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID):

An independent data and safety monitoring board (DSMB) overseeing the trial met on April 27 to review data and shared their interim analysis with the study team. Based upon their review of the data, they noted that remdesivir was better than placebo from the perspective of the primary endpoint, time to recovery, a metric often used in influenza trials. Recovery in this study was defined as being well enough for hospital discharge or returning to normal activity level.

Preliminary results indicate that patients who received remdesivir had a 31% faster time to recovery than those who received placebo (p<0.001). Specifically, the median time to recovery was 11 days for patients treated with remdesivir compared with 15 days for those who received placebo. Results also suggested a survival benefit, with a mortality rate of 8.0% for the group receiving remdesivir versus 11.6% for the placebo group (p=0.059). (emphasis added)

In the NIH’s earlier February 21, 2020 report (released at the outset of the study), the methodology was described as follows:

... A randomized, controlled clinical trial to evaluate the safety and efficacy of the investigational antiviral remdesivir in hospitalized adults diagnosed with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) ...
repatriated after being quarantined on the Diamond Princess cruise ship” that docked in Yokohama (Japanese Territorial Waters). “Thirteen people repatriated by the U.S. State Department from the Diamond Princess cruise ship” were selected as patients for the placebo trial test.

Ironically, at the outset of the study, 58.7% of the “confirmed cases” Worldwide (542 cases out of 924) (outside China), were on the Diamond Cruise Princess from which the initial trial placebo patients were selected.

Where and When: The trial test in the 68 selected sites? That came at a later date because on February 19th (WHO data), the US had recorded only 15 positive cases (see Table Below).

“A total of 68 sites ultimately joined the study—47 in the United States and 21 in countries in Europe and Asia.” (emphasis added)

In the final May 22 NEJM report entitled Remdesivir for the Treatment of Covid-19 — Preliminary Report:

There were 60 trial sites and 13 subsites in the United States (45 sites), Denmark (8), the United Kingdom (5), Greece (4), Germany (3), Korea (2), Mexico (2), Spain (2), Japan (1), and Singapore (1). Eligible patients were randomly assigned in a 1:1 ratio to receive either remdesivir or placebo. Randomization was stratified by study site and disease severity at enrollment.

The Washington Post applauded Anthony Fauci’s announcement (April 29):

“The preliminary results, disclosed at the White House by Anthony S. Fauci, ... fall short of the magic bullet or cure... But with no approved treatments for Covid-19,[Lie] Fauci said, it will become the standard of care for hospitalized patients ...The data shows that remdesivir has a clear-cut, significant, positive effect in diminishing the time to recovery,” Fauci said.

Gilead’s remdesivir improves recovery time of coronavirus patients in NIH trial

April 29, 2020 at 7:50 am | Updated April 29, 2020 at 3:48 pm

By Laurie Mcginley and Christopher Rowland

The Washington Post

The government’s first rigorous clinical trial of the experimental drug remdesivir as a coronavirus treatment delivered mixed results to the medical community Wednesday — but rallied stock markets and raised hopes that an early weapon to help some patients was at hand.

The government’s first rigorous clinical trial of the experimental drug remdesivir as a coronavirus treatment delivered mixed results to the medical community Wednesday — but rallied stock markets and raised hopes that an early weapon to help some patients
was at hand.

The preliminary results, disclosed at the White House by Anthony Fauci, chief of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, which led the placebo-controlled trial found that the drug accelerated the recovery of hospitalized patients but had only a marginal benefit in the rate of death.

... Fauci’s remarks boosted speculation that the Food and Drug Administration would seek emergency use authorization that would permit doctors to prescribe the drug.

In addition to clinical trials, remdesivir has been given to more than 1,000 patients under compassionate use. [also refers to the Gilead study published on April 10 in the NEJM]

The study, involving [more than] 1,000 patients at 68 sites in the United States and around the world, offers the first evidence from a large, randomized clinical study of remdesivir’s effectiveness against COVID-19.

The NIH placebo test study provided “preliminary results”. While the placebo trial test was “randomized”, the overall selection of patients at the 68 sites was not fully randomized. See the full report.


It is worth noting that the full report of the NIH-NIAID) entitled Remdesivir for the Treatment of Covid-19 — Preliminary Report was released on May 22, 2020 in the NEJM, on the same day as the controversial Lancet report on Hydroxychloroquine.

Immediately following its publication, the media went into high gear, smearing the HCQ cure, while applauding the NIH-NIASD report released on the same day.

Remdesivir, the only drug cleared to treat Covid-19, sped the recovery time of patients with the disease, ... “It’s a very safe and effective drug,” said Eric Topol, founder and director of the Scripps Research Translational Institute. “We now have a definite first efficacious drug for Covid-19, which is a major step forward and will be built upon with other drugs, [and drug] combinations.”

When the Lancet HCQ article by Bingham-Harvard was retracted on June 5, it was too late, it received minimal media coverage. Despite the Retraction, the HCQ cure “had been killed”.

June 29: Fauci Greenlight. The $1.6 Billion Remdesivir Contract with Gilead Sciences Inc

Dr. Anthony Fauci granted the “Greenlight” to Gilead Sciences Inc. on June 29, 2020.

The semi-official US government NIH-NIAID sponsored report (May 22) entitled Remdesivir for the Treatment of Covid-19 — Preliminary Report (NEJM) was used to justify a major agreement with Gilead Sciences Inc. (A Final Report was Released on November 5, 2020)

The Report was largely funded by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) headed by Dr. Anthony Fauci and the National Institutes of Health (NIH).
On June 29, based on the findings of the NIH-NIAID Report published in the NEJM, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) announced on behalf of the Trump Administration an agreement to secure large supplies of the remdesivir drug from Gilead Sciences Inc. for the treatment of Covid-19 in America’s private hospitals and clinics.

The earlier Gilead study based on scanty test results published in the NEJM (April 10), of 53 cases (and 56 co-authors) was not highlighted. The results of this study had been questioned by several prominent physicians and scientists.

Who will be able to afford Remdesivir? 500,000 doses of Remdesivir are envisaged at $3,200 per patient, namely $1.6 billion (see the study by Elizabeth Woodworth).

The Drug was also approved for marketing in the European Union, under the brandname Veklury.

If this contract is implemented as planned, it represents for Gilead Science Inc. and the recipient US private hospitals and clinics a colossal amount of money.

**Gilead's COVID-19 Treatment Remdesivir Will Cost $3,120 for Typical U.S Patient With Private Insurance**

According to The Trump Administration’s HHS Secretary Alex Azar (June 29, 2020):

“To the extent possible, we want to ensure that any American patient who needs remdesivir can get it. [at $3200] The Trump Administration is doing everything in our power to learn more about life-saving therapeutics for COVID-19 and secure access to these options for the American people.”

**Remdesivir for Covid-19: $1.6 Billion for a “Modestly Beneficial” Drug?**

Remdesivir versus Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ)

Careful timing:

*The Lancet study* (published on May 22, 2020 and subsequently retracted) was intended to undermine the legitimacy of Hydroxychloroquine as an effective cure to Covid-19, with a view to sustaining the $1.6 billion agreement between the HHS and Gilead Sciences Inc. on June 29th. The legitimacy of this agreement rested on the May 22 NIH-NIAID study in the NEJM which was considered “preliminary”.

What Dr. Fauci failed to acknowledge is that Chloroquine had been “studied” and tested fifteen years ago by the CDC as a drug to be used against coronavirus infections. And that Hydroxychloroquine has been used in the course of 2020 in the treatment of Covid-19 in several countries.
According to the Virology Journal (2005) (See below) “Chloroquine is a potent inhibitor of SARS coronavirus infection and spread”. It was used in the SARS-1 outbreak in 2002. It had the endorsement of the CDC.

Chloroquine is a potent inhibitor of SARS coronavirus infection and spread


Virology Journal 2, Article number: 89 (2005) | Cite this article

279k Accesses | 243 Citations | 28322 Altmetric | Metrics

HCQ is not only effective, it is “inexpensive” when compared to Remdesivir, at an estimated “$3120 for a US Patient with private insurance”.

Concluding Remarks

The Gilead Sciences Inc. Remdesivir study (50+ authors) was published in the New England Journal of Medicine (April 10, 2020).

It was followed by the NIH-NIAID Remdesivir for the Treatment of Covid-19 — Preliminary Report on May 22, 2020 in the NEJM. And on that same day, May 22, the report on Hydroxychloroquine coordinated by BWH-Harvard Dr. Mehra was published by The Lancet (which was subsequently retracted).

Harvard Medical School and the BWH bear responsibility for having hosted and financed the Lancet report on HCQ coordinated by Dr. Mandeep Mehra.

Is there conflict of interest? BWH was simultaneously involved in a study on Remdesivir in a contract with Gilead Sciences, Inc.

While the Lancet report coordinated by Harvard’s Dr. Mehra was retracted, it nonetheless served the interests of Gilead Sciences Inc.

It is important that an independent scientific and medical assessment be undertaken, respectively of the Gilead Sciences Inc New England Journal of Medicine (NEMJ) peer reviewed study (April 10, 2020) as well as the NIH-NIAID study also published in the NEJM (May 22, 2020).
Chapter VIII

Big Pharma’s Covid “Vaccine”

Introduction

The Covid-19 vaccine is profit driven. The US government had already ordered 100 million doses back in July 2020 and the EU is to purchase 300 million doses. It’s Big Money for Big Pharma, generous payoffs to corrupt politicians, at the expense of tax payers.

The objective is ultimately to make money, by vaccinating the entire planet of 7.8 billion people for SARS-CoV-2.

The Covid vaccine in some cases envisages more than one shot. If this initiative goes ahead as planned, it would be the largest vaccine project in World history and the biggest money making operation for Big Pharma.

The Second Wave of the pandemic commenced in October 2020. The Pfizer Moderna corona vaccine was launched in early November 2020.

Worldwide, people are led to believe that the corona vaccine is a solution. And that “normality” will then be restored.

How is it that a vaccine for the SARS-CoV-2 virus, which under normal conditions would take years to develop, was promptly launched on the 9th of November 2020?

Moreover, the vaccine announced by Pfizer, Moderna Inc, AstraZeneka and Johnson and Johnson (J & J) is based on an experimental gene editing mRNA technology which has a bearing on the human genome. Coupled with the mRNA vaccine initiative is the development of a so-called digital passport which will be imposed on entire populations. (See analysis below).

And why do we need a vaccine for Covid-19 when the WHO, the US Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) as well as numerous scientists have confirmed unequivocally that Covid-19 is “similar to seasonal influenza”. (See our analysis in Chapter III).

The mRNA Vaccine is “Unapproved” and “Experimental”

Four major companies including Pfizer Inc, Moderna Inc, AstraZeneca and Johnson and Johnson (J & J) are currently involved (early 2021) in marketing the experimental mRNA vaccine with the relentless support of national governments.

