

The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison

A Review of the docuseries Never Again is Now Global

By Dan Fournier



eBook edition

May 9, 2023

Foreword

This eBook is a synthesis, or collage, of a **6-part review** of the documentary film called [Never Again Is Now Global](#) which draws numerous comparisons between the **Holocaust** which occurred preceding and during World War II and the current **Covid-19 Pandemic** and its harsh measures. A more descriptive summary of the film is provided below under *Introduction to the Film*.

This series reviews and analyzes the major claims stated by witness participants from the film in order to objectively verify their respective merits and validity.

Each of the 6 parts were published as separate, individual posts, on Dan Fournier's Substack at fournier.substack.com from February 22 until May 9, 2023:

1. [The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 1](#)
2. [The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 2](#)
3. [The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 3](#)
4. [The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 4](#)
5. [The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 5](#)
6. [The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 6](#)

A Table of Contents figures below.

This review series' author, [Dan Fournier](#), is an independent investigative journalist and long-time educator based in Quebec, Canada.

Having worked and lived in China from July, 2008 until the end of October, 2021, he obtained a first-hand perspective of the how the pandemic originated, developed, and evolved, including the harsh measures and restrictions imposed on people.

Such kinds of measures and restrictions continued after the author's return to his native country, Canada, which saw some of the [most restrictive measures in the world](#) imposed on its citizens.

Upon his return, Dan Fournier experienced a reverse-culture-shock in that he no longer recognised his home country – one in for which its people had traditionally been convivial, strong, proud, and freedom-loving souls.

What struck him most were the harsh restrictions for the non-vaccinated, how they were insulted, ridiculed, and vilified by the country's own Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau, as well as many others, the extent to which people had become physically and psychologically isolated, and how society as a whole had become extremely divisive and confrontational.

These are some of the reasons that the author opted for a radical vocational change, after having worked for over 35 years in the educational sector, 22 as a teacher. The main motivation for this being that he wanted to find out what the hell happened to Canada (and the world, for that matter), particularly regarding the incomprehensible events and abuses that surrounded the

pandemic.

The **purpose** of this review series is stated shortly hereafter under *Purpose and Methodology of this Review*.

Another ambition of this comprehensive work is to **preserve a historical record** for current and future generations of citizens around the world regarding some important events surrounding the **global Covid-19 Pandemic** which was thrust on the world from at least December 31, 2019.

It is the hope of this author that this work can be shared to as many souls around the world, for if we fail to learn from this historical disaster, it is likely to be repeated. As such, this author releases this work into the public domain and seeks no financial consideration for it.

Are there remarkable parallels between the two periods?



Table of Contents:



The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, **Part 1**

Purpose and Methodology of this Review

Introduction to the Film

A quick overview of the Holocaust and the

Etymology of the term itself

What was the Holocaust?

Episode 1 – Here We Go Again On Steroids

1.1 Dr. Vladimir Zelenko on the deliberate suppression of early treatment

1.2 Rabbi Michael Green on the parallels between the Holocaust and the Covid-19 Pandemic

1.3 Dr. Hervé Seligmann on false science and disinformation

This Post is Dedicated to members of The White Rose

Appendix 1 – Letter penned by 280 professors of Laval University to the executive regarding Prof. Patrick Provost’s possible suspension (in French).




The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, **Part 2**

Episode 2 – Anyone Who Wants To Start A War Has To Lie

2.1 Dr. Vladimir Zelenko on AIDS caused by the Covid-19 vaccines

2.2 Vera Sharav on global concentration of power

2.3 Joshua Stylman on the violation of the Nuremberg Code & international laws



The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, **Part 3**


Episode 3 – Breaking The Veil Of The Real Conspirators

3.1 Vera Sharav on the Eugenics Movement & the Gates Family

3.2 Vera Sharav on Transhumanism

3.3 Vera Sharav on how Covid-19 was planned Biowarfare

Summary & Conclusion (for Part 3)



The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 4
Episode 4 –This Time Around We’re All Jews
 4.1 Dr. Michael Yeadon former Pfizer VP on the absurdity of Covid-19 measures
 4.2 Dr. Michael Yeadon on planned Digital IDs & CBDCs
 Summary & Conclusion (for Part 4)




The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 5
Episode 5 –Never Give In - Never Give Up
 5.1 Monica Felgendreher on who is funding the fact-checking outfits
 5.2 Supplement: The WHO & its own Network of Fact-Checkers
 Summary & Conclusion (for Part 5)



The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 6
 Parts 1 to 5 Recap
 Series Conclusion
 Dedication

The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 1



Cover image for the docuseries *Never Again Is Now Global*.

Purpose and Methodology of this Review

A short description of the film is presented in the sub-section below. But for now, it is one which posits clear **parallels** between the **Holocaust** and the current Covid-19 Pandemic.

This **review** introduces some of the **key claims** put forth in the documentary film along with some of the best **evidence** it provides with the **aim** of **analysing their merits**, so as to offer an **objective** determination regarding the veracity and accuracy of its contents.

Furthermore, this review seeks to cast aside any traces of sensationalistic and propagandistic elements in order to focus solely on the validity of its content.

Moreover, it seeks to offer an **impartial examination** of the **facts**, particularly through the lens of **primary sources**, i.e., through official documents, scientific and medical research papers, official statements by key figures, photographs, videos, and more. Additional sources, independent of the film, will be provided to supplement the analysis.

The author of this review will **refrain** from presenting **personal views** and make it a point to **not** include conjecture or any form of **propaganda** - there will be no eerie background music or sensational images designed to gaslight or persuade its audience in any direction.

The alleged **best evidence** from each part of the series will be **outlined** and **scrutinised** for their **validity** and **credibility**, not excluding their respective sources and authors.

Only through such an *objective analysis* can **proper discernment** be utilised to get to the *truth*.

Of course, many will argue that truth, in itself, is a subjective rather than objective beast; howbeit, this author invites each individual reader to keep an open mind and use his or her own judgement to decide for oneself what truth is revealed.

Let the reader also be cognizant that since this author is Canadian, there will be a higher degree of Canada-related sources added to this review and analysis, so as to provide a more localised context of the events that surround the issues herein.

That is not to say that sources from several different countries will not be used to substantiate the analyses and provide additional context, due to the global nature of the pandemic at hand.

Introduction to the Film

January 30, 2023, saw the premier of a film called [Never Again Is Now Global](#), a five-part docuseries produced by Holocaust survivor [Vera Sharav](#) that highlights the parallels between Nazi Germany and global pandemic policies and mandates related to Covid-19.

[Children's Health Defense hosts](#) the [series](#) on its website and provides the following details about the film [links included]:

“[The Alliance for Human Research Protection](#), founded by Holocaust survivor and human rights activist [Vera Sharav](#), produced the film and Sharav directed it.”

“Each one-hour episode focuses on recent testimonies by Holocaust survivors and their descendants who discuss comparisons between the early repressive stages under the Nazi regime that culminated in the Holocaust and global [COVID-19](#) policies.”

“Individuals featured in the docuseries explain how Nazi interventions — including the suspension of freedoms, imposition of lockdowns, coerced medical procedures and identity passports — are similar to modern-day dictatorial constraints on citizens worldwide.”

“In addition to testimonials and insights from Holocaust survivors and their families, the series also includes comments and analyses by

historians, professors, doctors, rabbis, activists and scientists — one of whom was Pfizer’s former vice president and chief scientist — from around the world.”

“The [32 participants](#) in the series tell their stories, share their opinions and deliver this urgent message: Today’s false narrative, suspension of freedoms, medical dictates and violations of human rights are reminiscent of the Nazi playbook. This time, the repressive measures are not limited to Jews — today’s false narrative targets the entire global population.”

“As a young child, the Nazis deported Sharav to a concentration camp, from which she narrowly escaped with her life. She encourages people to watch the docuseries with an open mind.”

“The Holocaust was only possible because of mass obedience to authority,” Sharav said. “Our survival rests on our willingness to resist oppressive, unlawful orders.”



Romanian-born holocaust survivor Vera Sharav.

“Each one-hour episode focuses on recent testimonies by Holocaust survivors and their descendants who discuss comparisons between the early repressive stages under the Nazi regime that culminated in the Holocaust and global COVID-19 policies,” [describes Sharav](#).

A four-minute trailer of the film commences with Vera Sharav stating that those who are responsible for the pandemic “have used two of the weapons the Nazis used which was fear and propaganda.”

She continued,

“At that time [during the Holocaust] the fear was against Jews who were accused of being spreaders of infectious disease. The thing that I realise, and was horrified by, was that medicine under the Nazis had been totally taken over by government. And so, I realised that panic was being fomented so that people would lose confidence in their ability to discern things. And so, the best way is listen to public health officials, the “experts.””

Video – Trailer for *Never Again Is Now Global* docuseries film:

<https://youtu.be/80cThwUHr8w>

Official trailer for Never Again Is Now Global, alternate links via [Bitchute](#), [Rumble](#)

A quick overview of the Holocaust and the Etymology of the term itself

Before providing an overview of what is usually meant by *Holocaust*, it is preferable to examine its meaning, or etymology.

It is important to do so since the film’s major premise is that the current Covid-19 Pandemic is synonymous with the events that surrounded the Holocaust which took place preceding and during World War II.

We can first have a look at the entry for the term in Etymonline.com:

holocaust (n.)

mid-13c., “sacrifice by fire, burnt offering,” from Old French *holocauste* (12c.), or directly from Late Latin *holocaustum*, from Greek *holokauston* “a thing wholly burnt,” neuter of *holokaustos* “burned whole,” from *holos* “whole” (from PIE root **sol-* “whole, well-kept”) + *kaustos*, verbal adjective of *kaiein* “to burn” (see **caustic**).

Originally a Bible word for “burnt offerings,” given wider figurative sense of “massacre, destruction of a large number of persons” from 1670s. *The Holocaust* “Nazi genocide of European Jews in World War II,” first recorded 1957, earlier known in Hebrew as *Shoah* “catastrophe.” The word itself was used in English in reference to Hitler’s Jewish policies from 1942, but not as a proper name for them.

From the Greek *holos* and *kostos* which translates to “totally burnt”, it was originally a term used in the Bible. More precisely, as per a [Haaretz article](#) on the subject, it was an ancient [Hebrew term](#) - *shoah* - which signifies **complete and utter destruction**.

Moreover, the first person “believed to use the word *shoah* specifically to describe the Holocaust was writer and editor Yehuda Erez, in 1938,” explains Haaretz, continuing:

“Erez, who emigrated from Russia to British Mandate Palestine 1923, wrote the article “With the Shoah in Europe” in December 1938, saying, “We are horrified at the foundation by the *shoah* that is taking place upon the heads of German Jewry.”

They add:

“Even before World War II broke out, ultra-Orthodox publications began calling the events befalling Germany’s Jews a *shoah*. The term also appeared here and there in secular periodicals. Once the Nazis invaded Poland and the war truly erupted, the word *shoah* began to spread to the daily newspapers.”

What was the Holocaust?

The [United States Holocaust Memorial Museum](#) defines it as follows:

“The Holocaust was the systematic, state-sponsored persecution and murder of six million European Jews by the Nazi German regime and its allies and collaborators. The Holocaust was an evolving process that took place throughout Europe between 1933 and 1945.”

The description above appears to be a good one. When people hear Holocaust, they tend to think that it was mostly centered around the extermination of 6 million Jews during the *later stages* of WWII. It is important, however and historically-speaking, to understand that the events surrounding the Holocaust began several years *before* the start of the Second World War.

So as to not make this post focused on a history lesson of this time, the reader is invited to learn more about the Holocaust from the following **sources**.

- The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum – Holocaust Encyclopedia – Introduction to the Holocaust, URL: <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/introduction-to-the-holocaust>
- The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum – Learn about the Holocaust, URL: <https://www.ushmm.org/learn/holocaust>

- History.com – The Holocaust, URL: <https://www.history.com/topics/world-war-ii/the-holocaust>
- The Wiener Holocaust Library – What was the Holocaust? URL: <https://www.theholocaustexplained.org/what-was-the-holocaust/>
- The Wiener Holocaust Library – Why did the Holocaust happen? URL: <https://www.theholocaustexplained.org/how-and-why/why/>
- The Wiener Holocaust Library – What is Genocide? URL: <https://www.theholocaustexplained.org/what-was-the-holocaust/what-was-genocide/>
- My Jewish Learning – A Timeline of the Holocaust, URL: <https://www.myjewishlearning.com/article/a-timeline-of-the-holocaust/>
- National Geographic – History & Culture Explainer – How the Holocaust happened in plain sight, URL: <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/article/holocaust-adolf-hitler-history-genocide-denial>
- PBS – Want to Learn More About the Holocaust? URL: <https://www.pbs.org/articles/want-to-learn-more-about-the-holocaust/>
- BBC – The Holocaust, URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/topics/c34vxewp0ykt>
- BBC – The Holocaust – Auschwitz: How death camp became centre of Nazi Holocaust, URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-50743973>
- Haaretz – The Holocaust: Facts and Figures, URL: <https://www.haaretz.com/jewish/holocaust-remembrance-day/2013-07-24/ty-article/the-holocaust-facts-and-figures/0000017f-e401-d9aa-aff-fd5995f10000>
- ATI – Holocaust Photos That Reveal Heartbreaking Tragedy Only Hinted At In The History Books, URL: <https://allthatsinteresting.com/holocaust-photos>

1 – Why Study History?

“Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.”

Winston Churchill (1874 - 1965)
Former Prime Minister of England



Famous quotation about history from Sir Winston Churchill who was pivotal in the events surrounding WWII. Image source: screenshot taken from the free online eBook [History of the World: From Ancient Mesopotamia to the Rise of England](#) by Dan Fournier (the same author as this post).

Comparing Holocaust deaths from WWII with that of Covid-19


While it is difficult to compare the total number of deaths attributable to the respective events of each, some raw numbers can be used in order to make a general comparison.

- Total number of **deaths (murders)** of Jews (not counting other civilian and military deaths from the war) due to the Holocaust is estimated at roughly **6 million**.

Source: [Haaretz - The Holocaust: Facts and Figures](#).

- Total deaths attributable to the SARS-CoV-2 virus, or the associated Covid-19 disease is estimated at roughly **6.86 million**.

Source: [Johns Hopkins COVID-19 Dashboard](#). (screenshot presented below)



Screenshot of John Hopkins' [COVID-19 Dashboard](#) taken on February 20, 2023.

The Johns Hopkins numbers appear similar to other dashboards (see [WHO](#), [Worldometer](#), [CNN](#), and [KFF](#)).

Also, other estimates tend to put the number of deaths higher, as with Nature's [The pandemic's true death toll: millions more than official counts](#) which puts the count as high as over **20 million deaths** (dated January, 2022).

Deaths related to, or as a result of Covid-19 vaccinations should also be considered.

Although obtaining accurate data for this segment is more difficult, estimates can still be approximated; and some researchers have done just that.

Canadian Researcher Denis G. Rancourt along with three fellow researchers have published a paper called [Age-stratified COVID-19 vaccine-dose fatality rate for Israel and Australia](#), published February 9, 2023, which they extrapolated the

global mortality rate based on the number of deaths attributable to the vaccine in India. The relevant section of their [research paper](#) reads as follows:

“On the global scale, given the 3.7 million fatalities in India alone, having vDFR = 1 % (Rancourt, 2022), and given the age-stratified vDFR results presented in this work, it is not unreasonable to assume an all-population global value of vDFR = 0.1 %. Based on the global number of COVID-19 vaccine doses administered to date (13.25 billion doses, up to 24 January 2023, Our World in Data),³ this would correspond to **13 million deaths from the COVID-19 vaccines worldwide.**”

On the flipside, some researchers claim that the **Covid-19 vaccinations have helped to prevent roughly 14 to 20 million deaths** as per their [work published in 2022](#) in The Lancet’s Infectious Diseases though [other researchers](#) (alternate [link](#)) and [Roger Koops](#), (who [holds](#) a Ph.D. in Chemistry from the University of California and worked in the Pharmaceutical and Biotechnology Industry for over 25 years) have challenged the numbers and methodology.

Determining a workable estimate of either the number of deaths attributable to the Covid-19 vaccinations or the number of lives they may have saved is beyond the scope of this review.

Nevertheless, it is important to consider the possible number of deaths associated with the Covid-19 vaccinations for the *purpose of this review* because it is an integral part of the claims of the authors of the [Never Again Is Now Global](#) film. As such, they are based on the presumption that these deaths were *intentional*. Whether or not this author or the reader agrees with this presumption or not is irrelevant, for it is posited for the purpose of exploring and examining the claim.

To condense and simplify the figures, the following table serves as a practical reference for comparison purposes to conclude this section. The ‘Estimated deaths alleged to be attributable to Covid-19 Vaccinations’ figure is based on the work of the researcher Denis Rancourt stated above.

Deaths attributable to the Holocaust from WWII	Deaths attributable to Covid-19	Estimated deaths alleged to be attributable to Covid-19 Vaccinations
	6,860,000	13,000,000
6,000,000	19,860,000	

On a side note, Visual Capitalist in its [Visualizing the History of Pandemics](#) compares the Covid-19 Pandemic with others from prior periods in history.

Episode 1 – Here We Go Again On Steroids

The [first episode](#) (click the link to watch) aired on January 30, 2023.

<https://live.childrenshealthdefense.org/chd-tv/events/never-again-is-now-global/Never-Again-Is-Now-Global-Part-1/>

1.1 Dr. Vladimir Zelenko

At the 11:16 mark, **Dr. Vladimir Zelenko**, a third generation Holocaust survivor, asserts that then governor of New York City, Mario Cuomo, decided that Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) for patients of Covid-19 was to be prohibited - as would turn out to be the case in many states.

Zelenko stated that the drug has been around for 65 years and used over a billion times.

At the time, Dr. Zelenko was treating Covid-19 patients with the drug with significant success. But the government imposed a decree preventing its use which put a barrier between the doctor-patient relationship, Zelenko asserted. As a result of no longer having access to the medication, patients started dying, he continued.

Zelenko expressed concern for the government narrative which made no medical sense to him.

The Jewish doctor then stated that data from his treatment protocols was [published internationally](#) (in ScienceDirect) and showed an [84% reduction in hospitalizations](#) for Covid-19 patients.

“Out of 900,000 dead Americans, we could have prevented 760,000 from even going to the hospital,” Zelenko concluded in this segment of the episode.

It is no secret that Dr. Zelenko has been ostracised in the media for his use of Hydroxychloroquine in his treatments of patients.

Part of his Wikipedia page alone reads as follows: “He also promoted unfounded medical advice, conspiracy theories, and misinformation about COVID-19 vaccination,” based upon what can none other be described as a [smear piece](#) in Forward which describes itself as “Jewish. Independent. NonProfit.” Language therein such as “doctor spouts conspiracy theories, anti-vaccine,” attests to the poor quality of the piece. It commences:

“The Hasidic doctor behind an [unsubstantiated](#) treatment for coronavirus espoused anti-vaccine and conspiracist views in a video circulating on WhatsApp among Haredi, or Ultra-Orthodox Jews.”

The article’s author, [Molly Boigon](#), does not appear to have any medical credentials and rather cites two New York Times articles to suggest Dr. Zelenko’s treatment using HCQ is “unsubstantiated.”

Forward receives its funding from donors which includes philanthropic partners which are not stated on their website; this author has contacted them for clarification but has yet to receive a response.

In short, this piece against Dr. Zelenko is one of many which fail to provide evidence which disproves the claims of effectiveness of Dr. Zelenko’s treatment protocols.

A more objective description of Dr. Zelenko can be found on [Conservapedia](#).

As to the claims of effectiveness of Dr. Zelenko’s treatments and related publications, some peer-reviewed, they do hold up to scrutiny in the medical establishment as can be verified by the following publications:

- American Journal of Epidemiology - [Early Outpatient Treatment of Symptomatic, High-Risk COVID-19 Patients That Should Be Ramped Up Immediately as Key to the Pandemic Crisis](#), published on May 27, 2020, and authored by Harvey A. Risch from the Department of Chronic Disease Epidemiology, Yale School of Public Health.
- NIH Pubmed - [COVID-19 outpatients: early risk-stratified treatment with zinc plus low-dose hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin: a retrospective case series study](#), (alternate [link via ScienceDirect](#)) published on Oct. 26, 2020, by Roland Derwand Martin Scholz, and Vladimir Zelenko.
- New England Journal of Medicine - [Observational Study of Hydroxychloroquine in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19](#), published on May 7, 2020 by 12 MDs & PhDs
- NIH Pubmed - [Low dose of hydroxychloroquine reduces fatality of critically ill patients with COVID-19](#) (alternate [link via Springer](#)), Published on May 15th, 2020, by 8 authors.
- NIH Pubmed - [Early treatment of COVID-19 patients with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin: A retrospective analysis of 1061 cases in Marseille, France](#), (alternate [link via ScienceDirect](#)), published on May 5, 2020 by 37 authors.
- NIH Pubmed - [Zinc augments the antiviral potential of HCQ/CQ and ivermectin to reduce the risks of more serious outcomes from COVID-19 infection](#), (alternate link via [ScienceDirect](#)) published on Feb. 17, 2022 by Alberto Boretti.

From the first peer-review journal entry above, let the reader observe the impressive credentials of its author, **Dr. Harvey Risch**, who is a renowned Epidemiologist from Yale and one of the most respected and published practitioner in his field.

Canadian blogger Viva Frei [interviewed him in March of 2022](#) wherein he describes his credentials which include a PhD in mathematical modeling of infectious epidemics from the University of Chicago, among many other degrees, along with an honest account of events surrounding the treatment of Covid-19 patients. In the interview, Risch provides a no-nonsense and very objective and measured assessment of the facts, as he did when he outlined his review of Dr. Zelenko's treatment protocol in his research paper:

The third piece of evidence involves a cohort of 1,450 patients treated by Dr. Vladimir Zelenko of Monroe, New York. Dr. Zelenko has released a 2-page report (28) describing his clinical reasoning and procedures, dosing conditions and regimen, and patient results through April 28. Symptomatic patients presenting to Dr. Zelenko were treated with 5 days of HCQ + AZ + zinc sulfate if they were considered high-risk, as evidenced by 1 or more of the following: age 60 years or older; high-risk comorbidity; body mass index (weight (kg)/height² (m²)) ≥ 30 ; and mild shortness of breath at presentation. Patients were considered to have COVID-19 on the basis of clinical grounds and started treatment as soon as possible following symptom onset, rather than waiting for test results before starting treatment. Of the 1,450 patients, 1,045 were classified as low-risk and sent home to recuperate without active medications. No deaths or hospitalizations occurred among them. Of the remaining 405 who were treated with the combined regimen, 6 were ultimately hospitalized and 2 died. No cardiac arrhythmias were noted in these 405 patients.

Extract from the peer-review paper [Early Outpatient Treatment of Symptomatic, High-Risk COVID-19 Patients That Should Be Ramped Up Immediately as Key to the Pandemic Crisis](#), published on May 27, 2020 in the American Journal of Epidemiology, authored by Harvey A. Risch.

Early last year, [Dr. Paul Elias Alexander](#), an epidemiologist from the University of Toronto, published a piece titled [Early Outpatient Treatment for COVID-19: The Evidence](#) which nicely cites and summarises the findings of early treatment using Hydroxychloroquine and Ivermectin.

To sum up this subsection, Dr. Zelenko's claims of early treatment using HCQ in combination with other substances have not been disproven by the medical community, but rather have been adequately substantiated.

1.2 Rabbi Michael Green

Another participant witness in the film, Rabbi Michael Green in Massachusetts, postulates the **marginalisation of the minority** as an obvious parallel between the period of the Nazis and the Covid-19 Pandemic.

Near the 27:07 mark, Green states [some links and **emphasis added for relevancy**]:

“I really truly see a parallel. **The parallel is really undeniable.** I feel that any objective person should be morally outraged by any time a government or corporations band together to trample on individual human liberties. I see this as a moment of truth for humanity. **What we’ re clearly seeing here is a replay of the same tell-tale signs of what precipitated the Holocaust in the 1930s. The marginalisation of the minority, identifying the minority as a threat to public health, or public health risk. That is exactly what [\[Joseph\] Goebbels](#) did, right out of the Nazi playbook...**And it doesn’ t matter if these people claim to do this for the greater good, because that’ s what Nazis did as well. But that doesn’ t justify marginalisation, persecution, and apartheid, and ultimately eugenics policy targeting innocent human beings. And what we’ re seeing nowadays is precisely that. **For the last 80, 70 some years we’ re chanting “Never Again” , we’ ll never allow this...**Those same liberal organisations are doing exactly that.”

He continues his testimony drawing yet another parallel from the Nazi era - “papers” , ironically stating:

“Just recently there was a Jewish woman who herself was also a Holocaust survivor who was asked to speak at an event in Touro College for Holocaust Memorial Day. And...they cancelled her because she could not show her vaccine papers. Can you imagine?”

For those unfamiliar, the utterance “Papers please” refers to how the Nazis use to go around neighborhoods asking people for identification to spot out Jews from non-Jews and to restrict their movements within designated areas. Moreover, members of Jewish communities were viewed as “unclean” by the Nazis which is one of the principal factors which lead to their persecution and extermination by the radical group.



A 1940 photograph of German police or soldiers checking the identification papers of a Jew in the streets of Krakow, Poland. Image [source](#).

Objectively speaking, the parallel outlined by Green about the marginalisation of individuals during the Covid-19 Pandemic is hard to refute.

This trend of segregating and degrading individuals based on their Covid-19 vaccination status, of those who have chosen not to wear masks for that matter, has certainly been on high display in countries such as Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, particularly during 2021 and early 2022.

The same can be said about the majority of countries in Europe where commuters and travelers were often checked for their “papers” .



Italian Carabinieri police officers check the QR code confirming that people received the Covid-19 vaccine, at Fontivegge Station in Rome, Italy on Dec. 6 2021. Source: AAP Image/EPA/GIUSEPPE LAMI. Photo via [SBS Italiano](#).



Police officers in Italy check a citizens "Green Pass" papers. Photo source: [TGCom24 Italy](#).

In this author's country, Canada, individuals who were not vaccinated for Covid-19 and could not show proof of vaccination were not allowed to travel by train or airplane, dine in restaurants, nor shop in non-essential businesses for parts of 2021 and early 2022.

Here is a video clip of a speech given by Prime Minister Justin Trudeau in Calgary:

Video: CPAC – Justin Trudeau campaigns in Calgary – August 19, 2021

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K5qRPn7_JA

Trudeau stated, verbatim:

“You deserve better. You deserve a government that is going to continue to say: “get vaccinated.” And you know what? If you don't want to get vaccinated, that's your choice. But, don't think you can get on a plane or a train beside vaccinated people and put them at risk.”