Amply documented, barely reported by the media, numerous cases of deaths and injury have occurred.

The “Green Light” to market the experimental mRNA vaccine was granted back in December 2020, despite the fact that according to the FDA, the vaccine is an “unapproved product”.

The FDA in an ambiguous statement has provided a so-called Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) to the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine, namely “to permit the emergency use of the unapproved product, ... for active immunization...” (see below)
There is something fishy and “contradictory” in this statement. The experimental Pfizer mRNA vaccine is both “unapproved” and “permitted”.

I have checked this statement with a prominent lawyer. It is blatantly illegal to market an “unapproved product”.

In the US, the Pfizer-Moderna vaccine is categorized by the CDC as an “investigational drug”. “The emergency use” clause is there to justify the launching of what might be described as an “illegal drug”.

There is an ongoing fear campaign but there is no “Emergency” which justifies “Emergency Use”. Why?

1. Both the WHO and the CDC have confirmed that Covid-19 is “similar to seasonal influenza”, It is not a killer virus.
2. The PCR test used to estimate “confirmed positive cases” is flawed. Since March 2020, the Covid-19 “numbers” have been manipulated, hiked up.
3. The overall validity of the PCR test (and estimates) as applied since January 2020 has been questioned (January 2021) by the WHO. (See our analysis in Chapter III)

“Fraudulent Marketing” of an “Unapproved Product”

Flashback to 2009. In a historic US Department of Justice decision in September 2009, Pfizer Inc. pleaded guilty to criminal charges. It was “The Largest Health Care Fraud Settlement” in the History of the US Department of Justice:

American pharmaceutical giant Pfizer Inc. and its subsidiary Pharmacia & Upjohn Company Inc. … have agreed to pay $2.3 billion, the largest health care fraud settlement in the history of the Department of Justice, to resolve criminal and civil liability arising from the illegal promotion of certain pharmaceutical products, … ” (September 2, 2009)
Déjà Vu: Flash Forward to 2020-2021

How on Earth can you trust a Big Pharma vaccine conglomerate which pleaded guilty to criminal charges by the US Department of Justice including “fraudulent marketing” and “felony violation of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act”?

I should mention, however, that in 2009, Pfizer was so to speak “Put on Probation” by the US Department of Justice. It was obliged to enter into “a corporate integrity agreement” with the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). “That
agreement provided for “procedures and reviews to ... avoid and promptly detect” misconduct on the part of Pfizer, Inc.

Johnson and Johnson and “The Opioid Epidemic”

At the height of the corona crisis, barely covered by the media, coinciding with the launch of the Covid-19 vaccine in early November 2020, Johnson and Johnson (and its three distributors) (involved in the marketing of prescription opioids) “reached a tentative $26 billion settlement with counties and cities that sued them for damages”. The class action law suit was “the largest federal court case in American history” (For further details see Chapter VI pertaining to “The Impacts on Mental Health”)

Are these legal antecedents relevant to an understanding of Big Pharma’s vaccine initiative?

Johnson and Johnson is currently involved in the production and marketing of a Covid adenovirus viral vector vaccine which also entails genetic therapy. (The above J & J 26 billion dollar settlement is one among several law suits against J&J).

Human Guinea Pigs

In relation to the Covid Vaccine, “fraudulent marketing” is an understatement: The mRNA vaccine announced by Pfizer, Moderna Inc, Johnson and Johnson and AstraZeneka is an “unapproved drug” based on the “experimental” gene editing mRNA technology which has a bearing on the human genome.

Moreover, the standard animal lab tests using mice or ferrets were not conducted. Pfizer “went straight to human “guinea pigs.”

“Human tests began in late July and early August [2020]. Three months is unheard of for testing a new vaccine. Several years is the norm.” (F. William Engdahl, Global Research, November 2020)
This caricature by Large + JIPÊM explains our predicament:

Mouse No 1: “Are You Going to get Vaccinated”,

Mouse No. 2: Are You Crazy, They Haven’t finished the Tests on Humans”

Un grand merci aux caricaturistes Large et JIPÊM

Dr. Michael Yeadon, a former Vice President of Pfizer has taken a firm stance:

“All vaccines against the SARS-COV-2 virus are by definition novel. No candidate vaccine has been... in development for more than a few months.”:

“If any such vaccine is approved for use under any circumstances that are not EXPLICITLY experimental, I believe that recipients are being misled to a criminal extent.”

In early December, Dr Michael Yeadon together with Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg “filed an application with the EMA, the European Medicine Agency responsible for EU-wide drug approval, for the immediate suspension of all SARS CoV 2 vaccine studies, in particular the BioNtech/Pfizer study on BNT162b (EudraCT number 2020-002641-42).
History of the SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine Project

There are many contradictions. The analysis below addresses the earlier stages of the vaccine project as well as the role of the 201 Simulation under the auspices of the John Hopkins School of Medicine held in New York on October 19, 2019.

The Covid vaccine is a multibillion dollar Big Pharma operation which will contribute to increasing the public debt of more than 150 national governments.

Supported by the fear campaign, Money rather than Public Health is the driving force behind this initiative.

The GSK-Pfizer Partnership

Five months before the onset of the Covid-19 crisis, two of the largest Worldwide Pharma conglomerates decided to join hands in a strategic relationship. In August 2019, GSK confirmed the formation of a major partnership with Pfizer entitled the Consumer Health Joint Venture.

While the relationship is said to be limited to “trusted consumer health brands”, the agreement envisages joint financial procedures including joint multibillion dollar investment projects. While it does not constitute a merger, the GSK-Pfizer alliance implies selective integration and de facto collusion in many of the two companies’ activities including the vaccine market.

“The completion of the joint venture with Pfizer marks the beginning of the next phase of our transformation of GSK. This is an important moment for the Group, laying the foundation for two great companies, one in Pharmaceuticals and Vaccines and one in Consumer Health.” (GSK, August 1, 2019, emphasis added)

This GSK-Pfizer relationship also encompasses a network of partner pharmaceutical companies, research labs, virology institutes, military and biotech entities, etc. many of which are currently involved in the Covid vaccine initiative.

At present, a handful of multinational companies including GSK and Pfizer control 80% of the global vaccine market. Under the agreement between the two companies, GSK-Pfizer is slated to play a dominant and coordinated role in regards to the Covid-19 vaccine.

The October 2019 Coronavirus Event 201 Simulation Exercise

The coronavirus was initially named nCoV-19 by CEPI and the WHO: exactly the same name as that adopted in the WEF-Gates-John Hopkins Event 201 (2019-nCoV) pertaining to a coronavirus simulation exercise held in Baltimore in mid October 2019.

The Event 201 John Hopkins simulation addressed the development of an effective vaccine in response to millions of cases (in the October 2019 simulation) of the 2019 nCoV. The simulation announced a scenario in which the entire population of the planet would be affected: “During the initial months of the pandemic, the cumulative number of cases [in the simulation] increases exponentially, doubling every week. And as the cases and deaths accumulate, the economic and societal consequences become increasingly severe.”
The scenario ends at the 18-month point, with 65 million deaths. The pandemic is beginning to slow due to the decreasing number of susceptible people. The pandemic will continue at some rate until there is an effective vaccine or until 80-90% of the global population has been exposed. From that point on, it is likely to be an endemic childhood disease.

According to the WEF Video below, produced in relation to the 201 Simulation, “we ran a massive viral pandemic simulation..., 65 million deaths Worldwide.”.

See also the analysis of F. William Engdahl on the 201 Simulation

Video Produced by the World Economic Forum in association with the 201 John Hopkins Simulation

Ironically, on January 30th 2020, the WHO defined the new virus as 2019-nCoV, i.e. the same name as that used in the 201 simulation in October 2019.

Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV)

It was only later that Covid-19 was identified by the WHO not as a virus but as a disease: coronavirus disease (COVID-19), the Virus was identified as “severe acute respiratory syndrome” coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2)

Two weeks after the virus had been formally identified by the People’s Republic of China (Jan 7, 2020), a vaccine for the novel coronavirus was announced by CEPI at the Davos World Economic Forum, January 20-24, 2020.

The Central Role of the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI)

The lead entity for the novel coronavirus vaccine initiative is the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI) an organization sponsored and financed by the World Economic Forum (WEF) and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

Note the chronology: The development of the 2019 nCoV vaccine was announced at the Davos World Economic Forum (WEF) a week prior to the official launching by the WHO of a Worldwide Public Health Emergency (January 30) at a time when the number of “confirmed cases” Worldwide (outside China) was 83. (see Chapter II)

The pandemic was launched by the WHO on March 11. And five days later, barely covered by the media, the first tests involving human volunteers were conducted by Moderna in Seattle on March 16.

According to Richard Hatchett, CEO of the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI) the project to develop a vaccine commenced not only prior to the discovery and identification of the coronavirus (January 7, 2020) but several months prior to the October 2019 simulation exercise.

“We did that in the last year or so [early 2019]. ...”
CEPI on behalf of the Gates Foundation and the WEF was seeking a “monopoly” role in the vaccination business the objective of which was a “global vaccine project”, in partnership with a large number of “candidates”.

It announced funding for its existing partnership with Inovio and The University of Queensland (Australia). In addition, CEPI confirmed (January 23) its contract with Moderna, Inc. and the U.S. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) headed by Dr. Anthony Fauci, who has been instrumental in waging the fear and panic campaign across America: “Ten Times Worse than Seasonal Flu”. (See WEF Video below)

The presentation of the CEO Stéphane Bencel from Moderna Inc describes the features of the mRNA vaccine starts at 11’50”.

“We inject instructions … mRNA is a platform”

CEPI was dealing simultaneously with several pharmaceutical companies. The Moderna-NIAID agreement was implemented. The mRNA COVID-19 vaccine was launched in the US in late November 2020.

On January 31st, 2020 the day following the WHO’s official launching of the global public health emergency (PHEIC) and Trump’s decision to curtail air travel with China, CEPI announced its partnership with CureVac AG, a German-based biopharmaceutical company.

A few days later, in early February 2020, CEPI “announced that major vaccine manufacturer GSK would allow its proprietary adjuvants—compounds that boost the effectiveness of vaccines — to be used in the response”. (The pandemic was officially launched on March 11).

There were many “potential vaccines in the pipeline” with “dozens of research groups around the world racing to create a vaccine against COVID-19”.

The COVID-19 Global Vaccination Program

CEPI (on behalf of Gates-WEF, which funded the 201 simulation exercise) played a key role in a large scale Worldwide vaccination program in partnership with biotech companies, Big Pharma, government agencies as well as university laboratories.

“We’re having conversations with a broad array of potential partners”. And critical to those conversations is: What’s the plan to make very large quantities of vaccine within a time frame that is potentially relevant to what people seem to be increasingly certain will be a pandemic, if it isn’t already there? …” [Richard Hatchett, CEPI CEO in interview with stat.news.com]. ...