Such strong rhetoric spoken in an angry tone is about divisive and segregational as it comes. Trudeau's words became official travel policy for several months before being suspended, not lifted or eliminated, in the second part of 2021. With little doubt, it attests to the deliberate intent on marginalising the group who have chosen to uphold their bodily autonomy.



Sign at the entrance of Canadian Tire, a retail chain store in Canada. The text reads (translated from French): “Before entering, please have in-hand your QR code [vaccination passport] and an Identity Card. Photo taken on January 29, 2022 in Sherbrooke, Quebec.



Sign at the entrance of a shopping mall in Sherbrooke, Quebec, which reads (translated from French): “Dining area reserved for those holding proof of vaccination.” Photo taken on January 29, 2022.

Signs similar to those above were displayed all around towns and cities across Canada and elsewhere in the world during the height of the Covid-19 Pandemic.

Moreover, Justin Trudeau, once again [singled out the group with choice words](#). The following video is in French, but subtitles for it can be viewed by clicking the preceding link.

Video: Justin Trudeau interview @ La Semaine des 4 Julie (/w english subtitles)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s8lo9U9s6_Y

As the leader of Canada, Trudeau stated [translated from French]: “Do we tolerate these people?”

When hundreds of truckers from around the country created a convoy to Ottawa to protest Covid-19 related mandates, Trudeau also called them and their tens of thousands of supporters a “fringe minority” with “unacceptable views.”

Video: Global News – Trudeau says "fringe minority" in trucker convoy with "unacceptable views" don't represent Canadians

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDfMybczw1k>

Once more, such choice of words leads to little confusion about the direct intent of marginalising this group of people.

Such ostracising has not been limited to politicians’ statements, but also from members of the medical community and with the larger population as a whole.

Medical doctors, [nurses](#), and other health practitioners from [Quebec](#), [Ontario](#), and other Canadian provinces who have opposed mandates and expressed concerns over the experimental Covid-19 vaccinations - particularly for children - have been severely punished by their professional associations and ridiculed by the mainstream media.

And all this, in a country that is known for its democratic freedoms, diversity and tolerance, and strong human rights.

Former New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern had also stated in a press conference the deliberate creation of a two-tier class system within her own country based on vaccination status, though she framed it in a way to help make the majority feel “safe.”

Video: The New Zealand Herald – PM Ardern on how NZ will look under the 'traffic light' system | nzherald.co.nz

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZdMSRoIWcyQ>

These are but a few of such abuses which have occurred around the globe.

Politicians from around the world used their power, seemingly in lockstep, to bestow questionable decrees and mandates - most deemed unlawful or unconstitutional - which obliged segments of society opposed to receiving experimental Covid-19 vaccines to submit to their will, lest they be fired from their job positions and scorned as a people.

Rabbi Michoel Green made another important assertion in his testimony, this time alluding to the possibility of *genocide* being committed on the masses [some emphasis added]:

“What we’ re seeing now is not just the prelude to the Holocaust, **we are witnessing genocide happening right now, global genocide...**What has been occurring in Shanghai [China] and what governments around the world are doing to people; people are literally being left to die and they’ re being locked into their homes, they’ re being denied nutrition, hydration, **access to medical care** in the name of combating an amorphous invisible disease. And that’ s exactly what the Nazis were doing which had no scientific substantiation. And...this is why I appeal to people, I appeal to, to scientists, and people who work in the medical field that you have an opportunity to, after 70 some years to atone to for the Holocaust. By doing what? **By no longer standing by complicity or collaboration with genocide, with eugenics, persecution of a minority, with scapegoating a minority.** And this is what our elected and unelected officials are doing, **blaming the unvaccinated...**It’ s the same thing [as the Holocaust], it just has a clever twist to it...It’ s the same genocidal totalitarian, tyrants doing the same thing all over again. And the only thing is they gave it a facelift. **Now it’ s not in the hands of [Nazi] brown coats, it’ s in the hand of white**

coats in the name of science. What's happened is that intelligent people have suspended their own critical thinking."

There is substantial evidence that exists which attests to people having to wait much longer periods for treatment and surgeries unrelated to Covid-19 during the pandemic. One mere example includes an [April 14, 2020 report](#) on the matter by the Fraser Institute which saw a backlog of elective cancelled surgeries.

The same can be said about hospitals and treatments centers all around the world. How many procedures were delayed or cancelled? How many have died or have seen their personal medical situations aggravated because of these? It is not an exaggeration to say that possibly hundreds of millions of patients were denied treatment and surgeries due to these restrictive measures.

Rabbi Green's claim about global genocide merits careful examination, for his choice of using this specific term implies some kind of *deliberate* plan for a massive reduction in the world's population.

While Collins dictionary defines genocide as the deliberate murder of a whole community or race, the etymology of the word itself has roots in the Holocaust.

genocide (n.)

1944, apparently coined by Polish-born U.S. jurist Raphael Lemkin (1900-1959) in his work "Axis Rule in Occupied Europe" [p.19], in reference to Nazi extermination of Jews, literally "killing a tribe," from Greek *genos* "race, kind" (from PIE root ***gene-** "give birth, beget," with derivatives referring to procreation and familial and tribal groups) + **-cide** "a killing." The proper formation would be **genticide*.

In this context, a genocide implies the deliberate extermination of a targeted group of people.

Therefore, an honest examination of this posited conspiracy would require an objective determination of *who* would be involved, their *intent* or motivations for doing so, and the means by which they could carry it out.

As this endeavour would be well beyond the scope of this series of posts for the film, it nevertheless is worth entertaining it as a possibility. As future episodes of the film touch upon this notion of intentional genocide through the Covid-19 Pandemic, related statements and materials will be scrutinised for their validity to substantiate this bold claim.

The impassioned rabbi makes another bold claim in that he compares the "**brown coats**" of the Nazi era with the "**white coats**" of today, seemingly implying the medical doctors and practitioners involved in implementing the Covid-19 policies set by governments and health authorities.

A micro history lesson is required here to better understand the meaning of “brown coats.” [History Hits](#) defines the “brown coats” - synonymously called the “brownshirts” - as follows:

The Sturmabteilung (SA)

The SA began in 1921 by Adolf Hitler. The majority of early members are disgruntled former soldiers who fought during World War I. The SA worked as a paramilitary force which worked mainly to intimidate political rivals during the early rise of the Nazi Party. This force was often known as Stormtroopers or Brownshirts because of their uniform.

“Led by Ernst Röhm from 1931 to 1934, it was distinctly separate from the German army and often used street violence to intimidate Nazi opposition,” History Hits adds.



Depiction of SA Brownshirts in 1933. Image [source](#).

Interestingly, the brownshirts were also referred to as “Stormtroopers” which is what many call the enforcers of Covid-19 policies in China, including police, who have been known to bully non-compliant subjects into submission.



Image from a video clip showing a police officer in a hazmat suit removing a protester from the scene. Image [source](#).

Green followed by touching upon *plausible deniability* and that everyone involved were just “doing their job” and taking orders, which is what Germans and others were doing during the Holocaust.

It is no secret that many medical doctors and nurses have been incentivised or even coerced to follow certain questionable Covid-19 policies and procedures such as strongly pushing their patients to get vaccinated with experimental vaccines, even if these deviated from the sacred doctor-patient relationship and Hippocratic Oath of *do no harm*.

Many were afraid to deviate from this Covid-19 orthodoxy for fear of being reprimanded, ridiculed, or terminated from their positions.

The broader question of *why* this has occurred must also be critically analysed.

Part of that analysis must take into account [possible conflicts of interests](#) that these professional associations and health agencies have with pharmaceutical companies who produced the Covid-19 vaccines.

And the same can be said with regards to how the [corporate media](#) have harshly criticised doctors who have questioned or gone against the prevailing orthodoxy on Covid-19 vaccines as well as censored their voices.

Rabbi Green asks a critical question: “At what point do people wake up?” He continues, “At what point do medical-minded people and people of scientific

backgrounds...wake up and realize that the narrative has been hijacked. And there is no free discussion, there's no dissent allowed. We're living in times of tyranny, book burning, censorship.”

A highly relevant and interesting case has been that of [Patrick Provost](#), a biochemistry researcher and professor at the Department of Microbiology, Infectiology and Immunology at Laval University, which became at odds his employer and the Collège des médecins, the main professional medical association in the province of Quebec. The publicly-outspoken Provost deviated from the Covid-19 vaccine orthodoxy and was reprimanded and punished for doing so.

Luckily for him, unlike for many others in his field, he was able to yield support from no less than 280 of his colleagues who did “wake up” and realised that there should indeed be room for academic and medical discussion. They penned a [stern letter](#) (which appears at the end of this post in Appendix 1) to their employer for breaching numerous rights in this regard. And Laval University [subsequently invalidated complaints against him and closed their investigation on the outspoken researcher](#).

There is also another case which involves [three doctors from Ontario](#) which has yet to reach its denouement, as is the situation with countless more medical practitioners from around the world.

1.3 Dr. Hervé Seligmann

Though there are many other claims worth examining in this film, the following from 2nd generation Holocaust survivor Dr. Hervé Seligmann, touches upon another significant parallel that reverberates between the two eras, namely that of false science and disinformation.

Though he spoke at other parts of this first episode, Hervé Seligmann discusses how Jews at were exposed to a tremendous amount of propaganda and were not privy to *correct* (accurate) information about the events of their time (at the 49:55 mark):

“My great grandparents wouldn't have been killed if they had the correct information...It's basically disinformation that killed them. After that, what made it possible that they would be physically killed was the disinformation. That is exactly what we are seeing [today]. I would say that's another common point with that, the previous time, because there were a lot of intellectuals and universities who went with Nazis.”

Seligmann then expands on *science* stating:

“And indeed, the control of science and deciding what is the right science...That is another point today that they say, that's what they call the [inaudible], the false science. This is a very strong parallel. And, as

we' ve said before, the disinformation point is the worst part, or the worst tool let' s say.”


How many times have the following phrases - “Trust the science” and “Follow the science” - been used during the Covid-19 Pandemic to justify health protocols and mandates?

In Canada, Prime Minister Trudeau has stated on numerous occasions that people opposed to Covid-19 vaccinations were “against the science” and were costing the lives of many.

In the United States, Dr. Anthony Fauci who led the government' s response team to the pandemic very often uttered these terms during press conferences, and when disparaging doctors and research scientists who questioned or challenged narratives emanating from the NIH (National Institutes of Health), CDC (Center for Disease Control, and FDA (Food and Drug Administration).

Though this author is not a scientist, it nonetheless remains obvious that science is a field where questioning and challenging assumptions should be integral to its study and practice.

As the late [Michael Crichton](#) - who graduated summa cum laude from Harvard College, received his MD from Harvard Medical School, taught anthropology at Cambridge University, and wrote at MIT - once observed:



The greatest scientists in history are great precisely because they broke with the consensus. There is no such thing as consensus science. If it's consensus, it isn't science. If it's science, it isn't consensus. Period.

— *Michael Crichton* —

AZ QUOTES

Yet, it seemed that all of a sudden during the Covid-19 Outbreak and Pandemic that the science was mostly agreed upon and settled. And anyone deviating from it, could be labelled as anti-science, or conspiracy theorist.

And this despite figures like Anthony Fauci and many others stating that the use of masks were useless at the start of the pandemic, only to change their tune soon afterwards.

Doctors such as Vladimir Zelenko, Robert Malone - who was the inventor of mRNA technology which was used in the four major Covid-19 vaccines, Dr. Peter McCullough, Dr. Pierre Kory, and many others were outright censored and ridiculed by the corporate press who, it must be added, receive a significant portion of their operating revenue from pharmaceutical companies such as Pfizer producing those same vaccines.

Moreover, social media platforms such as [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), and [YouTube](#) took it upon themselves, on the basis of being *private* companies, to censor many of these doctors and information that opposed any of the prevailing narratives as well as assign the *disinformation* or other warning labels on them.

While there can be a never-ending discussion on this topic alone, suffice it to say that the scale of censorship and mis/disinformation which has occurred since the start of the pandemic has been undeniably apparent.

While it is a fools errand to try to determine *who*, in totality or collectively, has been behind the scenes pulling the levers of the censorship machine, the more important question to be asked, rather, is: *Why* has this widely occurred and been amplified during the Covid-19 Pandemic?

For the moment, this, and many other questions, will have to be put on hold.

The remaining five posts in this series will continue to touch on this, and many other subjects related to the parallels between the Covid-19 Pandemic and the Holocaust, as are postulated in the film under examination.

This Post is Dedicated to members of The White Rose

Today, **February 22, 2023**, marks the **80th anniversary** of the deaths of prominent members of [The White Rose](#), a resistance group comprised of courageous Germans who opposed Hitler, the Nazis, and their destructive policies during the height of WWII.



Members of The White Rose. Image source: The Collector - [The White Rose: A Youth Resistance That Denounced Hitler](#).

You can learn more about the group by watching [The White Rose Young Germans Who Took on the Nazis](#) or the [1982 film The White Rose](#).

Video: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum – The White Rose Young Germans Who Took on the Nazis

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qbZx_44Px5Q

Appendix 1 – Letter penned by 280 professors of Laval University to the executive regarding Prof. Patrick Provost’s possible suspension (in French).