The underlying focus was to develop a global vaccine:
And part of that was doing a global survey of manufacturing capacity to think about where we wanted to plant the manufacturing of any successful products we were able to bring forward.

**Prior Knowledge**

Of significance, Hatchett confirmed that the project to develop a vaccine commenced not only prior to the discovery and identification of the coronavirus (January 7, 2020) but several months prior to the October 2019 201 Simulation exercise.

“We did that in the last year or so. [early 2019]... We are using the information that we have collected and have that team now thinking about opportunities for scaling vaccines of various different types. That is a work in progress. For some of the technologies the tech transfer [to a manufacturer] may be something that could be done in a time frame that was pertinent to the epidemic, potentially.

I think it is going to be really important to engage those folks who have access to really substantial production capacity. And having the big producers at the table — because of their depth, because of their experience, because of their internal resources — would be very, very important.

The candidate vaccines will be very, very quick. Dr. Anthony Fauci, director of NIAID [who has been spreading panic on network TV], is out in public as saying he thinks the clinical trial for the Moderna vaccine may be as early as the spring. (emphasis added)

Did CEPI Director Richard Hatchett, Dr. Anthony Fauci who heads NIAID and Moderna’s CEO, Stéphane Bencel have “prior knowledge” of the outbreak of the Covid-19?

Hatchett’s statements suggest that they had already been working on a mRNA vaccine in early 2019. Moreover, on December 12, 2019, two weeks prior to the official confirmation of the existence of a so-called “novel coronavirus” by the Chinese health authorities, Moderna Inc. together with the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), had already “sent mRNA coronavirus vaccine candidates” to a lab investigator at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. (see Joseph Mercola, July 10, 2021)

What is now unfolding in real life with Covid-19 crisis is (2020-2021) in some regards “similar” to the October 2019 201 Simulation exercise at John Hopkins.

The intended 2020-2021 scenario was how to produce millions of vaccine shots on the presumption that the pandemic would spread Worldwide, and for that you needed the Covid-19 “positive cases” to go fly high.

The CEPI sponsored vaccine conglomerates had already planned their investments well in advance of the global Worldwide health emergency (declared by the WHO on January 30, 2020):

I [Hachett] think part of the general strategy is to have a large number of candidates. [and] you want to have enough candidates that at least some of them are moving rapidly through the process.

And then for each candidate, you need to ask yourself the question: How do
you produce that? ... [And] how are you going to get to that point with production at a scale that is meaningful in the context of a disease that is going to infect the whole of society? (Interview conducted by Helen Branswell, statsnews, February 3, 2020)

Moderna Inc

Moderna Inc based in Seattle was one of the several candidates involved and supported by CEPI.

Moderna announced on February 24th the development of “an experimental (messenger) mRNA COVID-19 vaccine, known as mRNA-1273”. “The initial batch of the vaccine has already been shipped to U.S. government researchers from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID)” headed by Dr. Antony Fauci.

While Moderna Inc initially stated that the first clinical trials would commence in late April, tests involving human volunteers started in mid-March in Seattle: (bear in mind the pandemic was officially launched on March 11)


Coronavirus vaccine test opens as volunteer in Seattle gets 1st shot

Researchers in Seattle gave the first shot to the first person in a test of an experimental coronavirus vaccine Monday — leading off a worldwide hunt for protection even as the pandemic surges. ...

Some of the study’s carefully chosen healthy volunteers, ages 18 to 55, will get higher dosages than others to test how strong the inoculations should be. Scientists will check for any side effects and draw blood samples to test if the vaccine is revving up the immune system, looking for encouraging clues like the NIH earlier found in vaccinated mice.

“We don’t know whether this vaccine will induce an immune response, or whether it will be safe. That’s why we’re doing a trial,” Jackson stressed. “It’s not at the stage where it would be possible or prudent to give it to the general population.” (FOX news local)

The Covid Vaccine and the ID2020 Digital Identity Platform

While CEPI had announced the launching of a global vaccine at the Davos World Economic Forum, another important and related endeavor was underway. It’s called the ID2020 Agenda, which, according to Peter Koenig constitutes “an electronic ID program that uses generalized vaccination as a platform for digital identity”.

“The program harnesses existing birth registration and vaccination operations to provide newborns with a portable and persistent biometrically-linked digital identity”. (Peter Koenig, March 2020)

The founding partners of ID2020 are Microsoft, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Global
Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI) (an initiative of the Gates Foundation).

GAVI and its partners (WHO, UNICEF, World Bank, the IMF) are now actively involved in the implementation (financing) of the global vaccine project entitled COVAX.

The key entities involved in coordinating COVAX are the Vaccine Alliance (GAVI), the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI) and the World Health Organization (WHO). All three entities receive financial support from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

With a fast-moving pandemic, no one is safe, unless everyone is safe

COVAX is co-led by CEPI, Gavi and WHO, alongside key delivery partner UNICEF. In the Americas, the PAHO Revolving Fund is the recognized procurement agent for COVAX.

It is worth noting the timeline: The ID2020 Alliance held their Summit in New York, entitled “Rising to the Good ID Challenge”, on September 19, 2019, exactly one month prior to the nCov-2019 simulation exercise entitled Event 201 at John Hopkins in New York:

Is it just a coincidence that ID2020 is being rolled out at the onset of what the WHO calls a Pandemic? – Or is a pandemic needed to ‘roll out’ the multiple devastating programs of ID2020? (Peter Koenig, March 2020)

ID2020 is part of a “World Governance” project which, if applied, would roll out the contours of what some analysts have described as a Global Police State encompassing through vaccination (embedded microchip) the personal details of several billion people Worldwide.

According to Dr. David Martin (quoted by Makia Freeman):

“This is not a vaccine ... using the term vaccine to sneak this thing under public health exemptions ... This is a mRNA packaged in a fat envelope that is delivered to a cell. It is a medical device designed to stimulate the human cell into becoming a pathogen creator. It is not a vaccine! Vaccines actually are a legally defined term ... under public health law ... under CDC and FDA standards, and a vaccine specifically has to stimulate both an immunity within the person receiving it, but it also has to disrupt transmission.
In the Wake of the Lockdown. The Second and Third Waves

The Second Wave: The fear campaign continues in the wake of the lockdown. A new lockdown is unfolding (December-January) in several countries.

Will the hardships of the economic and social crisis (coupled with a fear campaign) encourage people to get vaccinated?

To implement the Global Vaccine, the propaganda campaign must continue. The Truth must be suppressed. These are their “guidelines”, which must be confronted and challenged.

Several governments (aka corrupt politicians) including the US, UK, France, Germany, Canada as well as India have already provided the green light. Information and analysis on the features of the virus (similar to seasonal influential) is being suppressed by the media.

While Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) and Ivermectin have been used to treat patients in both Europe and North America, Big Pharma with the support of the governments is intent upon suppressing evidence on how COVID-19 can be cured, without the need of a vaccine. (See Chapter VI)

The Covid Vaccine and “Herd Immunity”: Changing the Definitions

Herd immunity is an important concept in medicine. According to Healthline:

“It happens when so many people in a community become immune to an infectious disease that it stops the disease from spreading.

This can happen in two ways:

1. Many people contract the disease and in time build up an immune response to it (natural immunity).

2. Many people are vaccinated against the disease to achieve immunity.

Herd immunity can work against the spread of some diseases. There are several reasons why it often works." (See Healthline)

The WHO has redefined herd immunity with a view to supporting the multibillion dollar Covid vaccine initiative:

Below (Left) is the official WHO definition (June 2020). And in November (Right) the WHO decided unilaterally to redefine a fundamental medical concept, focussing solely on the role of vaccination in achieving herd immunity.
To our knowledge, the peer reviewed definition of herd immunity has not changed.

The new “definition” of the WHO visibly serves the interests of Big Pharma.

Chapter IX
The 2009 H1N1 Swine Flu Pandemic

Remember the 2009 H1N1 “pandemic” when Obama’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology compared the H1N1 pandemic to the 1918 Spanish flu pandemic while reassuring the public that the latter was more deadly. (CBC: Get swine flu vaccine ready: U.S. advisers).

For further details see Michel Chossudovsky, August 2009 Study on H1N1 Pandemic)

Based on incomplete and scanty data, the WHO Director General Margaret Chan predicted with authority that: “as many as 2 billion people could become infected over the next two years — nearly one-third of the world population.” (World Health Organization as reported by the Western media, July 2009).

It was a multibillion bonanza for Big Pharma supported by the WHO’s Director-General Margaret Chan.

WHO sees 4.9 billion pandemic flu shots in best-case

By Katie Reid, Laura MacInnis

In a subsequent statement Dr. Chan confirmed that:

“Vaccine makers could produce 4.9 billion pandemic flu shots per year in the best-case scenario”, Margaret Chan, Director-General, World Health Organization (WHO), quoted by Reuters, 21 July 2009).

“Swine flu could strike up to 40 percent of Americans over the next two years and as many as several hundred thousand could die if a vaccine campaign and other measures aren’t successful.” (Official Statement of Obama Administration, Associated Press, 24 July 2009).
There was no H1N1 pandemic affecting 2 billion people. Millions of doses of swine flu vaccine had been ordered by national governments from Big Pharma.

Millions of vaccine doses were subsequently destroyed: a financial bonanza for Big Pharma, an expenditure crisis for national governments.

There was no investigation into who was behind this multibillion dollar fraud. Several critics said that the H1N1 Pandemic was “Fake”

The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE), a human rights watchdog, is publicly investigating the WHO’s motives in declaring a pandemic. Indeed, the chairman of its influential health committee, epidemiologist Wolfgang Wodarg, has declared that the “false pandemic” is “one of the greatest medicine scandals of the century.” (Michael Fomento, Forbes, February 10, 2010)
in Munster, Germany, Dr. Ulrich Kiel, has essentially labeled the pandemic a hoax. “We are witnessing a gigantic misallocation of resources [$18 billion so far] in terms of public health,” he said.

They’re right. This wasn’t merely overcautiousness or simple misjudgment. The pandemic declaration and all the Klaxon-ringing since reflect sheer dishonesty motivated not by medical concerns but political ones.

Unquestionably, swine flu has proved to be vastly milder than ordinary seasonal flu. It kills at a third to a tenth the rate, according to U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates. Data from other countries like France and Japan indicate it’s far tamer than that.

**PACE to prepare report on the handling of the Swine Flu pandemic**

"Are decisions on pandemics taken on the best scientific evidence only?" was the question asked at a January public hearing of PACE's Committee on Social, Health and Family Affairs which looked into the handling of the H1N1 pandemic. The World Health Organisation's flu chief defended his organisation, saying its advice was not improperly influenced by the pharmaceutical industry.

The committee now intends to hold a second public hearing in Paris, with the participation of government officials who dealt with the pandemic. Rapporteur Paul Flynn (United Kingdom, SOC) is also due to visit the WHO's headquarters in Geneva. His report should be available at the end of April, for a possible plenary debate in June.