3 février 2023

Objet : suspension du professeur Patrick Provost

Madame la Rectrice,
Monsieur le Vice-recteur exécutif et vice-recteur aux ressources humaines et aux finances,
Madame la Vice-rectrice à la recherche, à la création et à l'innovation,
Madame la secrétaire générale,

Nous sommes 278 professeures/professeurs de l'Université Laval et nous voulons vous signifier que nous considérons **abusive** la sanction d'une deuxième suspension de 4 mois sans salaire¹ que l'Université Laval impose à Patrick Provost, professeur titulaire au Département de microbiologie-infectiologie et d'immunologie de la Faculté de médecine de l'Université Laval, sans que la première suspension n'ait été réglée. Dans ce contexte, nous sentons que nous ne pouvons exercer nos fonctions universitaires de manière sereine. Entre autres choses, cette décision **amène des membres du corps professoral à s'autocensurer et à limiter leur participation aux conversations liées aux enjeux sociétaux**.

À la suite de la première suspension de 8 semaines sans salaire imposée à nos collègues Provost et Derome, nous sommes restés silencieux. Nous pensions que l'Université se raviserait à la lumière des interventions du SPUL, de la Commission permanente sur la liberté académique (COPLA) et de la ministre de l'Enseignement supérieur. Rappelons en effet que :

- le SPUL soutenait, et soutient toujours, notre collègue dans les règles de l'art;
- le Comité de la Commission permanente sur la liberté académique (COPLA) de la Fédération québécoise des professeures et professeurs d'université (FQPPU) a invité la direction de l'Université Laval à revoir sa décision concernant la première suspension sans salaire ayant eu lieu l'été dernier²;
- la ministre de l'Enseignement supérieur, prenant appui sur la loi 32³ et en précisant son sens, a invité explicitement les dirigeants d'université à protéger la liberté académique et a réitéré que «sous aucune condition nous ne devrions tolérer la censure dans les milieux universitaires»⁴.

De surcroît, nous faisons jusque-là confiance à la direction de notre institution à l'effet qu'elle respecterait le chapitre 1.4 de notre convention collective :

- La professeure ou le professeur a droit à la liberté universitaire, d'enseignement, de recherche, de création et de **critique sans aucune contrainte discriminatoire** (...). La liberté universitaire comprend le droit pour la professeure ou le professeur d'exercer ses fonctions professorales **sans être obligé d'adhérer à une doctrine prescrite et sans restriction de pensée ou d'opinion**.

¹ 2 février 2023 | Daphnée Dion-Viens | Journal de Québec | [Le professeur Patrick Provost suspendu une 2e fois par l'Université Laval](#)

² 2 février 2023 | Judith Desmeules | Le Soleil | [Une 2e suspension pour le professeur Patrick Provost](#)

³ <https://fqppu.org/universite-laval-doit-rectifier-le-tir-afin-de-respecter-la-loi-sur-la-liberte-academique-en-milieu-universitaire/>

⁴ « Le Comité d'expert.es de la COPLA a estimé que l'Université Laval a démesurément étendu la définition de ce qui constitue une activité de recherche, imposant ainsi aux professeures de l'Université Laval le raisonnement circulaire selon lequel un.e chercheur.euse, parce qu'il ou elle est chercheur.euse, fait de la recherche dès qu'il ou elle remet en cause publiquement une recherche ou une politique publique et, en conséquence, doit respecter l'ensemble des règles d'éthique qui s'appliquent aux activités de recherche. »

³ https://www.publicationsduquebec.gouv.qc.ca/fileadmin/Fichiers_client/lois_et_reglements/LoisAnnuelles/fr/2022/2022C21F.PDF

⁴ https://www.ledevoir.com/opinion/idees/778119/idees-aucune-censure-n-a-sa-place-dans-les-milieux-universitaires?utm_source=recirculation&utm_medium=hyperlien&utm_campaign=corps_texte

Appendix 1 note: The names of the first three signatories were blacked out so as to not publicly reveal their identities.

The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 2



Secretary-General António Guterres (right) meets with Professor Klaus Schwab, Founder and Executive Chairman of the World Economic Forum. Photo credit and copyright: [United Nations Photo/Manuel Elias](#).

Episode 2 – Anyone Who Wants To Start A War Has To Lie

The [second episode](#) (click the link to watch) aired on January 30, 2023.

<https://live.childrenshealthdefense.org/chd-tv/events/never-again-is-now-global/Never-Again-Is-Now-Global-Part-2/>

The same methodology for a review of this second part of the docuseries applies and, once more, three of its major claims will be scrutinised on the merits of their accuracy and validity - mostly through a thorough examination and verification of key facts.

2.1 Dr. Vladimir Zelenko on AIDS caused by the Covid-19 vaccines

At the 32:11 mark, Dr. Vladimir Zelenko, a third generation Holocaust survivor, mentions people are dying from [opportunistic infection](#) which they usually wouldn't die from.

According to [HIVinfo.NIH.gov](https://www.hivinfo.nih.gov/condition-info/topics/10/what-are-opportunistic-infections), [Opportunistic infections \(OIs\)](#) are infections that occur more often or are more severe in people with weakened immune systems than in people with healthy immune systems.

Dr. Zelenko then says “There’ s a term for that. It’ s an **acquired immune deficiency syndrome** which has an acronym: **it’ s called AIDS.**”

The National Institutes of Health’ s [National Human Genome Research Institute](#) defines acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) as follows (from March 7, 2023):

“AIDS is a collection of symptoms known as acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. It is caused by infection with the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), which leads to loss of immune cells and leaves individuals susceptible to other infections and the development of certain types of cancers. There is no cure for AIDS, though drugs can slow down and stabilize the disease’ s progress.”

Due to the general understanding that AIDS is caused by HIV, the human immunodeficiency virus, many may find this claim strange. And that is perhaps why Dr. Zelenko offers the following caveat before explaining his meaning:

“Now, before people go nuts. They go nuts. I don’ t care. I actually like it. They call it VAIDS - Vaccine Immune Deficiency Syndrome. I prefer to call it AIDS because it sends the message stronger. It’ s not HIV. HIV is a virus that damages the immune system causes AIDS. It’ s true, but there are other things that can damage the immune system like this poison death shot.”

Calling the [Covid-19] vaccine a “poison death shot” is certainly controversial. But Zelenko makes an additional claim about Israel and Pfizer, one of the main manufacturers of the Covid-19 vaccines [with links added to references from the video]:

“So, the Israeli government permitted signed a deal with the devil Albert Bourla [CEO of Pfizer] who won the [genesis prize](#), which is the equivalent of the Jewish Nobel prize this year [2022]. And he [called on CNBC Israel the biggest laboratory in the world](#). And, what they’ ve done is given a large percentage of their country AIDS. They’ ve destroyed the immune system of half the Jewish people in Israel.”

Apart from the harsh labels that Dr. Zelenko’ s assigned for Pfizer, its CEO, and its vaccine, the **main claim he is making is that Pfizer’ s [mRNA] Covid-19 vaccine is destroying the immune system** of a significant portion of the Israeli population, perhaps implying this is the case elsewhere given the nature of his allegation.

Thus, what needs to be examined here is an **objective assessment or determination of the validity of his three-part claim that:**

1. Covid-19 vaccines can lead to an acquired immune deficiency syndrome,
2. It leaves individuals susceptible to other infections,
3. and the development of certain types of cancers.

The corresponding articles referenced in the docuseries while Dr. Zelenko was speaking were the following:

- [Steve Kirsch: New studies show that the COVID vaccines damage your immune system, likely permanently](#), Dec 24, 2021
- [News Medical Life Sciences – Research suggests Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine reprograms innate immune responses](#), May 10 2021
- [Scientific Studies prove the Covid-19 Vaccines damage the Immune System, and suggest it may be permanent](#), January 5, 2022 [*note: the same article, but from a different website*]
- [NexusNewsFeed.com – How the COVID-19 Vaccine destroys your immune system](#), published November 11, 2020, and has been updated with new information
- [FlyByNews – How COVID Shots Suppress Your Immune System](#), January 23, 2022
- [UK government reports suggest the fully vaccinated are rapidly developing acquired immunodeficiency syndrome, and the immune system decline has now begun in children](#), November 7, 2021

It is not difficult to look at the above articles to see what medical literature they reference to. Preferably, it is better to find articles that are peer-reviewed and have been published in reputable medical journals.

Two of the articles from above – the [News Medical Life Sciences](#) and [FlyByNews ones](#) – do reference *non-peer reviewed* articles. Still, they may contain relevant information with regards to the Covid-19 shots and weakening of the immune system and would be best evaluated for their reliability and validity by peer experts in their respective fields.

The article from NexusNewsFeed.com does reference a peer-reviewed study – [Informed Consent Disclosure to Vaccine Trial Subjects of Risk of COVID-19 Vaccine Worsening Clinical Disease](#), published in the *International Journal of Clinical Practice*, October 28, 2020 (also published in [NIH Pubmed](#)).

The study had as its aim to “determine if sufficient literature exists to require clinicians to disclose the specific risk that COVID-19 vaccines could worsen disease upon exposure to challenge or circulating virus.”

It does point out that “*COVID-19 vaccines designed to elicit neutralizing antibodies may sensitize vaccine recipients to more severe disease than if they were not vaccinated.*”

In addition, the study paper indicates other concerns about inadequate information for proper consent to trial patients, and that the vaccines “*may worsen COVID-19 disease via antibody-dependent enhancement (ADE).*”

But the study doesn't seem to directly support Dr. Zelenko's claims.

The '[UK government](#)' article does refer to "Public Health England / UK Health Security Agency 'Vaccine Surveillance' reports on Covid-19 cases" but does not provide any links for proper verification. It seems mostly focused on comparing vaccinated versus unvaccinated figures, rather than providing direct evidence of increased immune deficiency.

Some sites and news agencies have been critical of claims from Dr. Zelenko and some of his peers, including Dr. Robert Malone, regarding a possible link between the Covid-19 vaccines and AIDS. Here are some of them:

- The World Health Organization's (WHO) Collaborating Centre for Vaccine Safety (Hospital Clínico Universitario de Santiago de Compostela) - [Can COVID-19 vaccines cause AIDS?](#), 4/7/2022 (with video)
- KCENNews (NBC, National Verify Team): [Can the Covid-19 vaccine cause AIDS?](#) (video), May 11, 2022
- APNews - [No relationship between COVID-19 vaccines and AIDS](#), by Josh Kelety, April 5, 2022

While the contents of these do appear to have valid counter-claims to disprove the linkage between Covid-19 vaccines and AIDS, there are some red flags.

For the **WHO piece**, the text is very brief and simply outright rejects that any related data exists. We really have no way of knowing if they even searched, for they do not provide details. Moreover, they limit their scope when they say "*It is not possible for COVID-19 vaccines to cause AIDS, which is caused by the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV).*" Dr. Zelenko was referring to *other contributors* than the HIV virus which may cause a decrease in the immune system. To simply dismiss its possibility by directly assigning it to a single contributor like the HIV virus is a false attestation.

The **NBC KCENNews** video tackles the question "Does the Covid-19 vaccine cause AIDS?" and they refer to the Center for Disease Control (CDC), the WHO (World Health Organization), the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and an assistant clinical professor, Payal Kohli. They immediately state that the claim is false. The problem is that, similar to the WHO piece, they cite statements that only refer to an absolute or direct link between the HIV virus and AIDS. When citing the CDC, they put up on the screen "*No. There is no association between COVID-19 vaccines and risk for HIV infection.*" That is totally not the same claim that Dr. Zelenko and others are making; they are not talking about a resulting *HIV infection*, but are rather referring to *immunodeficiency syndrome* or *disorders*. The NIH quotation is similar, as it only focuses on HIV infection. So, this so-called Verify team is either not really doing their job properly or purposely misleading viewers by deflecting to unrelated information. Lastly, the M.D. assistant professor Payal Kohli was cited as saying "*No reporting in the Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System that there is an association between COVID vaccine*

and development of AIDS.” This is quite a weak statement, for the [VAERS system](#) is not designed to report such broad associations such as “the development of AIDS,” but rather more specific adverse events and deaths. Just the word “development” implies a condition that evolves *over time*. Overall, this news report is weak and does not appear to invalidate the claim at hand.

The **AP News piece** appears to be the most measured of the three, for it makes the correct distinction of the claim of AIDS that is *not related* to HIV. They immediately dismiss the claim as false with the blanket statement “*There is no evidence that the COVID-19 vaccines cause any kind of immune deficiency condition, let alone AIDS, experts say. Nor is there evidence that the COVID-19 vaccines damage the immune system.*” However, the two experts they cite said the term “AIDS” is strictly used to describe the condition caused by HIV, though one mentioned that there are other forms of immunodeficiency. Overall, this piece is more measured and cites more credible experts but still leaves doubt due to its HIV-focus and broad blanket statement.

Though there doesn’t appear to be a whole lot on the link between the Covid-19 vaccines and AIDS or immunodeficiency syndrome or related disorders - either in general articles or in medical literature - at this stage, there are some that touch upon the subject.

What other studies examine the subject?

1 - [Innate immune suppression by SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccinations: The role of G-quadruplexes, exosomes, and MicroRNAs](#) published in NIH Pubmed on April 15, 2022 by Stephanie Seneff, Greg Nigh, Anthony M. Kyriakopoulos, and Peter A. McCullough.

The study does examine “immune suppression” by the Covid-19 mRNA vaccinations. Here are a few notable highlights from the study:

“In this paper, we present evidence that vaccination induces a profound impairment in type I interferon signaling, which has diverse adverse consequences to human health.”

“We also identify potential profound disturbances in regulatory control of protein synthesis and cancer surveillance. These disturbances potentially have a causal link to neurodegenerative disease, myocarditis, immune thrombocytopenia, Bell’s palsy, liver disease, impaired adaptive immunity, impaired DNA damage response and tumorigenesis.”

“We show evidence from the VAERS database supporting our hypothesis. We believe a comprehensive risk/benefit assessment of the mRNA vaccines questions them as positive contributors to public health.”

The paper also inspected the VAERS database for instances of increased cancer risks related to the vaccines. Here are some of their findings [**emphasis and original links added**]:

“For our analysis of evidence of increased cancer risk in VAERS, we focused on two somewhat distinct approaches. One, represented by the results in [Table 6](#) , was to gather the counts for any terms that contained keywords clearly linked to cancer, namely, “cancer,” “lymphoma,” “leukaemia,” “metastasis,” “carcinoma,” and “neoplasm.” Overall, we found 1,474 entries linking these terms to COVID-19 vaccines, representing 96% of all the entries for any of these terms for any vaccine in that year.”

Table 6

Number of symptoms reported in VAERS, restricted to the US population, for the year 2021, for various cancer-related terms, showing total counts for COVID-19 vaccines and for all vaccines.

Symptom	Counts COVID-19 vaccines	Counts All Vaccines	Percent COVID-19
Cancer	396	403	98.3
Lymphoma	144	153	94.1
Leukaemia	155	161	96.3
Metastatic/metastasis	175	179	97.8
Carcinoma	176	187	94.1
Neoplasm	428	452	94.7
TOTAL	1,474	1,535	96.0

[Open in a separate window](#)

“The complementary approach was to find terms involving cancer in specific organs, namely, breasts, prostate, bladder, colon, brain, lungs, pancreas and ovaries, as shown in [Table 7](#) . Although all the numbers are small, the highest by far was for breast cancer (246 cases), with nearly four times as many hits as for lung cancer, the second most common type. All of the cases for pancreatic, ovarian and bladder cancer were linked to COVID-19 vaccines, with zero cases for any other vaccine. Altogether, we tabulated 534 cases of cancer of specific organs linked to COVID-19 vaccines, representing 97.3% of all the cases for any vaccine in 2021.”

Table 7

Number of symptoms reported in VAERS, restricted to the US population, for the year 2021, for cancer of specific organs, showing total counts for COVID-19 vaccines and for all vaccines.

Symptom	Counts COVID-19 vaccines	Counts All Vaccines	Percent COVID-19
Breast cancer	246	254	96.8
Prostate cancer	50	52	96.2
Bladder cancer	30	30	100
Colon cancer	40	41	97.6
Brain neoplasm	53	55	96.4
Lung cancer	64	66	97.0
Pancreatic cancer	24	24	100
Ovarian cancer	27	27	100
Total	534	549	97.3

[Open in a separate window](#)

In its Conclusions section, the following segments provide some telling concerns about the mRNA Covid-19 vaccinations [with some **emphasis added for relevancy**]:

“There has been an unwavering message about the safety and efficacy of mRNA vaccinations against SARS-CoV-2 from the public health apparatus in the US and around the globe.”

“The efficacy is increasingly in doubt, as shown in a recent letter to the Lancet Regional Health by Günter Kampf (2021b). Kampf provided data showing that the vaccinated are now as likely as the unvaccinated to spread disease. He concluded: “It appears to be grossly negligent to ignore the vaccinated population as a possible and relevant source of transmission when deciding about public health control measures.” ”

“Moreover, the inadequacy of phase I, II, and III trials to evaluate mid-term and long-term side effects from mRNA genetic vaccines may have been misleading on their suppressive impact on the innate immunity of the vaccinees [sic].”

“In this paper, we call attention to three very important aspects of the safety profile of these vaccinations. First is the **extensively documented subversion of innate immunity**, primarily via suppression of IFN- α and its associated signaling cascade. **This suppression will have a wide range of consequences**, not the least of which include the reactivation of latent

viral infections and the reduced ability to effectively combat future infections.”

“Second is the dysregulation of the system for both preventing and detecting genetically driven malignant transformation within cells and the consequent potential for vaccination to promote those transformations.”

“Third, mRNA vaccination potentially disrupts intracellular communication carried out by exosomes, and induces cells taking up spike glycoprotein mRNA to produce high levels of spike-glycoprotein-carrying exosomes, with potentially serious inflammatory consequences.”

“Should any of these potentials be fully realized, the impact on billions of people around the world could be enormous and could contribute to both the short-term and long-term disease burden our health care system faces.”

“It is essential that further studies be conducted to determine the extent of the potential pathological consequences outlined in this paper.”

“In the end, billions of lives are potentially at risk, given the large number of individuals injected with the SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines and the broad range of adverse outcomes we have described. We call on the public health institutions to demonstrate, with evidence, why the issues discussed in this paper are not relevant to public health, or to acknowledge that they are and to act accordingly. Furthermore, we encourage all individuals to make their own health care decisions with this information as a contributing factor in those decisions.”

Though this paper is quite lengthy and complex, largely beyond the scope of this author’s competence to fully interpret, it does seem to show adverse impacts to the immune system and thus does appear to validate claims that Dr. Zelenko has put forth.

Moreover, one of its authors, Dr. [Peter McCullough](#), is [widely published](#) and a leading expert in his field which adds to the credibility of the work.

2 - [New-onset autoimmune phenomena post-COVID-19 vaccination](#), by Yue Chen, Zhiwei Xu, Peng Wang, Xiao-Mei Li, Zong-Wen Shuai, Dong-Qing Ye, Hai-Feng Pan, published 27 December 2021

Without going into the nitty gritty details of the study, here are some highlights from its Abstract and Conclusion [with **emphasis added**]:

“From the **Abstract**:

Recently, **new-onset autoimmune phenomena after COVID-19 vaccination have been reported increasingly (e.g. immune thrombotic thrombocytopenia, autoimmune liver diseases, Guillain-Barré syndrome, IgA nephropathy,**

rheumatoid arthritis and systemic lupus erythematosus). Molecular mimicry, the production of particular autoantibodies and the role of certain vaccine adjuvants seem to be substantial contributors to autoimmune phenomena. However, whether the association between COVID-19 vaccine and autoimmune manifestations is coincidental or causal remains to be elucidated. Here, we summarize the emerging evidence about autoimmune manifestations occurring in response to certain COVID-19 vaccines.”

“From the Conclusion:

In the light of the information discussed above, emerging evidence has indicated that new onset of autoimmune manifestations including VITT, autoimmune liver diseases, GBS and IgA nephropathy appears to be associated with COVID-19 vaccines ([Table 2](#)). The plausible mechanisms by which COVID-19 vaccines lead to autoimmune manifestations include molecular mimicry, the production of particular autoantibodies and the role of certain vaccine adjuvants. Further studies are warranted to elucidate the underlying biological mechanisms and identify the exact causality.”

Here is the contents of [Table 2](#) the conclusion refers to:

TABLE 2. Different new-onset autoimmune phenomena following diverse COVID-19 vaccines

Autoimmune phenomena	Vaccine type
Vaccine-induced immune thrombotic thrombocytopenia	Adenovirus vector vaccine and mRNA vaccine
Immune thrombocytopenic purpura	mRNA vaccine
Autoimmune liver diseases	mRNA vaccine and Adenovirus vector vaccine
Guillain–Barré syndrome	mRNA vaccine and Adenovirus vector vaccine
IgA nephropathy	mRNA vaccine
Autoimmune polyarthritis	mRNA vaccine
Rheumatoid arthritis	mRNA vaccine and Adenovirus vector vaccine
Graves' disease	mRNA vaccine
Type 1 diabetes mellitus	mRNA vaccine
Systemic lupus erythematosus	Adenovirus vector vaccine

Once again, this study also outlines immunity issues associated with the mRNA vaccines.

3 – [Autoimmune Inflammatory Reactions Triggered by the COVID-19 Genetic Vaccines in Terminally Differentiated Tissues](#), by Panagis Polykretis, Alberto Donzelli,

Janci C. Lindsay, David Wiseman, Anthony M. Kyriakopoulos, Michael Mörz, Paolo Bellavite, Masanori Fukushima, Stephanie Seneff, Peter A. McCullough, Version 1: Received: 7 March 2023 / Approved: 8 March 2023 / Online: 8 March 2023

The third paper above, not yet peer-reviewed, was just published this morning a few hours before this post was published on Substack. It is also one whereby Peter McCullough is an author.

As this author has not yet had adequate time to fully review it, here are some additional notes from McCullough taken from his [Substack on March 8, 2023](#) [**emphasis added**]:

“The human immune system is designed to recognize foreign invaders (microbes, other substances) attack, kill, and then clear the debris away. For that reason, we must be sure that our bodies recognize our own cells as “protected” and the foreign ones as targets. For the first time, mRNA (Pfizer, Moderna) and adenoviral DNA (Janssen) COVID-19 vaccines install the genetic code for our bodies to make a deadly foreign protein with the aspiration that our immune system would not only respond and protect us, but also form live saving immunity from SARS-CoV-2. **We have come to learn this was the drug development miscalculation of all time.** Production of a foreign protein in the human body has turned out to be a disaster as illustrated by Polykretis et al in a recent paper. Here are some of the reasons why: 1) each cell that takes up the vaccine expresses the protein in the cell surface initiating autoimmune attack, 2) **the tissue distribution appears to be wide involving organs where this attack could be lethal (heart, brain, bone marrow, etc.),** 3) **both the genetic material and the Spike protein are long lasting (months to years) which is long enough to cause an autoimmune syndrome which may be permanent.**”

To conclude this section, some of Dr. Zelenko’s claims do indeed appear to have merit, given the scientific data and literature referenced and presented above, also considering some critical pieces this author has added above. Of course, more research is needed into the subject of increased or possible immuno-deficiencies and issues, as well as the effects on cancer from those who have taken the Covid-19 vaccines. Time will certainly tell whether Dr. Zelenko’s claims turn out to be mostly *true* or mostly *not true*.

2.2 Vera Sharav on global concentration of power

At around the 35:20 mark [Vera Sharav](#), a 1st generation Holocaust survivor who produced and directed the series, noted that **Klaus Schwab**’s - who is the current Chairman of the [World Economic Forum](#) (WEF) - father had a factories in Switzerland and Germany that produced heavy military machinery for the Nazi regime which used slave labor.

Klaus Schwab's father was **Eugen Wilhelm Schwab**, as is acknowledged in the [front pages](#) of his 2021 book Stakeholder Capitalism.

Eugen Wilhelm Schwab was [managing director](#) of a subsidiary of Zurich-based engineering firm [Escher Wyss](#), a Swiss industrial company that was a [supplier for the German war effort](#).

Apart from admitting that Escher Wyss did indeed use slave labor during the second world war, Newsweek provided a seemingly convincing [article](#) (which is mostly based on the [work](#) of a Dutch fact-checking outfit) debunking the father's ties to the Nazi regime, it fails to reveal some evidence which seems to indicate otherwise.

Military intelligence [records](#) collected by the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) - which eventually [became](#) the CIA - indicates that Escher Wyss was working on a large order for Germany under which flame-throwers, [weapons used during the war](#), were dispatched under the name Brennstoffbehälter.

In addition, Escher-Wyss was an [integral part of researching and developing turbines to produce heavy water for the creation of nuclear weapons for the Nazis](#).

Lastly, while the Dutch fact-checking [article](#) asserts that Eugen Schwab was not a professed member of the [Nazi Party](#) or the [SS](#), they do indicate that he was a member of the German Labour Front [Die Deutsche Arbeitsfront](#), or DAF which, with 25 million members, was the largest collective that enabled the Nazi regime to [control and indoctrinate the working population](#). The DAF was also [associated](#) with the [National Socialist German Workers' Party \(NSDAP\)](#), better known as the [Nazi Party](#).

Sharav also noted that while Klaus Schwab studied at Harvard University in the United States where he became acquainted with [Henry Kissinger](#) who was a political and strategic advisor to President Nixon in the 1970s.



Photograph from 1980 of Klaus Schwab with two important mentors, Henry Kissinger (left), his former professor at Harvard, and Edward Heath (right), Symposium Chair. Image source: [The World Economic Forum, A Partner in Shaping History, The First 40 Years, 1971 - 2010](#) (ISBN: [9789295044302](#)) and [weforum.org](#).

Born [Heinz Alfred Kissinger](#) in Fürth, Bavaria, Weimar Republic in 1923, the nonagenarian is still active and regularly attends the World Economic Forum in Davos, even having [spoken via teleconference at the 2022 edition](#).

Klaus Schwab [launched the WEF in 1971](#) which would become a global center for promoting public-private partnerships between governments and big business for the decades to come.

Sharav then made the following point regarding the **concentration of power** that has been occurring since that time:

“What they’ ve been doing is slowly putting um authority and power into global uniform agencies like the World Health Organization [WHO], the United Nations, World Economic Forum [WEF], the Bilderberg [Group]. There are a whole bunch of them, we small fry haven’ t been paying much attention to those because this is really the oligarchs, you know, the billionaires, the, and but they have managed to include heads of state from all stripes.”



Henry Kissinger alongside Klaus Schwab at the World Economic Forum. Photo source: [Unlimited Hangout](#).