---

**H1N1 2009 Vaccine Causes Brain Damage to Children**: GSK’s ArepanrixTD applied in Canada

In Memory of a Little Girl Called Amina Abudu

See detailed article here

The WHO’s H1N1 pandemic was declared in June 11, 2009. GSK was on contract to the Canadian government. The GSK’s ArepandrixTM vaccine was delivered to Canadian health authorities within less than four months.

“As a result, an impressive 45% of Canadians received protection from the H1N1 virus by being vaccinated with GSK’s ArepandrixTM” according to GSK’S President-CEO Paul Lucas in a statement on October 9 2009 to Canada’s Senate Standing Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology.

Within four months?. Does that give them Time to Test????
Lots of people in Canada fell sick after receiving the H1N1 ArepanrixTD vaccine.

And that vaccine killed a little girl called Amina Abudu, which then led to a ten year lawsuit against GSK.

A vaccine was rushed to market, and the five year old was among millions of Canadians to get the shot, amid widespread fears about the new pathogen.

Five days later, Amina’s older brother found her lying unconscious in the bathroom of the family’s east-end Toronto home. She was dead.

Her devastated parents came to blame the flu shot itself and sued the vaccine’s manufacturer, Glaxo Smith Kline (GSK), for $4.2 million. The little-noticed trial of that lawsuit drew toward a close on Tuesday, a rare judicial airing in Canada of a vaccine’s alleged side effects.

The parents’ lawyer, Jasmine Ghosn, alleged the preventive drug was brought out quickly and without proper testing during a chaotic flu season, as the federal government exerted “intense pressure” on Canadians to get immunized. (National Post, November 2019)

At rare trial of alleged vaccine side effects, parents say H1N1 flu shot killed 5-year-old daughter

In 2009, Governments faced major pressure to procure the vaccine and administer it widely, but at the same time there were concerns about its safety

Screenshot of National Post. Death of Canadian girl in 2009 (Report is dated November 2019)

It took ten years for a judgment. The Family lost. GSK declined responsibility for her death.
And the Canadian government reimbursed GSK’s legal expenses.

That lawsuit against GSK should be reopened. Canada’s government bears the burden of responsibility.


GSK has casually acknowledged that the ArepanrixTD which was used in Canada is “similar” to the GSK’s PandemrixTM applied in the UK and the EU, which led to brain damage in children. It was subsequently withdrawn. But ArepandrixTD applied in Canada prevailed. An ArepandrixTD (2010) was subsequently released the following year (and compared to PandemrixTD (2009))

GSK acknowledges that PandemrixTD (2009) causes narcolepsy, which is categorized as “a chronic neurological disorder that affects the brain’s ability to control sleep-wake cycles.”

COVID-19 Vaccine is Déjà Vu. Let’s not be taken in again.

**Was the 2009 H1N1 Pandemic a “Dress Rehearsal”**

The COVID-19 “pandemic” is far more serious and diabolical than the 2009 H1N1. Can we trust the World Health Organization (WHO) and the powerful economic interest groups behind it?

Can we trust the main actors behind the multibillion dollar global vaccination project?

Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg who revealed the fraud behind H1N1 are actively involved together with Dr. Michael Yeadon in the campaign against the Covid-19 vaccine.

**Secret Meeting of Billionaires At the Height of the H1N1 Pandemic**

On April 25, The World Health Organization (WHO) headed by Margaret Chan declared a Public Health Emergency of International concern (PHEIC). Barely a couple of weeks later, the Billionaire philanthropists met behind closed doors at the home of the president of The Rockefeller University in Manhattan.

This Secret Gathering was sponsored by Bill Gates. They called themselves “The Good Club”.

Among the participants were the late David Rockefeller, Warren Buffett, George Soros, Michael Bloomberg, Ted Turner, Oprah Winfrey and many more:

“This of America’s leading billionaires have met secretly to consider how their wealth could be used to slow the growth of the world’s population and speed up improvements in health and education.” (Sunday Times, May 2009)

The emphasis was not on population growth (i.e Planned Parenthood) but on “Depopulation,” i.e., the reduction in the absolute size of World population.
According to the *Sunday Times* report:

The philanthropists who attended a summit convened on the initiative of Bill Gates, the Microsoft co-founder, discussed joining forces to overcome political and religious obstacles to change.

...  

Stacy Palmer, editor of the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, said the summit was unprecedented. “We only learnt about it afterwards, by accident. Normally these people are happy to talk good causes, but this is different – maybe because they don’t want to be seen as a global cabal,” he said.

Another guest said there was “nothing as crude as a vote” but a consensus emerged that they would back a strategy in which population growth would be tackled as a potentially disastrous environmental, social and industrial threat.

“This is something so nightmarish that everyone in this group agreed it needs big-brain answers,” said the guest. ...

Why all the secrecy? “They wanted to speak rich to rich without worrying anything they said would end up in the newspapers, painting them as an alternative world government,” he said. (*Sunday Times*)

Déjà Vu: Neil Ferguson

It is also worth noting that at very outset of the H1N1 crisis in April 2009, Professor Neil Ferguson of Imperial College, London was advising Bill Gates and the WHO:
“40 per cent of people in the UK could be infected [with H1N1] within the next six months if the country was hit by a pandemic.”

That was the same Niel Ferguson (generously supported by the Gates Foundation) who designed the coronavirus Lockdown Model (launched on March 11, 2020). As we recall, that March 2020 mathematical model was based on “predictions” of 600,000 deaths the UK.

And in Summer 2021, a third authoritative “mathematical model” by the same “scientist” (Ferguson) is being used to contemplate a “Fourth Wave Lockdown”.

Depopulation

Was an absolute “reduction” in World population contemplated at that May 2009 secret meeting? A few months later, Bill Gates in his TED presentation (February 2010) pertaining to vaccination, confirmed the following:

“And if we do a really great job on new vaccines, health care, reproductive health services, we could lower that [the world population] by 10 or 15 percent”.

According to Gates’ statement, this would represent an absolute reduction of the World’s population (2009) of the order 680 million to 1.02 billion.

(See quotation on Video starting at 04.21. See also screenshot of Transcript of quotation)

TED Talk at 04:21:

Billionaire club in bid to curb overpopulation

First, we’ve got population. The world today has 6.8 billion people. That’s headed up to about nine billion. Now, if we do a really great job on new vaccines, health care, reproductive health services, we could lower that by, perhaps, 10 or 15 percent. But there, we see an increase of about 1.3.

“The Good Club” Then and Now

The same group of billionaires who met at the May 2009 secret venue, have been actively involved from the outset of the Covid crisis in designing the lockdown policies applied Worldwide, the mRNA vaccine and the “Great Reset”.

The mRNA vaccine is not a project of a UN intergovernmental body (WHO) on behalf the member states of the UN: It’s is a private initiative. The billionaire elites which fund and enforce the Vaccine Project Worldwide are Eugenists committed to Depopulation.
Chapter X

Has The Virus been Identified?

Has SARS-CoV-2 been Isolated?

Introduction

The contentious issue is the following, Is there reliable evidence provided by the WHO and national health authorities that the alleged SARS-CoV-2 virus has been isolated/purified from an “unadulterated sample taken from a diseased patient”?

While the virus was initially defined as the 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in January 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) did not have in its possession details regarding the isolation/purification and identity of 2019-nCoV.

And because details concerning isolation / purification were not available, the WHO decided to “customize” The Real Time Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction (rRT-PCR) Test using the alleged “similar” 2003 SARS virus (subsequently renamed SARS-1) as “a point of reference” for detecting genetic fragments of the novel 2019-nCoV. (See Chapter III).

What this decision entails is that novel 2019-CoV-2 is NOT a novel virus. It was categorized by the Chinese authorities and the WHO as “similar” to the 2003 SARS-CoV as well as to MERS. 2003 SARS-CoV was subsequently renamed SARS-CoV-1.

History: Isolation and Purification of the Virus

Chinese Health Authorities

As outlined in the Timeline (Chapter II), the Chinese authorities announced on January 7, 2020 that “a new type of virus” had been identified “similar to the one associated with SARS and MERS”. The report below (which is not from original Chinese government sources), describes China’s methodology as follows:

We prospectively collected and analysed data on patients with laboratory-confirmed
2019-nCoV infection by real-time RT-PCR and next-generation sequencing.

Data were obtained with standardised data collection forms shared by WHO and the International Severe Acute Respiratory and Emerging Infection Consortium from electronic medical records. (emphasis added)

The following article entitled “A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China, (Nature, February 3, 2021) was among the first to report on China’s novel coronavirus:

...[We] collected bronchoalveolar lavage fluid (BALF) and performed deep meta-transcriptomic sequencing. The clinical specimen was handled in a biosafety level 3 laboratory at Shanghai Public Health Clinical Center. Total RNA was extracted from 200 μl of BALF and a meta-transcriptomic library was constructed for pair-end (150-bp reads) sequencing using an Illumina MiniSeq as previously described 4,6,7,8.

In total, we generated 56,565,928 sequence reads that were de novo-assembled and screened for potential aetiological agents. ...

The genome sequence of this virus, as well as its termini, were determined and confirmed by reverse-transcription PCR (RT-PCR)\textsuperscript{10} and 5'/3' rapid amplification of cDNA ends (RACE), respectively. This virus strain was designated as WH-Human 1 coronavirus (WHCV) (and has also been referred to as ‘2019-nCoV’) and its whole genome sequence (29,903 nt) has been assigned GenBank accession number MN908947.

The viral genome organization of WHCV was determined by sequence alignment to two representative members of the genus Betacoronavirus: a coronavirus associated with humans (SARS-CoV Tor2, GenBank accession number AY274119) [2003] and a coronavirus associated with bats (bat SL-CoVZC45, GenBank accession number MG772933) (Nature, February 3, 2020, emphasis added).

It is unclear from the above quotations as well as from the documents consulted, whether the Chinese health authorities undertook an isolation / purification of a patient’s specimen. What should be abundantly clear is the PCR test which reveals a genome sequence cannot be used to identify the 2019-nCoV virus.

US Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

Following the Chinese announcement on the 28th of January 2020, the US Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) stated that the novel coronavirus had been isolated. The CDC statement dated January 28th, 2020 (updated December 2020) is unequivocal:

\textit{SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19, was isolated in the laboratory and is available for research by the scientific and medical community.}

....

Timeline:

- On January 20, 2020, CDC received a clinical specimen collected from the first reported U.S. patient infected with SARS-CoV-2. CDC immediately placed the
specimen into cell culture to grow a sufficient amount of virus for study.
- On February 2, 2020, CDC generated enough SARS-CoV-2 grown in cell culture to
distribute to medical and scientific researchers.
- On February 4, 2020, CDC shipped SARS-CoV-2 to the BEI Resources Repository.
- An article discussing the isolation and characterization of this virus specimen is
available in *Emerging Infectious Diseases*.