She then mentions that that Vladimir Putin was also a WEF graduate, adding:

“This club is who we are really fighting and behind this club are others who always remain behind the curtain. We don’ t know all the names, but we know some of the players. What is interesting is to know all these people are unelected by anyone. They are absolutely intent on demolishing democracy in any and every form. What is now called democracies are not democracies anymore because they don’ t represent the interests of the people that they rule.”

While this claim can certainly appear as a grand conspiracy, it is not to be readily dismissed as conspiracy theory. Rather, it must be evaluated on its merits, requiring further examination and scrutiny.

Firstly, it is worthwhile to examine what Sharav stated about democracies. She makes the following **claims** which need to be verified for their validity:

1. “These people are unelected by anyone”
2. “They are intent on demolishing democracy in any and every form”
3. “They are not democracies anymore because they don’ t represent the interests of the people that they rule.”

Before examining these, it is worthwhile to look at how many, and what kinds of democracies exist around the world. Thankfully, a recent report from Visual Capitalist titled [Mapped: The State of Global Democracy in 2022](#) sheds light on

the matter (also see the [related article from ZeroHedge](#)). Here are some of its highlights [with some **emphasis added** for relevancy]:

- This year’ s [Democracy Index report](#) by the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU), is one such attempt to apply a score to countries based on how closely they measure up to democratic ideals.
- According to EIU, the state of democracy is at its **lowest point since the index began in 2006**, blamed in part on the pandemic restrictions that saw **many countries struggling to balance public health with personal freedom**.
- The following table classifies and summarises four types of regimes we see for countries around the world.

Regime Type	No. of Countries	Share of countries	Share of World Population
Full democracies	21	12.6%	6.4%
Flawed democracies	53	31.7%	39.3%
Hybrid Regimes	34	20.4%	17.2%
Authoritarian regimes	59	35.3%	37.1%

What is perhaps most staggering from the table above is that **only 6.4% of the world’ s population live in a full democracy**. That leaves **93.6%** of the world’ s population living under other regimes ranging from ‘flawed democracies’ to ‘authoritarian regimes’ .

It is also worth noting that these figures were determined by [The Economist Intelligence Unit](#), the research and analysis division of The Economist Group. [The Economist](#) magazine is world-renowned and considered to be one of the top economic and financial publications in the world.

As for Sharav’ s first claim, this is only partially factual. For, many countries do hold elections around the world to determine their leaders. However, even in some so-called advanced democracies there is evidence of the erosion of proper electoral practices, controversial vote counting, and lack of accountability to electors.

For instance, many democratic countries located in Europe the have ceded a tremendous amount of decision-making power to the [European Union](#) (EU).

Though it is comprised of many distinct [institutions](#), the [EU](#) - a supranational political and economic union - is made up of three main governing bodies: The [European Parliament](#), the [European Commission](#), and the [Council of the European Union](#), the latter two being its legislative bodies.

Only members of the European Parliament are [elected](#) by the populace while those in the other two groups are *appointed*.

As was [stated](#) by [Christine Anderson](#), an elected German [MEP](#) (Member of the European Parliament) who is a fervent defender of democratic rights and values, the European Parliament has no power in contrast to the European Commission which does, for which she deems comprised of “unelected technocrats” led by [Ursula von der Leyen](#), their President.

Video: Viva Frei – My Interview with EU Parliamentarian Christine Anderson! From EU to WEF to Trudeau!

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y4ufeLR2JkA>

Though it is certainly likely that other MEPs would hold different views from those of Mrs. Anderson, it stands to reason that, as an integral member of the organisation, she is intimately familiar with and understands the functioning of the broader EU apparatus.

During the Covid-19 Pandemic, the European Commission established a Covid-19 vaccine passport initiative called the [EU Digital COVID Certificate](#).



Screenshot from a Summit News [February 4, 2022](#) article showing the EU Digital COVID Certificate with a QR Code on a smart phone.

A year ago, the European Commission sought to [extend](#) the EU Digital COVID Certificate system for another year, [stating](#):

“Extending the Regulation will ensure that travellers can continue using their EU Digital COVID Certificate when travelling in the EU where Member States maintain certain public health measures.”

Several member countries such as Denmark, France, Italy, had moved to scrap restrictions which included the vaccine passes.

In short, this demonstrates how unelected officials of the European Commission have took it upon themselves to exert their power in order to mandate travel restrictions of citizens from member countries of the EU.

The other two points made by Sharav as stated above - that such institutions are intent on destroying democracies and that they no longer represent the interest of the people - require more effort to substantiate. Nevertheless, and thus far this century, many of these supranational organisations have augmented their power and clout over member states.

For instance, the **World Health Organization (WHO)** and the **United Nations (UN)** hold significant power and influence on member states, with the former having exerted a tremendous amount of influence during the Covid-19 Pandemic which spearheaded health policies and protocols amongst its member countries.

For several years already, the United Nations has been pushing for the coordinated implementation of their [Sustainable Development Goals](#), or SDGs. Over the years, they have been seen as [controversial](#), given that their equitable implementation across nations which vary greatly in terms of their social, cultural, geographic, and economic circumstances would prove unattainable.

[Goal #13 on Climate Action](#) along with its enforcers, the UN Environmental Program’ s [Net-Zero Banking Alliance](#) and the [Glasgow Financial Alliance for Net Zero \(GFANZ\)](#) has been regarded as particularly cumbersome since it targets net-zero carbon emissions by 2050, with some intermediate targets set for as early as 2030; as such, these are deemed [unrealistic and unattainable which would strangle existing businesses](#) currently trying to recover from the economic downturn brought about by the Covid-19 Pandemic and soaring inflation.

The WHO’ s Pandemic Treaty

Moreover, [in 2021](#), the World Health Organization (WHO) set out to establish a [pandemic treaty](#) that will legally bind countries to its adhere to its policies by 2024, essentially ceding participating countries’ sovereignty over to the global health authority in the event of future pandemics.

Details about the treaty can be found in the following documents:

1. [Report of the Member States Working Group on Strengthening WHO Preparedness and response to Health Emergencies to the special session of the World Health Assembly](#), 23 November 2021
2. [Strengthening WHO preparedness for and response to health emergencies \(Proposal for amendments to the International Health Regulations\)](#), 12 April 2022
3. WHO white paper: [Strengthening the Global Architecture for Health Emergency Preparedness, Response and Resilience](#), 4 May 2022
4. [Zero draft of the WHO CA+ for the consideration of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Body at its fourth meeting](#), 1 February 2023
5. [Proposed amendments to the International Health Regulations \(2005\) submitted in accordance with decision WHA75\(9\) \(2022\)](#), 6 February 2023
6. [Article-by-Article compilation of proposed amendments to the International Health Regulations \(2005\) submitted in accordance with decision WHA75\(9\) \(2022\)](#), 6 February 2023

In other words, the WHO' s Pandemic Treaty would *supersede* the constitutions and laws of 194 member countries, removing decision making away from democratically elected governments.

From the first document listed above, we can also find the following proposed measure for the treaty:

“(i) **Misinformation and disinformation.** Member States recognize the need for national and global coordinated actions to address the misinformation, disinformation and stigmatization that undermine public health.”

By “global coordinated actions”, it stands to reason that they mean the WHO would act as the global entity that would establish the rules to be enforced by which member states would need to adhere to.

It goes without saying, that this would undermine rights to free speech and would ultimately act as a stringent censorship mechanism.

There was already a tremendous amount of censorship during the Covid-19 Pandemic - much of which was unwarranted and abusive; so, granting such power to a supranational organisation that has board members who are unelected by the citizens of different countries would certainly leave room for abuses.

Major funders such as Bill Gates could effectively decide what would be deemed mis- or disinformation.

Reclaim the Net, an advocacy group for online rights, [warned](#) about this information surveillance mechanism [**emphasis added**]:

“The [World Health Organization \(WHO\)](#) recently released a zero draft of its international pandemic treaty **which will give the unelected global health**

agency new powers to “tackle” anything that it deems to be “false, misleading, misinformation or disinformation” if passed.”

They added,

“If adopted, the treaty will be legally binding under international law and the WHO’ s 194 member states (which represent 98% of all the countries in the world) would be required to comply with the treaty’ s demands to target misinformation.”

Reclaim the Net also raised several [additional concerns](#) with particular emphasis on certain [amendments](#). For instance, one amendment paves the way for “other types of proofs and certificates” which “may be designed by the Health Assembly” (i.e., the WHO’ s decision-making body) and will be used to “attest the holder’ s status as having a decreased risk of being the disease carrier. These other proofs include test certificates (which provide proof someone has been tested for a disease) and recovery certificates (which provide proof someone has recovered from a disease).

In a [separate article](#) that also touched upon information surveillance by the WHO, the online rights advocacy outfit noted the following:

“The WHO intends to adopt the treaty under Article 19 of [the WHO Constitution](#) through an international lawmaking process where a group of mostly unelected diplomats vote on the treaty.”

At last year’ s [G20 summit meeting in Indonesia](#), the leaders of the [top 20 economies](#) pledged to introduce international vaccine passports [**emphasis added**]:

“23. ...We acknowledge the importance of shared technical standards and verification methods, under the framework of the IHR (2005), to **facilitate seamless international travel, interoperability, and recognizing digital solutions and non-digital solutions, including proof of vaccinations.** We support continued international dialogue and collaboration on the establishment of trusted global digital health networks...”

G20 Members

The Group of Twenty (G20) comprises 19 countries (Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Republic of Korea, Mexico, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Türkiye, United Kingdom and United States) and the European Union. The G20 members represent around 85% of the global GDP, over 75% of the global trade, and about two-thirds of the world population.



List of [G20 members](#), as of March 3, 2023.

And, in lockstep with the treatment of so-called mis- and disinformation and the [G20 Bali Leaders' Declaration](#), they also seek to increase digital surveillance and censor what they would deem disinformation:

“24. The COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the transformation of the digital ecosystem and digital economy. We recognize the importance of digital transformation in reaching the SDGs. We acknowledge that affordable and high-quality digital connectivity is essential for digital inclusion and digital transformation, while a resilient, safe and secure online environment is necessary to enhance confidence and trust in the digital economy...We acknowledge the importance to **counter disinformation campaigns, cyber threats, online abuse**, and ensuring security in connectivity infrastructure.”

While there are apparent benefits in some of the [pledges](#), those outlined above committed to by [G20 members](#) could set the stage for vast impingement on several fundamental rights of citizens who reside this Group of Twenty along with curtailing respective governments' abilities to handle health crises at the national or local level based on their individual demographics, needs, and circumstances.

The WHO with its selected a partner, T-Systems, has [contracted German-based Deutsche Telekom subsidiary T-Systems](#) to develop a [global vaccine passport system](#).



The World Health Organization has brought T-Systems on board to develop validation services that confirm the authenticity of digital Covid certificates. Image source: [Deutsche Telekom](#).

As per the company' s [information media packet](#) [emphasis added]:

“The World Health Organization (WHO) will make it easier for its member states to introduce digital vaccination certificates in the future. The WHO is setting up a gateway for this purpose. It enables QR codes on electronic vaccination certificates to be checked across national borders. It is intended to serve as a standard procedure for other vaccinations such as polio or yellow fever after COVID-19.”

This suggests that to travel across international borders, proof of vaccination (through electronic vaccination certificates) *will* be required. And the WHO would be *the* global institution with the authority to mandate it.

Furthermore, they state that after the Covid-19 Pandemic, it is *intended* to serve as a “standard procedure” , or mechanism for other vaccinations which would again

be determined by the governing body of the WHO whose members are not elected by the citizens of member states.

If passed, such a scheme will completely punish individuals who favor bodily autonomy and the right to choose to be vaccinated or not, lest they be prohibited from traveling across international borders.

Though the proposed WHO Pandemic Treaty has been welcomed by several countries such as the [United States](#) (who proposed the related Amendments), [Canada](#), France, Germany, and [others](#), there has been pushback by various organisations, health advocates, and politicians in those and other countries.

The [World Council for Health](#) - a coalition of scientists, doctors, lawyers, and civil society advocacy organizations - is one organisation [opposing the treaty](#), having also penned an [open letter](#) warning about it.

In Canada, Conservative MP [Leslyn Lewis](#), a lawyer with international experience, was one of the earliest to draw attention to the dangers signing up to the treaty would entail, stating that [Canada should never sign away the sovereignty of its health system to the WHO](#).



Dr. Leslyn Lewis

@LeslynLewis

Addressing the WHO pandemic Treaty and our Health Care Sovereignty: My statement - leslynlewis.ca/blog/the-who-p... #cdnpoli #cpcldr



6:29 PM · Apr 9, 2022

1,324 Likes 434 Retweets

In Lewis’ warning, she stressed:

“The treaty defines and classifies what is considered a pandemic and this could consist of broad classifications including an increase in cancers, heart conditions, strokes, etc. If a pandemic is declared, the WHO takes over the global health management of the pandemic.”

“This treaty has very serious implications for our national health sovereignty. Under this treaty, Canada would essentially be surrendering our national health sovereignty to the WHO when it comes to responding to pandemics.”

Mismanagement of the Covid-19 Pandemic at national levels has already showcased substantial flaws. One could only imagine how much worse a globally centralised

approach would prove, for it would not easily and readily take into account local needs, rights and freedoms of citizens from around the world.

Who funds the World Health Organization?

It must also be noted that the largest source of funds obtained by the WHO comes from the [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation](#) and the [Gavi Foundation](#), a vaccine advocacy group.

In [2021](#), these two entities accounted for over \$308 million in funding to the WHO, ahead of the largest single contributing nation, the United States at \$122.5 million.