One important way that CDC has supported global efforts to study and learn about
SARS-CoV-2 in the laboratory was by growing the virus in cell culture and ensuring that
it was widely available. Researchers in the scientific and medical community can use
virus obtained from this work in their studies.

SARS-CoV-2 strains supplied by CDC and other researchers can be requested, free, from
the Biodefense and Emerging Infections Research (BEI) Resources Repository by
established institutions that meet BEI requirements. These requirements include
maintaining appropriate facilities and safety programs, as well as having the
appropriate expertise. BEI supplies organisms and reagents to the broader community
of microbiology and infectious disease researchers. (Emphasis added).

see screenshot below:

Timeline:

- On January 20, 2020, CDC received a clinical specimen collected from the first reported U.S. patient infected with SARS-CoV-2. CDC immediately placed the specimen into cell culture to grow a sufficient amount of virus for study.
- On February 2, 2020, CDC generated enough SARS-CoV-2 grown in cell culture to distribute to medical and scientific researchers.
- On February 4, 2020, CDC shipped SARS-CoV-2 to the BEI Resources Repository.
- An article discussing the isolation and characterization of this virus specimen is available in *Emerging Infectious Diseases*.

See also related study which was posted on the [CDC website](https://www.cdc.gov).

The CDC acknowledges that SARS-CoV-2 has not been isolated.

Since no quantified virus isolates of the 2019-nCoV were available for CDC use at the time the test was developed [January 2020] and this study conducted, assays designed for detection of the 2019-nCoV RNA were tested with characterized stocks of in vitro transcribed full length RNA (N gene; GenBank accession: MN908947.2) of known titer (RNA copies/μL) spiked into a diluent consisting of a suspension of human A549 cells and viral transport medium (VTM) to mimic clinical specimen. (emphasis added, page 40)

Compare the above statement to the CDC January 28th, 2020 advisory confirming the isolation of SARS-CoV-2:

On January 20, 2020, CDC received a clinical specimen collected from the first reported U.S. patient infected with SARS-CoV-2. CDC immediately placed the specimen into cell
culture to grow a sufficient amount of virus for study.

The World Health Organization (WHO) Did Not Undertake The Isolation / Purification of a Specimen

From the documents quoted below, the Chinese authorities did not provide the WHO with a specimen of isolated / purified SARS-CoV-2.

And because details concerning isolation were not available, the WHO decided to “customize” its Real Time Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction (rRT-PCR) test using a so-called isolate of the “similar” 2003 SARS corona virus (subsequently renamed SARS-CoV-1) as “a point of reference” (or proxy) for detecting genetic fragments of the 2019 SARS-CoV-2. For further details see Chapter III.


While Corman, Drosten et al’s study confirmed that “several viral genome sequences had been released”, in the case of 2019-nCoV, “virus isolates or samples from infected patients were not available ...”

The recommendations to the WHO were as follows:

“The genome sequences suggest presence of a virus closely related to the members of a viral species termed severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS)-related CoV, a species defined by the agent of the 2002/03 outbreak of SARS in humans.

We report on the establishment and validation of a diagnostic workflow for 2019-nCoV screening and specific confirmation [using the RT-PCR test], designed in absence of available virus isolates or original patient specimens. Design and validation were enabled by the close genetic relatedness to the 2003 SARS-CoV, and aided by the use of synthetic nucleic acid technology.” (Eurosurveillance, January 23, 2020, emphasis added).

What this bold statement suggests is that the isolation / purification of 2019-nCoV was not required and that “validation” would be enabled by “the close genetic relatedness to the 2003-SARS-CoV.”

The recommendations of the Corman- Drosten study (supported and financed by the Gates Foundation) pertaining to the use of the RT-PCR test applied to 2019-nCoV were then firmly endorsed by the Director General of the WHO, Dr. Tedros Adhanom. (For further details, see Chapter III).

Freedom of Information Requests: No Record of SARS-CoV-2 Isolation-Purification

An important ongoing and detailed investigative project by Christine Massey, M.Sc. has provided detailed documentation based on Freedom of Information (FOI) requests addressed to ninety Health /Science institutions in a large number of countries.

The responses to these requests confirm that there is no record of isolation / purification of
SARS-CoV-2 “having been performed by anyone, anywhere, ever.”

“The 90 Health /Science institutions that have responded thus far have provided and/or cited, in total, zero such records:

Our requests [under “freedom of information”] have not been limited to records of isolation performed by the respective institution, or limited to records authored by the respective institution, rather they were open to any records describing “COVID-19 virus” (aka “SARS-COV-2”) isolation/purification performed by anyone, ever, anywhere on the planet.”

The Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

The CDC was contacted by the author of the report.


The CDC admitted they have no records of actual isolation/purification by anyone, anywhere, ever, by any method” :

USA-CDC-Virus-Isolation-Response-Scrubbed.pdf

Freedom of Information Requests: Health/ Science Institutions Worldwide “Have No Record” of SARS-COV-2 Isolation/Purification
March 1, 2021:

The CDC again made clear that they still have no records of “SARS-COV-2” isolation performed by anyone, anywhere on the planet, ever... just not in so many words. Instead, the CDC absurdly implied that isolation/purification of “SARS-COV-2” would require the replication of a “virus” without host cells and thus is impossible. (The request had nothing to do with replication.)

March 3, 2021:

CDC again failed to provide/cite any records describing “SARS-COV-2” isolation/purification by anyone anywhere ever... but would no longer simply say so (as they did on November 2nd); instead they gave song and dance citing the study by Harcourt et al. which is the same one posted on CDC’s website:

Conclusive Results of the Investigation based Freedom of Information Requests

What this incisive and detailed report by Christine Massey confirms is that:

Every institution has failed to provide even 1 record describing the isolation aka purification of any “COVID-19 virus” directly from a patient sample that was not first adulterated with other sources of genetic material. (Those other sources are typically monkey kidney aka “Vero” cells and fetal bovine serum).

Response Public Health England

Response

PHE can confirm is does not hold information in the way suggested by your request.

Under section 16 of the Act, public authorities have a duty to provide advice and assistance. I have signposted you to the below links which contain information on taking COVID-19 swabs.


Additionally, the below publication contains some information on virus isolation:

https://www.eurosurveillance.org/content/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.32.2001483

If you have any queries regarding the information that has been supplied to you, please refer your query to in writing in the first instance. If you remain dissatisfied and would like to request an internal review, then please contact us at the address above or by emailing foi@phe.gov.uk.

Please note that you have the right to an independent review by the Information Commissioner’s Office if a complaint cannot be resolved through the PHE complaints procedure. The Information Commissioner’s Office can be contacted by writing to Information Commissioner’s Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF.

Yours sincerely,
FOI Team

It follows from the above detailed study that there is no evidence that the SARS-CoV-2 virus
has been isolated/purified from a patient’s sample, as evidenced by the responses “under freedom of information” (FOI) from some 90 health / science institutions Worldwide.

For further details see the following reports by Christine Massey:

- Freedom of Information Requests: Health/ Science Institutions Worldwide “Have No Record” of SARS-COV-2 Isolation/Purification August 04, 2021
- 90 Health/Science Institutions Globally All Failed to Cite Even 1 Record of “SARS-COV-2” Purification, by Anyone, Anywhere, Ever August 04, 2021


SARS-CoV-2 has not been isolated. Does the virus exist?

Neither the Chinese authorities nor the CDC, the WHO, national governments, scientific / health authorities have provided evidence that SARS-CoV-2 has been isolated /purified.

What this means is that the entire covid narrative falls flat.

There is no pandemic. The isolation / purification of the virus has not been undertaken. All the policies adopted by governments worldwide allegedly to “save lives” are illegal, socially destructive and in violation of fundamental human rights.

Mortality and Morbidity: While there is “No Killer Virus”, there is a “Killer Vaccine”.

While the SARS-CoV-2 virus is presented by the media and the governments as a “killer virus” (when in fact the WHO and CDC describe it as “similar to seasonal influenza”), a totally invalid and dysfunctional Covid -19 vaccine is currently being imposed on the entire population of Planet Earth: 7.9 billion people.

Important Question

How did Big Pharma manage to develop a vaccine (sponsored by the WHO, GAVI, the Gates Foundation, et al) with a mandate “to protect people” against a novel virus which has not been isolated/ purified from an “unadulterated sample taken from a diseased patient”?

Vaccine in relation to What? The virus has not been identified.

2019 SARS-CoV-2 was categorized by the WHO as similar to 2003 SARS-CoV (see Chapter III) which means that the 2019 SARS-CoV-2 is not a novel (new) virus. The original strain of SARS-CoV-2 has not be isolated /purified.

The Variants

How can one detect the “deadly variants” of the original virus (using the PCR test) when the 2019 novela virus has been isolated? Or is the “detection” of the deadly variants in relation to the eighteen year old 2003 SARS-CoV which is used as a “proxy” of the 2019 novel virus in the configuration of the PCR?

The legitimacy of the Covid vaccine project hinges upon the validity of hundreds of
thousands of RT-PCR fake positive cases Worldwide combined with fake Covid related mortality data. The PCR test has been confirmed by the WHO as being totally invalid (See Appendix to Chapter III).

***

Author’s Note. I remain indebted to Christine Massey for her extensive research and investigation on the issue of isolation /purification.

---

Chapter XI
Freedom of Expression
Categorizing The Protest Movement as “Anti-Social”

A diabolical process is underway which consists in “identifying” all those who are opposed to the governments’ management of the coronavirus pandemic. According to ongoing psychological studies, these opponents are categorized as “anti-social psychopaths”.

The unspoken objective is to shunt the emergence of an organized protest movement pertaining to social engineering and the decision taken Worldwide at a political level to close down the national economies of more than 190 members states of the United Nations.

Protest against the “official truth”, criticize government guidelines, express reservations regarding the closing down of the global economy, social distancing and the wearing of the face mask, and you will be tagged (according to “scientific opinion”) as a “callous and deceitful psychopath”.

Note: This chapter was drafted prior to the launching of the Covid-19 Vaccine in December 2020

Psychology: Empirical Studies

Peer reviewed psychological “studies” have been carried in several countries using sample surveys.

Accept the “official narrative” and you are tagged as a “good person” with “empathy” who understands the feelings of others.

A so-called peer reviewed “empirical report” describes those who refuse to wear the
face mask or abide by social distancing as having “anti-social personality disorders”.

Those who “do not adhere to measures to prevent the spread of COVID-19” are tagged as “anti-social”.