Many pharmaceutical companies are also funders to the WHO.

It is no secret that funding to the WHO comes with strings attached. Those such as Bill Gates who provide vast amounts of funding inherently have a tremendous amount of say and influence over the organisation's policies and procedures.

Bill Gates, who holds no medical or public-health related degrees, has been a very outspoken figure fervently promoting Covid-19 vaccines around the globe during the pandemic.

Conflicts of interest and profiteering must also be considered when looking at who funds the WHO. In this respect, there have been some serious abuses in the past.

In 2010, the BMJ (British Medical Journal) and the Bureau of Investigative Journalism published findings of their [investigation into the financial ties between drug companies and the WHO in the context of the 2009 influenza "pandemic"](#).

The article revealed that some of the experts advising the WHO had declarable financial ties with drug companies that were producing antivirals and influenza vaccines. Here are just a few key excerpts:

"Meanwhile drug companies have banked vast profits- \$7bn (£4.8bn; €5.7bn) to \$10bn from vaccines alone according to investment bank JP Morgan."

"Given the scale of public cost and private profit, it would seem important to know that WHO'S key decisions were free from commercial influence. An investigation by the BMJ and the Bureau of Investigative Journalism, published this week, finds that this was far from the case."

"As reported by Deborah Cohen and Philip Carter, some of the experts advising WHO on the pandemic had declarable financial ties with drug companies that were producing antivirals and influenza vaccines."

Another case exhibiting profiteering and conflicts of interest entails of one reported by Deutsche Welle who came out with an article entitled [Who is really helping the WHO?](#)

The article outlined the WHO's growing dependence on the pharmaceutical industry (see also a related [open letter](#) to the then Director General of the WHO).

Here are some notable extracts from the piece, starting with the intended mission, scope and size of the WHO:

“The [“People’s Health Movement,”](#) a network of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) focused on health policy from more than 70 countries, has criticized the pharmaceutical industry’s growing influence on WHO as well as the organization’s increasing reliance on private donors.”

“According to NGOs engaged in the People’s Health Movement, commercial interests have a growing influence on WHO’s goals and strategies. The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation is a prime example. “The lion’s share of the \$25 billion that Gates was able to invest in health programs around the world in the past 10 years stemmed from returns from well-known companies in the chemical, pharmaceutical and food industries whose business practices often run counter to global health efforts,” Gebauer said.”

“If Gates brings WHO to back such patented vaccination programs, both vaccine producers and their shareholders, like the Gates Foundation, stand to benefit,” Gebauer said. This would come at the expense of people in the world’s poor countries whose governments are unable to afford typically expensive vaccination programs.”

“Pharma industry influence: The H1N1 “swine flu” influenza showed just how much influence the pharmaceutical industry and its supporting foundations actually have. In June 2009, WHO was advised by its standing vaccination committee to issue its highest alert for the H1N1 pandemic. Among the members and consultants of the commission were scientists who had contracts with the manufacturers of Tamiflu and other “anti-flu” drugs.”

“The global vaccination program that WHO set in motion with its pandemic alert turned into a billion-dollar business for these companies.”

“For a “perfectly ordinary flu” to escalate into a dangerous pandemic, WHO lowered the criteria for pandemic alerts before the first case of H1N1 had been known, according to the Council of Europe. Also, health officials around the world committed contractually to purchases with vaccine manufacturers.”

Read the point above carefully: The *“WHO lowered the criteria for pandemic alerts before the first case of H1N1 had been known.”* This is a clear abuse of power.

One has to wonder and can only think of one of two reasons why they would do so - they either did so willingly, or were coerced by their funders (Big Pharma) in order to position themselves for massive sales of H1N1 vaccines.

With just these few instances enumerated above, one has to be extremely mindful about the potential for abuse, profiteering, and conflicts of interests between those who fund the WHO and the supranational organisation itself.

To sum up this section, supranational groups such as the WHO and the WEF do hold a tremendous amount of power and influence over governments and corporations. Investigative reporter Johnny Vedmore has written a very thorough [piece](#) on how the WEF was formed, which powers were behind it, and how they go about achieving their goals.

The WEF' s Great Reset: Conspiracy or Conspiracy Theory?

Both of these conspiracy labels have been wantonly thrown around across mainstream media, alternative media, and on social media in the past few years.

They have been weaponized by different camps for the sole purpose of discrediting each other.

In this digital fog, facts have been obfuscated and, more importantly, *truth* has been its greatest victim.

There is a veritable *information war* that is occurring and this author has covered some of its sophisticated aspect as it relates to [NATO and the current Russia-Ukraine War](#).

Needless to say, the level of *deception* and *dishonesty* is at a fever pitch.

Actually, it is fairly evident to tell when such terms - particularly “conspiracy theorist,” “conspiracy theories,” or “spreading conspiracies” - are used to intently disparage certain ideas, narratives, or individuals. Such monikers have been used ad nauseum by the mainstream media.

Moreover, other obvious tells that a story, often a *hit piece*, is merely being used to discredit authors or counter so-called mis- or disinformation, as they usually put it, include:

- citing experts or studies without actually linking to them
- deflecting to another, unrelated, topic;
- defaming their targets using demeaning labels and adjectives;
- linking to some “fact check” sites that are usually funded by actors with conflicting or self-serving interests;
- associating the author or their targets with a disreputable person or outfit (i. e., the “*guilt by association*” logical fallacy);

- and presenting opinions as facts.

So as to further evaluate Holocaust survivor Very Sharav' s claim regarding the concentration of power of the elite, this subsection will examination diametrically opposed takes on the relationship between the World Economic Forum (WEF), its agendas, and other supranational parties such as the WHO and the United Nations (UN).

With regards to concentration of power, one of the most contentious issues to surface during the Covid-19 Pandemic has been that of the [World Economic Forum' s "Great Reset"](#) .

Video: World Economic Forum – The Great Reset Launch | Highlights

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u5pxhSnDr4U>

Before delving into the WEF' s Great Reset itself, it is worthwhile to rewind back to 2016 when another very controversial article from November 12, 2016, titled '[8 predictions for the world in 2030](#)' and accompanying video which came about imagining it is the year 2030 and "[You' ll own nothing. And you' ll be happy.](#)"

Video: The Great Reset You'll Own Nothing and Be Happy World Economic Forum Commercial AD 2023

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aztvWxRKqDQ>

This particular video outraged many people who shared it on social media, for it implied that the elitist group was planning the abolishment of private property, among other concerns.

On November 11 of the same year, the WEF had posted an article titled 'Here' s how life could change in my city by the year 2030' , but they removed it and only [archived](#) versions can be found.

But getting back to the more controversial agenda proposal by the WEF, namely that of the [Great Reset](#), it worthwhile to make a comparison between competing claims. To do so, two articles - one from a prominent mainstream outlet and one from an independent media platform - from roughly the same time period (summer of 2021, at the height of the Covid-19 Pandemic) will be examined for their merits:

1. **BBC News** - By BBC Monitoring and BBC Reality Check: [What is the Great Reset - and how did it get hijacked by conspiracy theories?](#) 24 June 2021
2. **openDemocracy** - [Conspiracy theories aside, there is something fishy about the Great Reset](#), 16 August 2021

Beginning with the BBC piece, it must be noted that it is filled with labels, as the terms "conspiracy theories" or "conspiracy theorist(s)" appears no less than a dozen times.

It is readily noticeable that the BBC piece employs many of the *tells* mentioned above.

“Among the most popular posts are baseless statements that the Great Reset is a strategic part of a grand conspiracy by the global elite, who somehow planned and managed the Covid-19 pandemic.”

The authors present opinion - “are baseless statements” as fact. Next, they cite an “expert” :

“Melanie Smith, head of analysis at Graphika, who researches online movements and disinformation, says the rumours are typical of an “anti-establishment conspiracy theory”.”

It doesn’ t take long to see that the outfit they are citing, Graphika, has at least one partner that can be deemed in conflict of interest to the topic of the BBC article. As it is stated on their ‘[Our Story](#)’ page, Graphika is partnered with the [Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency \(DARPA\)](#) which is an agency of the Department of Defense responsible for the development of technologies for use by the military. Such technology includes [research](#) funding for the development of a coronavirus vaccine, as has been detailed in a STAT news article titled [Moderna failed to disclose federal funding for vaccine patent applications, advocates say](#). Therefore, it would not be in the interest of Melanie Smith from Graphika to provide comment that would go against the prevailing Covid-19 narratives. And the authors of the BBC piece either failed to catch or mention this.

In their ‘How did it go viral?’ section, the BBC piece referred to how the phrase started trending on Twitter when a [video went viral showing Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau at a UN meeting in September, saying the pandemic provided an opportunity for a “reset”](#) which was immediately followed by ‘guilt by association’ tactic, specifically stating:

“Thousands of Donald Trump supporters boosted this idea. They claimed that that a victory for Mr Trump in November’s election was the only chance to thwart the so-called secret plot.”

In other words, they were suggesting that “Donald Trump supporters” are not to be trusted either.

“**Experts say** similar ideas about the emergence of a totalitarian world government have been [circulating since the 1960s under the umbrella term New World Order, which itself borrows ideas from conspiracy theories of the 18th Century,](#) ” the article stated. Yet, no specific expert was cited on the matter; instead, they deflected to another unrelated topic altogether linking to another BBC article about the Illuminati (a secret society from the 18th century) in which cited no experts, and another article on the same group which only offered a remark by a historian.

The article mostly employs a disparaging tone and rhetoric, and is tainted by demeaning labels, as is exemplified by the following paragraph:

“The nebulousness of this conspiracy theory means it has found followers among anti-vaccine activists, anti-lockdown campaigners, new-age healers, and those on the far right and far left.”

In short, the BBC seemed more of a hit piece to counter those who questioned the WEF’ s Great Reset rather than offering a [balanced and objective](#) take on the issue with merits coming from both sides.

The second article to be examined - [Conspiracy theories aside, there is something fishy about the Great Reset](#) by [openDemocracy](#), in contrast, provides much more factual and credible information that is largely linked and referenced, while mostly abstaining from using sensationalistic rhetoric, providing a more objective assessment of the WEF’ s Great Reset plan and partnerships.

The article’ s lede reads:

“It’ s a corporate takeover of global governance that affects our food, our data and our vaccines”

Hence, the article examines not only the Covid-19 vaccine (and vaccines in general), but also how food supplies and data, i.e., surveillance, are also central to the topic at hand, namely the concentration of power into the hands of a few.

While examining the WEF’ s Great Reset, the article expands on its concept as it related to what Klaus Schwab has often referred to as *Stakeholder capitalism*.

The WEF summarises the movement as part of their agenda in a January 22, 2021 article titled [What is stakeholder capitalism?](#) as follows:

- Stakeholder capitalism is a form of capitalism in which companies seek long-term value creation by taking into account the needs of all their stakeholders, and society at large.
- Klaus Schwab discusses its history and relevance in this excerpt from the book [Stakeholder Capitalism: A Global Economy that Works for Progress, People and Planet](#).

While the first point above appears benevolent and leaves little to suspicion, Schwab’ s book [COVID-19: The Great Reset](#) along with [another](#), titled [The Fourth Industrial Revolution](#), have received a fair amount of criticism, not excluding some from the author of the openDemocracy piece, [Ivan Wecke](#), a political scientist and writer.

Wecke notes the following [emphasis added]:

“The idea of stakeholder capitalism and multi-stakeholder partnerships might sound warm and fuzzy, until we dig deeper and realise that this actually means giving corporations more power over society, and democratic institutions less.”

He expands on his observation by stating the following:

“Instead of corporations serving many stakeholders, in the multi-stakeholder model of global governance, corporations are promoted to being official stakeholders in global decision-making, while governments are relegated to being one of many stakeholders. In practice, corporations become the main stakeholders, while governments take a backseat role, and civil society is mainly window dressing.”

While examining the WEF’s multi-stakeholder ecosystem, the author made reference to [Harris Gleckman](#), a [senior fellow at the University of Massachusetts](#), who said that governments would be just one of many stakeholders in a multi-stakeholder model of global governance.

Gleckman also emphasised that the controversial [strategic partnership agreement signed between the United Nations \(UN\) and the WEF in 2019](#), describing it as a move to turn the UN into a [public-private partnership](#), creating a special place for corporations inside the UN.

He adds that these global stakeholder groups lack any democratic accountability and mostly consist of private stakeholders (big corporations) who “recruit their friends in government, civil society and universities to join them in solving public problems.”

In other words, under the scheme, large multinational corporations would acquire even more power by leveraging the UN’s institutions and decision-making bodies, while usurping or bypassing the will of the people.

The following description on the [partnership](#) appears on the WEF’s own website as follows:

“The UN-Forum Partnership was signed in a meeting held at United Nations headquarters between UN Secretary-General António Guterres and World Economic Forum Founder and Executive Chairman Klaus Schwab to accelerate the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.”

There are two points of interest in the passage above. First, this is an agreement that has been agreed upon and signed by the heads of these two organisations. The Secretary-General of the United Nations acted on *his own* behalf, and no vote was ever held on the matter by [member states](#), essentially bypassing the will of citizens of those countries and their respective governments.

Second, while the agreement's title is cleverly disguised to imply the explicit directive "accelerate the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", it also contains many other areas [such as](#) health, gender equality, digital cooperation (i.e., surveillance), and climate change.

Put differently, the [agreement](#) provides the stakeholders with clout and governance on these affairs of significant interest to nation states.