The findings of the Brazilian study involving a “sample” of 1578 adults was published in the journal *Personality and Individual Differences*, under the title:

**COVID-19 pandemic over time: Do antisocial traits matter?**

*Compliance with containment measures to the COVID-19 pandemic over time: Do antisocial traits matter?*

Fabiano Koich Miguel a, Gisele Magarotto Machado b, Giselle Pianowski b, Lucas de Francisco Carvalho b, c, d

*Show more ↪*

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110346  Get rights and content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• First empirical report of findings from a Latin American country on antisocial traits associated with compliance with containment measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lower levels of empathy and higher levels of Callousness, Deceitfulness, and Risk-taking are associated with lower compliance with containment measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The increase in COVID-19 cases in the country are not associated with people’s adherence to containment measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Empathy” versus “Anti-social Traits”

The statistical “methodology” of this study is straightforward. It is intended to serve as a model.

It consists in categorizing a so-called sample of adults from all major regions of Brazil into two distinct groups. It examines:

“..the relationships between antisocial traits and compliance with COVID-19 containment measures. The sample consisted of 1578 Brazilian adults aged 18–73 years ... and a questionnaire about compliance with containment measures.

Latent profile analyses indicated a 2-profile solution: “the antisocial pattern profile which presented higher scores in Callousness, Deceitfulness, Hostility, Impulsivity, Irresponsibility, Manipulativeness, and Risk-taking, as well as lower scores in
Affective resonance; and “the empathy pattern profile which presented higher scores in Affective resonance ...”

The antisocial and empathy groups showed significant differences. ... Our findings indicated that antisocial traits, especially lower levels of empathy and higher levels of Callousness, Deceitfulness, and Risk-taking, are directly associated with lower compliance with containment measures. These traits explain, at least partially, the reason why people continue not adhering to the containment measures even with increasing numbers of cases and deaths. (emphasis added)

**The research methodology** is built around 3 main questions:

- “Do you think it is necessary to avoid approaching people as much as possible until the coronavirus situation is controlled?” (social distancing),
- “Do you think it is necessary to wash your hands and/or use alcohol gel as many times a day until the coronavirus situation is controlled?” (hygiene),
- “Do you think it is necessary to use facemask (that protects nose and mouth) in Brazil?” (facemask).

Yes/No Categorization

Answer Yes to these Three Questions: you are categorized as having “Empathy” (i.e. the ability to understand and share the feelings of others).

Answer No to all Three Questions: you are categorized (according to the study) as having “higher levels of Callousness, Deceitfulness, Hostility, Impulsivity, Irresponsibility, Manipulativeness, and Risk-taking” (as quoted above).

It all sounds very scientific. The unspoken objective of these psycho-studies is to provide governments with a mandate to intimidate as well as to enforce compliance, while smearing the alleged psychopaths who refuse to conform to the official narrative, which is an outright lie.

“The Dark Triad” and “Collective Narcissism”

According to [Eric W. Dolan](https://psypost.org) (PsyPost) the above study consisted in identifying “a measure of maladaptive personality traits... “. Dolan also refers to a related study focussing on: “the “Dark Triad” of narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism associated with ignoring preventative COVID-19 measures.”.

The study conducted in Poland is entitled:

"Adaptive and maladaptive behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic: The roles of Dark Triad traits, collective narcissism, and health beliefs"

The study refers to the practice of “collective narcissism”, namely a common belief and practice by a so-called ‘In-Group” (aka protest movement, collective of dissident medical
Adaptive and maladaptive behavior during the COVID-19 pandemic: The roles of Dark Triad traits, collective narcissism, and health beliefs

Bartłomiej Nowak, Paweł Brzoska, Jarek Piotrowski, Constantine Sedikides, Magdalena Zernotek-Piotrowska, Peter K. Jonason

The study is based on “a nationally representative sample from Poland (N = 755)”. It examines: “the relationships between the Dark Triad traits (i.e., psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism) and collective narcissism (i.e., agentic and communal) … Participants characterized by the Dark Triad traits engaged less in prevention …”

“The results point to the utility of health beliefs in predicting behaviors during the pandemic, explaining (at least in part) problematic behaviors associated with the dark personalities (i.e., Dark Triad, collective narcissism). …

The traits, such as the Dark Triad (i.e., narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy) and collective narcissism … may have implications for how one copes with the virus… For example, individuals characterized by the Dark Triad traits may be less likely to follow governmentally-enforced restrictions related to COVID-19

The Term “Agentic” quoted above refers to “goal-achievement”.

And here is the Methodology

“We measured the Dark Triad traits (Wave 2) … [also with reference to] the Dark Triad Dirty Dozen scale (Jonason & Webster, 2010). The scale consists of four items assessing individual differences in psychopathy (e.g., “I tend to lack remorse”), narcissism (e.g., “I tend to seek prestige or status”), and Machiavellianism (e.g., “I tend to manipulate others to get my way”). Participants indicated their agreement with each item (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). We averaged responses to create indices of each trait.”

Sounds scientific. What are the conclusions?
“We advanced the scope of the model by illustrating the relevance of dark personality traits in predicting both adaptive and maladaptive behaviors in response to the pandemic by person-focused (i.e., the Dark Triad traits) and group-focused (i.e., collective narcissism) personality traits.” The read the full report click here (emphasis added)

The psychological definition of Dark Triad Traits comprises the combined personality traits of narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. “They are called “dark” because of their malevolent qualities.”

The Dark Triad Dirty Dozen (DTDD) consists of a broader “personality inventory” which assesses and measures the three personality components of the Dark Triad. (see image right)

In substance, what this “scientific report” confirms is that people who question the covid-19 official narrative have “malevolent personality disorders”. They are said to suffer from the Dirty Dozen “Dark Triad Traits” (DTDD).

When they act contiguously within a In-Group or a Protest movement (E.g. The August Mass Rally in Berlin), they are tagged as applying “collective narcissism”.

The framework of the above study is also envisaged for other countries in partnership (with the Warsaw group). Another related study is entitled: “Who complies with the restrictions to reduce the spread of COVID-19?: Personality and perceptions of the COVID-19 situation”

Strong words. “Peer Reviewed”?  

Psychology is being used in a pernicious way to provide legitimacy to a Police State with a mandate to “go after” those who allegedly have Dark Triad “malevolent personality disorders”.

It’s an inquisitorial doctrine, which could eventually evolve towards a digital witch hunt, far more sophisticated than the “Spanish Inquisition”.

“In contrast to the Spanish Inquisition, the contemporary inquisitorial system has almost unlimited capabilities of spying on and categorizing individuals.

People are tagged and labeled, their emails, cell phones are monitored, detailed personal data is entered into giant Big Brother data banks. Once this digital cataloging has been completed, people are locked into watertight compartments. Their profiles are established and entered into a computerized system.

Law enforcement is systematic. The witch hunt is not only directed against presumed
“terrorists” through ethnic profiling, etc., the various human rights, affirmative action, antiwar cohorts are themselves the object of the anti-terrorist legislation and so on.

Needless to say, converting or recanting by antiwar heretics is not permitted.

Meanwhile war criminals occupy positions of authority. The citizenry is galvanized into supporting rulers, “committed to their safety and well-being”, “who are going after the bad guys.” (Michel Chossudovsky, The Spanish Inquisition, “Made in America”, Global Research, December 2004)

Francisco Goya: The Spanish Inquisition (1812-1819) Real Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando, Madrid

Are the Billionaires Mentally Deranged?

These empirical psychology studies are meant to be used against citizens who are opposed to the instructions of their respective governments. In turn these governments obey orders from higher up.

While ordinary citizens are tagged, what is increasingly obvious is that the billionaires, “philanthropists”, corrupt politicians, et al., who are the unspoken architects of the global economic lockdown are psychopaths in their own right.

While their personality traits are not the motive of scientific investigation, the corrupt billionaires who are behind the corona lockdown and closure of the global economy are mentally deranged. Money and enrichment is the driving force.

However, tagging politicians and financiers as “psychopaths” is an understatement. Calling for the simultaneous closing down of the national economies of 193 member states of the UN is an act of “economic genocide”.
Economic and social decision-making is criminalized. The legitimacy of Wall Street, the World Economic Forum (WEF), Big Pharma and the billionaire foundations which ordered the closure of the global economy on March 11, 2020 must be forcefully addressed.

Chapter XII
The Worldwide CoVax Operation and the Nuremberg Code.

Crimes Against Humanity, Genocide

“We, the survivors of the atrocities committed against humanity during the Second World War, feel bound to follow our conscience. ... Another holocaust of greater magnitude is taking place before our eyes. We call upon you to stop this ungodly medical experiment on humankind immediately. It is a medical experiment to which the Nuremberg Code must be applied.” (Rabbi Hillel Handler, Hagar Schafrir, Sorin Shapira, Mascha Orel, Morry Krispijn et al, [see complete text here](http://example.com)

Digital Tyranny at a Global Level

The vaccine is being applied and imposed Worldwide. The target population is 7.9 billion. Several doses are contemplated. It is the largest vaccination program in World history.

“Never before has immunization of the entire planet been accomplished by delivering a synthetic mRNA into the human body”.

The WHO “Guidelines” for establishing a Worldwide Digital Informations System for issuing so-called “Digital Certificates for Covid-19” are generously funded by the Rockefeller and Bill and Melinda Gates foundations.

Focussing on the experimental nature of the mRNA vaccine and its devastating health impacts, legal analysts have raised the issue of the historic Nuremberg “Nazi Doctors Trial’ (1946-47) in which Nazi doctors were charged for war crimes, specifically in the conduct of medical experiments on both prisoners in the concentration camps and civilians.

The Medical Case, U.S.A. vs. Karl Brandt, et al. (also known as the Doctors’ Trial), was prosecuted in 1946-47 against twenty-three doctors and administrators accused of organizing and participating in war crimes and crimes against humanity in the form of
medical experiments and medical procedures inflicted on prisoners and civilians.

Karl Brandt, the lead defendant, was the senior medical official of the German government during World War II; other defendants included senior doctors and administrators in the armed forces and SS. See Harvard Documents

Resulting from the verdict on August 19, 1947, the Nuremberg Code was enacted. Reviewed below are the Ten Principles of the Nuremberg Code. Several of these principles—in relation to the mRNA vaccine and the vaccine passport—have been blatantly violated.

The first principle of the “Nuremberg Code” states that “the voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.” And that is precisely what is being denied in relation to the “vaccine” (see sentences in bold below).

1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.

This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of
any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This latter element requires that before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject there should be made known to him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment.

2. The experiment should be such as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, unprocurable by other methods or means of study, and not random and unnecessary in nature.

3. The experiment should be so designed and based on the results of animal experimentation and a knowledge of the natural history of the disease or other problem under study that the anticipated results will justify the performance of the experiment.

4. The experiment should be so conducted as to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering and injury.

5. No experiment should be conducted where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur; except, perhaps, in those experiments where the experimental physicians also serve as subjects.

6. The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment.

7. Proper preparations should be made and adequate facilities provided to protect the experimental subject against even remote possibilities of injury, disability, or death.

8. The experiment should be conducted only by scientifically qualified persons. The highest degree of skill and care should be required through all stages of the experiment of those who conduct or engage in the experiment.

9. During the course of the experiment the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment to an end if he has reached the physical or mental state where continuation of the experiment seems to him to be impossible.

10. During the course of the experiment the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the experiment at any stage, if he has probably cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior skill and careful judgment required of him that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.

emphasis added

Nuremberg and the Covid Crisis

Starting in December 2020, entire populations in a large number of countries are under threat to comply and get vaccinated.
With reference to the Nuremberg Code, they are unable:

“to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion” (Nuremberg 1 above).

Amply documented, there is an upward trend in mRNA vaccine deaths and injuries Worldwide and the health authorities are fully aware of the “health risks”, yet they have not informed the public. There is no informed consent. And the media is lying through their teeth:

“No experiment should be conducted where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur” (Nuremberg 5 above).

That “a priori reason” outlined in Nuremberg principle 5, is amply documented: Deaths and disabling injuries are ongoing at the level of the entire planet. They are confirmed by the official statistics of mRNA vaccine mortality and morbidity (EU, US, UK).

Video: The mRNA vaccine was launched in mid to late December 2020. In many countries, there was a significant shift in mortality following the introduction of the mRNA vaccine

Source: HeathData.org

Nazi “Medical Experiments”

Let us recall the categorization of specific crimes pertaining to Nazi “medical experiments” conducted on concentration camp prisoners. These included “the killing of Jews for anatomical research, the killing of tubercular Poles, and the euthanasia of sick and disabled civilians in Germany and occupied territories. …”

Karl Brandt and six other defendants were convicted, sentenced to death, and executed; nine defendants were convicted and sentenced to terms in prison; and seven defendants were acquitted.

The trial documents and evidence are all on file. The defendants were charged with war crimes and crimes against humanity.
The Scale and Size of the Worldwide Covid-19 Vaxx Operation

I have not been able to review the relevant documents in detail with a view to establishing the number of victims resulting from the Nazi medical experiments.

While the Nuremberg principles are of utmost relevance to the Covid-19 vaccine project, simplistic comparisons should be avoided. The context, the history and the mechanisms of compliance pertaining to the mRNA “vaccine” are fundamentally different.

The scale and size of the Worldwide CoVax operation as well as its complex organizational structure (WHO, GAVI, Gates Foundation, Big Pharma) is unprecedented.

Humanity in its entirety is the objective of the Vaxx project. The target population for vaccine experimentation of the Covid-19 vaccine is the entire population of Planet Earth:

7.9 billion people, involving several doses.

Multiply the World’s population by 4 doses (as proposed by Pfizer): the order of magnitude is 30 billion doses Worldwide.

The numbers are in the billions. The likely impacts on mortality and morbidity are beyond description.

Big Money is behind this public-private partnership project.
We are dealing with a Worldwide process of crimes against humanity. Entire populations in a large number of member states of the UN are subject to compliance and enforcement (without the Rule of Law).

If they refuse the vaccine, they are socially marginalized and confined, rejected by their employers, rejected by society: no education, no career, no life. Their lives are destroyed.

If they accept the vaccine, their health and their life are potentially in jeopardy.

The evidence of mortality and morbidity resulting from vaccine inoculation both present (official data) and future (e.g. undetected microscopic blood clots) is overwhelming.

And that’s just the beginning.

Extensive crimes against humanity Worldwide are being committed.

The mRNA “vaccine” modifies the human genome at the level of the entire Planet. It’s Genocide.

It’s a “Holocaust of Greater Magnitude, Taking Place before our Eyes”.

Chapter XIII

Global Coup d’État? The “Great Reset”, Global Debt and Neoliberal “Shock Treatment”

History of Economic “Shock Treatment”. From The Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) to “Global Adjustment (GA)"

The March 11, 2020 (simultaneous) closing down of the national economies of 190 member states of the UN is diabolical and unprecedented. Millions of people have lost their jobs, and their lifelong savings. In developing countries, poverty, famine and despair prevail. The closure of national economies has led to a spiralling global debt. Increasingly, national governments are controlled by the creditors, which are currently financing the social safety nets, corporate bailouts and handouts.

While this model of “global intervention” is unprecedented, it has certain features reminiscent of the country-level macro-economic reforms including the imposition of strong “economic medicine” by the IMF. To address this issue let us examine the history of so-called “economic shock treatment” (a term first used in the 1970s).
Flash back to Chile, September 11 1973.

As a visiting professor at the Catholic University of Chile, I lived through the military coup directed against the democratically elected government of Salvador Allende. It was a CIA op led by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger coupled with devastating macro-economic reforms.

In the month following the Coup d’Etat, the price of bread increased from 11 to 40 escudos overnight. This engineered collapse of both real wages and employment under the Pinochet dictatorship was conducive to a nationwide process of impoverishment. While food prices had skyrocketed, wages had been frozen to ensure “economic stability and stave off inflationary pressures.” From one day to the next, an entire country had been precipitated into abysmal poverty: in less than a year the price of bread in Chile increased thirty-six times and eighty-five percent of the Chilean population had been driven below the poverty line.” That was Chile’s 1973 “Reset”.

Two and a half years later in 1976, I returned to Latin America as a visiting professor at the National University of Cordoba in the northern industrial heartland of Argentina. My stay coincided with another military coup d’état in March 1976. Behind the massacres and human rights violations, “free market” macro-economic reforms had also been prescribed – this time under the supervision of Argentina’s New York creditors, including David Rockefeller who was a friend of The Junta’s Minister of Economy José Alfredo Martinez de Hoz.

Chile and Argentina were “dress rehearsals” for things to come: The imposition of the IMF-World Bank Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) was imposed on more than 100 countries starting in the early 1980s. (See Michel Chossudovsky, The Globalization of Poverty and the New World Order, Global Research, 2003)

A notorious example of the “free market”: Peru in August 1990 \textit{was punished for not}
conforming to IMF diktats: the price of fuel was hiked up 31 times and the price of bread increased more than twelve times in a single day. These reforms - carried out in the name of “democracy” - were far more devastating than those applied in Chile and Argentina under the fist of military rule.

The March 2020 Lockdown

And now on March 11, 2020, we enter a new phase of macro-economic destabilization, which is more devastating and destructive than 40 years of “shock treatment” and austerity measures imposed by the IMF on behalf of dominant financial interests.

There is rupture, a historical break as well as continuity. It’s “Neoliberalism to the n-th Degree”

Image on the left: Kissinger with Argentina’s Dictator General Jorge Videla (1970s)

Closure of the Global Economy: Economic and Social Impacts at the Level of the Entire Planet

Compare what is happening to the Global Economy today with the country by country “negotiated” macro-economic measures imposed by creditors under the Structural Adjustment Program (SAP). The March 11, 2020 “Global Adjustment” was not negotiated with national governments. It was imposed by a “public / private partnership”, supported by media propaganda, and accepted, invariably by co-opted and corrupt politicians.

“Engineered” Social Inequality and Impoverishment. The Globalization of Poverty


In a bitter irony, the same Big Money interests behind the 2020 “Global Adjustment” were actively involved in Chile (1973) and Argentina (1976). Remember “Operation Condor” and the “Dirty War” (Guerra Sucia).

There is continuity: The same powerful financial interests: The IMF and the World Bank bureaucracies in liaison with the Federal Reserve, Wall Street and the WEF are currently involved in preparing and managing the “post-pandemic “New Normal” debt operations (on behalf of the creditors) under the Great Reset.

Henry Kissinger was involved in coordinating Chile’s 9/11, 1973 “Reset”.
The following year (1974), he was in put charge of the drafting of the “National Strategic Security Memorandum 200 (NSSM 200) which identified depopulation as “the highest priority in US foreign policy towards the Third World”.

The Thrust of “Depopulation” under the Great Reset?

"Control oil and you control nations; control food and you control the people.”

— Henry Kissinger

Today, Henry Kissinger is a firm supporter alongside the Gates Foundation (which is also firmly committed to depopulation) of the Great Reset under the auspices of the World Economic Forum (WEF).

No need to negotiate with national governments or carry out “regime change”. The March 11, 2020 lockdown project constitutes a “Global Adjustment” which triggers bankruptcies, unemployment and privatization on a much larger scale affecting in one fell swoop the national economies of more than 150 countries.

And this whole process is presented to public opinion as a means to combating the “killer virus” which, according to the CDC and the WHO is similar to seasonal influenza. (Viruses A, B).

The Hegemonic Power Structure of Global Capitalism

Big Money including the billionaire foundations are the driving force. It’s a complex alliance of Wall Street and the Banking establishment, The Big Oil and Energy Conglomerates, the so-called “Defense Contractors”, Big Pharma, the Biotech Conglomerates, the Corporate Media, the Telecom, Communications and Digital Technology Giants, together with a network of think tanks, lobby groups, research labs, etc. The ownership of intellectual property also plays a central role.

This powerful digital-financial decision-making network also involves major creditor and banking institutions: The Federal Reserve, the European Central Bank (ECB), the IMF, the World Bank, the regional development banks, and the Basel based Bank for International Settlements (BIS), which plays a key strategic role.

In turn, the upper echelons of the US State apparatus (and Washington’s Western Allies) are directly or indirectly involved, including the Pentagon, US Intelligence (and its research labs), the Health authorities, Homeland Security and the US State Department (including US embassies in over 150 countries).

The “Real Economy” and “Big Money”

Why are these Covid lockdown policies spearheading bankruptcy, poverty and unemployment?
Global capitalism is not monolithic. There is indeed “A Class Conflict” “between the super-rich and the vast majority of the World population.

But there is also intense rivalry within the capitalist system. Namely a conflict between “Big Money Capital” and what might be described as “Real Capitalism” which consists of corporations in different areas of productive activity at the national and regional levels. It also includes small and medium sized enterprises.

What is ongoing is a process of concentration of wealth (and control of advanced technologies) unprecedented in World history, whereby the financial establishment, (i.e. the multibillion dollar creditors) are slated to appropriate the real assets of both bankrupt companies as well as State assets.

The “Real Economy” constitutes “the economic landscape” of real economic activity: productive assets, agriculture, industry, services, economic and social infrastructure, investment, employment, etc. The real economy at the global and national levels is being targeted by the lockdown and closure of economic activity. The Global Money financial institutions are the “creditors” of the real economy.

**Global Governance: Towards a Totalitarian State**

The individuals and organizations involved in the October 18, 2019 201 Simulation are now involved in the actual management of the crisis once it went live on January 30th, 2020 under the WHO’s Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC), which in turn set the stage for the February 2020 financial crisis and the March Lockdown.

The lockdown and closure of national economies triggers a second spree of mass unemployment coupled with the engineered bankruptcy (applied Worldwide) of small and medium sized enterprises.

All of which is spearheaded by the installation of a global totalitarian State which is intent upon breaking all forms of protest and resistance.

The Covid vaccination program (including the embedded digital passport) (see Chapter VI) is an integral part of a global totalitarian regime.

What is the infamous **ID2020**? It is an alliance of public-private partners, including UN agencies and civil society. It’s an electronic ID program that uses generalized vaccination as a platform for digital identity. The program harnesses existing birth registration and vaccination operations to provide newborns with a portable and persistent biometrically-linked digital identity. 

**red zones, face masks, social distancing, lockdown,** (Peter Koenig, March 12, 2020)

**“The Great Reset”**

The same powerful creditors which triggered the Covid Global Debt Crisis are now establishing a “New Normal” which essentially consists in imposing what the World Economic Forum describes as the “Great Reset”

Using COVID-19 lockdowns and restrictions to push through this transformation, the Great Reset is being rolled out under the guise of a ‘Fourth Industrial Revolution’ in
which older enterprises are to be driven to bankruptcy or absorbed into monopolies, effectively shutting down huge sections of the pre-COVID economy. Economies are being ‘restructured’ and many jobs will be carried out by AI-driven machines.

The jobless (and there will be many) would be placed on some kind of universal basic income and have their debts (indebtedness and bankruptcy on a massive scale is the deliberate result of lockdowns and restrictions) written off in return for handing their assets to the state or more precisely to the financial institutions helping to drive this Great Reset. The WEF says the public will ‘rent’ everything they require: stripping the right of ownership under the guise of ‘sustainable consumption’ and ‘saving the planet’. Of course, the tiny elite who rolled out this great reset will own everything. (Colin Todhunter, Dystopian Great Reset, November 9, 2020)

Push the Reset Button

The World Economic Forum’s Great Reset has been long in the making. “Push the reset button” with a view to saving the World Economy had was announced by WEF Chairman Klaus Schwab in January 2014, six years prior to the onslaught of the Covid 19 pandemic.

“What we want to do in Davos this year [2014] is to Push the Reset Button, The World is much too much caught in a crisis mode.”

Two years later in a 2016 interview with the Swiss French language TV network (RTS), Klaus Schwab talked about implanting microchips in human bodies, which in essence is the basis of the “experimental” Covid mRNA vaccine. “What we see is a kind of fusion of the physical, digital and biological world” said Klaus Schwab.

Schwab explained that human beings will soon receive a chip which will be implanted in their bodies in order to merge with the digital World. (listen to interview in French)

RTS: “When will that happen?

KS: “Certainly in the next ten years.

“We could imagine that we will implant them in our brain or in our skin”.

“And then we can imagine that there is direct communication between the brain and the digital World”.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dg6BlXuj8cM .

June 2020. The WEF officially announces the Great Reset

“The pandemic represents a rare but narrow window of opportunity to reflect, reimagine, and reset our world to create a healthier, more equitable, and more prosperous future” — Klaus Schwab, WEF (June 2020)

What is envisaged under “the Great Reset” is a scenario whereby the global creditors will have appropriated by 2030 the World’s wealth, while impoverishing large sectors of the World Population.
In 2030 “You’ll own nothing, And you’ll be happy.” (see video below)

The United Nations: An Instrument of Global Governance on Behalf of an Unelected Public / Private Partnership

The UN system is also complicit. It has endorsed “global governance” and The Great Reset.

While UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres rightfully acknowledges that the pandemic is “more than a health crisis”, no meaningful analysis or debate under UN auspices as to the real causes of this crisis has been undertaken.

According to a September 2020 UN Report:

“Hundreds of thousands of lives have been lost. The lives of billions of people have been disrupted. In addition to the health impacts, COVID-19 has exposed and exacerbated deep inequalities ... It has affected us as individuals, as families, communities and societies. It has had an impact on every generation, including on those not yet born. The crisis has highlighted fragilities within and among nations, as well as in our systems for mounting a coordinated global response to shared threats. (UN Report)

The far-reaching decisions which triggered social and economic destruction World wide are not mentioned. No debate in the UN Security Council. Consensus among all Five Permanent Members of the UNSC.

V the Virus is casually held responsible for the process of economic destruction.

The World Economic Forum’s “public-private partnership” project entitled “Reimagine and Reset our World” has been endorsed by the United Nations.

Flash back to George Kennan and the Truman Doctrine in the late 1940s. Kennan believed that the UN provided a useful way to “connect power with morality,” using morality, as a means to rubber-stamp America’s “humanitarian wars”.
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The Covid crisis and the lockdown measures are the culmination of a historical process.

The lockdown and closure of the global economy are “weapons of mass destruction” which in the real sense of the word “destroy people’s lives”.

What we are dealing with are extensive “crimes against humanity”.

**President Joe Biden and the “Great Reset”**

Joe Biden is a groomed politician, a trusted proxy, serving the interests of the financial establishment.

Let’s not forget that Joe Biden was a firm supporter of the Invasion of Iraq on the grounds that Saddam Hussein “had weapons of mass destruction”. “The American People were deceived into this war”, said Senator Dick Durbin. Do not let yourself be deceived again by Joe Biden.

Evolving acronyms. 9/11, GWOT, WMD and now COVID: Biden was rewarded for having supported the invasion of Iraq.

During the election campaign, Fox News described Biden as a “socialist” who threatens capitalism: “Joe Biden’s disturbing connection to the socialist ‘Great Reset’ movement”.

While this is absolute nonsense, many “progressives” and anti-war activists have endorsed Joe Biden without analyzing the broader consequences of a Biden presidency.

“The Great Reset” is socially divisive, it’s racist. It is a diabolical project of Global Capitalism. It constitutes a threat to the large majority of Americans workers as well as to small and medium sized enterprises. It also undermines several important sectors of the capitalist economy.

**The Biden Presidency and the Lockdown**

With regard to Covid, Biden is firmly committed to the “Second Wave”, i.e. maintaining the partial closing down of both the US economy and the global economy as a means to “combating the killer virus”.

Joe Biden will push for the adoption of the WEF’s “Great Reset” both nationally and internationally, with devastating economic and social consequences. The 2021 World Economic Forum (WEF) meetings scheduled for Summer 2021 in Singapore will focus on the implementation of the “Great Reset”.

President Biden is a firm supporter of the Corona lockdown. His statements concerning a “Dark Winter” in 2021 confirm that he not only endorses the adoption of staunch Covid-19
lockdown policies, his administration will pursue and adopt the World Economic Forum’s “Great Reset” and the ‘vaccine passport” as an integral part of US foreign policy, to be implemented or more correctly “imposed” Worldwide.

In turn, the Biden-Harris administration will attempt to override all forms of popular resistance to the corona virus lockdown.

What is unfolding is a new and destructive phase of US imperialism. It’s a totalitarian project of economic and social engineering, which ultimately destroys people’s lives Worldwide. This “novel” neoliberal agenda using the corona lockdown as an instrument of social oppression has been endorsed by President Biden and the leadership of the Democratic Party.

The Biden White House will be used to instate what David Rockefeller called “Global Governance”, which is tantamount to a Worldwide “democratic dictatorship”.

It should be noted that the protest movement in the US, against the lockdown is weak. In fact there is no coherent grassroots national protest movement. Why? Because “progressive forces” including leftist intellectuals, NGO leaders, trade union and labor leaders –most of whom are aligned with the Democratic Party– have from the outset been supportive of the lockdown. And they are also supportive of Joe Biden.

In a bitter irony, antiwar activists as well as the critics of neoliberalism have endorsed Joe Biden.

Unless there is significant protest and organized resistance, nationally and internationally, the Great Reset will be embedded in both domestic and US foreign policy agendas of the Joe Biden-Kamala Harris administration.

It’s what you call Imperialism with a “Human Face”.

Where is the Protest Movement against this Unelected Corona “public-private partnership”?

The same philanthropic foundations (Rockefeller, Ford, Soros, et al) which are the unspoken architects of the “Great Reset” and “Global Governance” are also involved in (generously) financing Climate Change activism, the Extinction Rebellion, the World Social Forum, Black Lives Matters, LGBT, et al.

What this means is that the grassroots of these social movements are often misled and betrayed by their leaders who are routinely coopted by a handful of corporate foundations.

The World Social Forum (WSF), which is commemorating its 20th anniversary brings together committed anti-globalization activists from all over the World. But who controls the WSF? From the outset in January 2001, it was (initially) funded by the Ford Foundation.

It’s what you call “manufactured dissent” (far more insidious than Herman-Chomsky’s “manufactured consent”).

The objective of the financial elites “has been to fragment the people’s movement into a vast “do it yourself” mosaic. Activism tends to be piecemeal. There is no integrated anti-globalization anti-war movement.” (Michel Chossudovsky, Manufacturing Dissent, Global Research, 2010)
In the words of McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation (1966-1979):

“Everything the [Ford] Foundation did could be regarded as “making the World safe for capitalism”, reducing social tensions by helping to comfort the afflicted, provide safety valves for the angry, and improve the functioning of government

The Protest movement against the Great Reset which constitutes a “Global Coup d’état” requires a process of Worldwide mobilization:

“.There can be no meaningful mass movement when dissent is generously funded by those same corporate interests [WEF, Gates, Ford, et al] which are the target of the protest movement”.

The Road Ahead

More than 7 billion people Worldwide are directly or indirectly affected by the corona crisis. Several billion people are slated to be vaccinated by an “unapproved” experimental mRNA vaccine.

What is required is the development of a broad based grassroots network which confronts both the architects of this crisis as well as the national and regional governments (States, provinces) involved in imposing the vaccine as well carrying out the lockdown and closure of economic activity as a means to combating “V the Virus”.

The legitimacy of politicians and their powerful corporate sponsors must be questioned, including the police state measures adopted to enforce the closure of economic activity, the imposition of a digital vaccine passport as well as the wearing of the face mask, social distancing, etc.

This network would be established (nationally and internationally) at all levels of society, in towns and villages, work places, parishes. Trade unions, farmers organizations, professional associations, business associations, student unions, veterans associations, church groups would be called upon to integrate this movement.

The first task would be to disable the fear campaign and media disinformation as well put an end to Big Pharma’s Covid vaccination programme.

The corporate media would be directly challenged, without specifically targeting mainstream journalists, many of whom have been instructed to abide by the official narrative. This endeavour would require a parallel process at the grassroots level, of sensitizing and educating fellow citizens on the nature of virus, the PCR test, the impacts of the lockdown, the face mask and social distancing.

“Spreading the word” through social media and independent online media outlets will be undertaken bearing in mind that Google as well as Facebook are instruments of censorship.

The creation of such a movement, which forcefully challenges the legitimacy of the financial elites as well as the structures of political authority at the national level, is no easy task. It will require a degree of solidarity, unity and commitment unparalleled in World history.

It will also require breaking down political and ideological barriers within society (i.e. between political parties) and acting with a single voice. We must also understand that the
“corona project” is an integral part of the U.S. imperial agenda. It has geopolitical and strategic implications. It will also require eventually unseating the architects of this diabolical “pandemic” and indicting them for crimes against humanity.
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