UN Secretary-General António Guterres and World Economic Forum Founder and Executive Chairman Klaus Schwab (center) with Børge Brende, President of the World Economic Forum (left), and Amina J. Mohammed, Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations (right). Photo source: [World Economic Forum and UN Sign Strategic Partnership Framework](#).

One of the key focus areas of the agreement is that of **Climate change** which focuses on achieving "clear, measurable and public commitments from the private sector to reach carbon neutrality by 2050."

As mentioned earlier, the net-zero [unrealistic and unattainable net-zero goals would strangle existing businesses](#).

In addition, the agreement aims to develop standards for 'digital governance.' Put another way, they would be in a position to define and regulate online behaviour with policing powers to tackle whatever they deem as mis- and disinformation, along with the ability to censor free speech.

Such digital governance, or surveillance is commensurate with what the WHO seeks to accomplish through its pandemic treaty.

The openDemocracy article further criticises how these multi-stakeholder partnerships would render real-world implications on the way our **food systems** are organized, how **big tech is governed** and **how our vaccines and medicines are distributed**.

Food Systems

The author highlighted how the 2021 [World Summit on Food Systems](#) in Rome disproportionately relies on ‘multi-stakeholder inclusivity’ in which the private sector holds a significant role along with the WEF’s involvement in the summit.

The article noted how [FIAN International](#), a global human rights organization that advocates for the right to adequate food and nutrition, contended that there was no discussion at the summit on land concentration, or holding companies accountable for their environmental and labour abuses.

Sofia Monsalve of FIAN International sees it as a bigger picture whereby large corporations, which dominate the food sector, are reluctant to fix the production system and would rather just focus on coming up with new investment opportunities.

In other words, these corporations are more interested in increasing their profits, than genuinely caring for the environment and local producers.

FIAN International together with 300 other organizations expressed their concerns about the multi-stakeholder setup in an [open letter](#) to the Secretary General of the United Nations, António Guterres.

Here are some key highlights from the open letter [**emphasis added**]:

“The UN-WEF strategic partnership agreement signed in June 2019 **casts a cloud on the integrity of the United Nations (UN) as a multilateral system.**”

“In September 2019, **more than 400 civil society organizations sent you a letter calling for the termination of the UN-WEF strategic partnership agreement.** We believe that **this agreement is fundamentally at odds with the UN Charter and with intergovernmental decisions on sustainable development, the climate emergency, and the eradication of poverty and hunger.** It will provide transnational corporations (TNCs) preferential access to the UN system and permanently associate the UN with TNCs, some of whose core activities **have caused and/or worsened the social, economic and environmental crises the world faces.**”

“Family Farmers produce more than 80% of the world’ s food in value terms. They should be at the center of the UN Food Systems Summit, particularly during this UN Decade on Family Farming.”

Then, they sharply criticised the WEF’ s multi-stakeholder platforms, stating:

“Instead of drawing from the innovative governance experiences that the UN system has to offer, the UN-WEF partnership is helping to establishing “stakeholder capitalism” as a governance model for the entire planet. The WEF’ s multi-stakeholder platforms lack democratic legitimacy and focus instead on harnessing the opportunities of the Fourth Industrial Revolution for the benefit of TNCs [Transnational Corporations] and global financial capital.”

In a separate [press release](#) from 2019, FIAN International made reference to another open letter signed by 240 civil society organizations and 40 international networks have called on the United Nations (UN) Secretary-General to end the recently signed UN’ s Strategic Partnership Agreement with the World Economic Forum (WEF).

And in another [press release from early 2020](#), FIAN also strongly condemned the WEF’ s “takeover” of the UN.

Big Tech

The same openDemocracy article outlines concerns about how [Big Tech giants such as Facebook, Google, Microsoft, and the WEF itself](#) will be key participants to a [UN Digital Cooperation program](#), thus able to exert a tremendous amount of power over online content and behavior by netizens.

Once more, an [open letter](#) was sent to the Secretary General of the United Nations by [Just Net Coalition \(JNC\)](#), a global network of civil society actors committed to an open, free, just and equitable Internet.

The letter was on behalf of more than 170 civil society groups from around the world that oppose plans for a Big Tech dominated body for global digital governance and offered the following stern warning [**emphasis added**]:

“It is in any case unacceptable that such an apex policy **body will have corporation and government nominees sitting as equals**. Worse, **the proposed Body will rely largely on private (i.e., corporate) funding, and the main proposal currently on the table for this Body suggests linking gaining a seat on it with providing funding support**. This is a new low for the UN, and an unthinkably dangerous direction for the future of global governance.”

Assuredly, corporate funding would compromise the independence and impartiality of the governing body.

The letter also outlines how the WEF would expand its power with regards to global digital governance:

“A Readers Guide (University of Massachusetts–Boston) describes how the World Economic Forum’s (WEF) Global Redesign Initiative believed that “ ‘multistakeholder consultations’ on global matters should evolve into ‘multi-stakeholder governance’ arrangements. This transformation means that non-state actors would no longer just provide input to decision-makers...but would actually be responsible for making global policy decisions.”

Apart from outlining specific requests, the [signatories pleaded](#), in a stern tone, that the UN abolish the proposal in its current form:

“We urge the office of the UN Secretary General to immediately withdraw the proposal for a High level Multistakeholder Body for ‘Digital Cooperation’ , since it would become the de facto body for ‘global digital governance’ . If this proposal is adopted, it will sound the death knell of democratic and multilateral global governance, replacing it with corporate-led governance systems, that (as envisaged by the WEF) will extend more widely with increasing digitalisation of all sectors.”

How our vaccines and medicines are distributed

The final aspect covered by Ivan Wecke in his [Conspiracy theories aside, there is something fishy about the Great Reset](#) article was that of the manufacture and distribution of Covid-19 vaccines.

Wecke makes reference to [COVAX](#), the WHO initiative that aims to “accelerate the development and manufacture of COVID-19 vaccines, and to guarantee fair and equitable access for every country in the world.”

In this section, the author questions why the WHO, which is part of the UN, is not calling the shots with regards to the vaccine for this global health issue.

He then emphasises that COVAX was set up as a multi-stakeholder group by two other multi-stakeholder groups, [GAVI \(the Vaccine Alliance\)](#) and [CEPI \(the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations\)](#), in partnership with the WHO, both having strong ties with the World Economic Forum (which was one of the founders of CEPI) as well as the [Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation](#). And how both are also connected to companies like [Pfizer](#), [GlaxoSmithKline](#), [AstraZeneca](#) and [Johnson & Johnson](#) through manufacturer partnerships (GAVI) or as ‘supporters’ (CEPI).

But here’s where the author really hits the nail on the head. He clearly demonstrates and exhibits the true colors and intentions of GAVI, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and Big Pharma, stating [**emphasis added**]:

“The contrast between the multi-stakeholder approach and a ‘classic’ multilateral one came to the surface when South Africa and India proposed the so-called [World Trade Organization] [TRIPS waiver](#) at the end of last year. They requested a temporary lifting of intellectual property rules on all COVID-19 technologies in order to boost the manufacturing and distribution of vaccines and other essential medical products in mainly developing countries. WHO director general Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus said in a speech that he backed the proposal. “But GAVI, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation – even Bill Gates himself – and Big Pharma opposed this proposal very strongly,” said Nandi. “It’s more important for them to protect their interests and market mechanisms than to protect universal health or protect people from COVID.” ”

This pretty much showcases the inherent conflicts of interest and overall dangers in letting these corporate interests seize decision-making control of such supranational institutions and governing bodies that are supposed to serve the interests of global citizens.

To summarise the comparison of the BBC and openDemocracy articles, it is clear that the latter is to be taken more seriously; for, rather than concentrating on sensationalistic rhetoric, it focuses more deeply and sincerely on the issues at hand, and does so in a more systematic and referenced manner, citing credible sources.

The ESG, (Environment Social Governance) [ideology](#) and [model](#) must also not be forgotten when assessing how the concentration of corporate power is currently unfolding amidst this Great Reset.

A popular researcher and crypto commentator called Guy from the YouTube channel [Coin Bureau](#) – who has over 2 million followers – offers a rather revealing take on how ESG is being weaponised by the WEF, EU, UN, and corporate giants such as [Blackrock](#) – [the world’s largest asset manager, with US\\$10 trillion in assets under management](#) to destroy the current capitalist-based economic model.

His recent [video from February 5](#) sheds much needed light on the complex matter and can be viewed hereunder.

Video: Coin Bureau – ESG Regulations Are HERE!! How They Will Affect YOU!!

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Drpmlf0ZDal>

A financial educator, Mark Moss, also nicely summarised what ESG really is, along with its real-world consequences in a December 2, 2022 tweet:



Mark Moss
@1MarkMoss

What is ESG and where does this it come from?

Environmental, social, and governance (ESG) is a standard that tells investors whether a company is ESG friendly or not.

Burning fossil fuels is deemed bad for the environment, so oil & gas companies receive a bad ESG score.

2/



3:02 PM · Dec 2, 2022

187 Likes 26 Retweets

In outro for this section, it must also be noted that the WEF's twitter and [YouTube](#) accounts have disabled the comments section to the public. On Twitter, only people who the [@wef](#) and [@Davos](#) follows can reply. Many contend that if the WEF were indeed a truly benevolent organisation who wishes to offer benefits a be

good stewards to a global society, it would permit those from around the globe to have a voice in the matter.



2.3 Joshua Stylman on the violation of the Nuremberg Code & international laws

Joshua Stylman, a 3rd generation Holocaust survivor based in New York City testified to the overbearing measures implemented in his city during the pandemic along with what he called a “hit piece” that was directed against him by the New York Times. At around the 55:44 mark he stated the following:

“Human beings are entitled to determine what they put in their body. And I believe the Nuremberg Code guarantees that.”

For those unfamiliar, the [Nuremberg Code](#) began before the war but came to prominence following the [Nuremberg Trials](#) which took place after the Second World War which consisted of military tribunals for war crimes against members of the Nazi leadership who committed [medical experiments](#) on Jews in concentration camps.



Nazi defendants listen to testimony at the Nuremberg trials, which set a precedent for prosecuting crimes against humanity. Photo [source](#).

In short, the [Nuremberg Code](#) is a set of research ethics principles for human experimentation. It came about as a mechanism to ensure that the destructive medical and health-related experiments and atrocities committed against the Jewry during the Second World War would never happen again.

The [10 points of the Nuremberg Code of 1949](#) were given in the section of the verdict (of the case of the [USA vs. Karl Brandt trial](#)) entitled "[Permissible Medical Experiments](#)".

The following **first three** points of the code were referenced in the documentary and by Joshua Stylman (main headers):

1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.
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.

The first point entails more than just the header above. It also includes the following:

“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.”

It is clear from above that not only should *consent* be given to patients or those receiving treatments (such as with Covid-19 vaccinations), but that they should also have free choice to do so, or not do so, without *coercion*, *deceit*, or *fraud*, among other limitations.

Many have argued that promoting the Covid-19 as “safe and effective” represented a form of *deceit* and/or *fraud*, for these were *experimental* treatments authorised under *special* health measures and circumstances.

In addition, it is a fact that many nurses, medical doctors, health practitioners, and others have been *coerced* into taking the vaccinations; and, many who refused were fired from their positions. As such, many people acquiesced to receiving the procedure for fear that they would be terminated if they refused. This clearly amounts to a form of coercion and duress.

The third point, “The experiment should be so designed and based on the results of **animal experimentation**,” was also largely ignored. For, the usual animal testing phase was absent for some of the Covid-19 vaccinations.

The mention of safety, effectiveness, and animal testing by health authorities around the world who have advertised or promoted the Covid-19 vaccines varied from country to country and state to state or province to province.

In Canada, on the Quebec government’s health [website](#), we can notice the following in the section ‘**Safety of the vaccines**’ (last updated on February 2, 2023):

Safety of the vaccines

The COVID-19 vaccines approved by Health Canada are safe. They have been tested in quality studies on a large number of people and have gone through all the necessary steps prior to approval. They must meet the same quality and safety standards as any other vaccine used in Canada. Experts closely monitor any adverse events that might occur after vaccination and take measures to ensure that these vaccines are safe and effective.

Last update: February 2, 2023

Previous versions (such as that of [October 29, 2021](#)) somewhat varied and used to include a [hyperlink](#) (“*all the requirements*”) pointing to the [page](#) that describes all the steps in the vaccine development process, **including conducting preclinical studies in animals**:



The screenshot shows a Wayback Machine interface for the URL <https://www.quebec.ca/en/health/advice-and-prevention/vaccination/covid-19-vaccine>. The page title is "Safety of the vaccines". The main text reads: "The COVID-19 vaccines approved by Health Canada are safe. The vaccines were tested on a large number of people and have met [all the requirements](#) for approval." Below this, it states: "COVID-19 vaccines must meet the same quality and safety standards as any other vaccine used in Canada." The Wayback Machine logo and "121 captures" are visible in the top left corner.

While it remains unclear why Quebec Health removed the link to the [Vaccine development process page](#) from the ‘Safety of the vaccines’ section, the current page does state that they “have gone through all the necessary steps prior to approval” which remains disputable, given insufficient testing on animals, at least according to [Réinfo Covid Québec](#), a collective of medical doctors and scientific professionals.

As for the legality in promoting the vaccines, in [Réinfo Covid Québec](#)’ s [open letter](#) (addressed to the [Quebec college of physicians](#), the [public health director](#), and the [Quebec association of pediatricians](#)) they refer to Section 9 (1) of the [Canadian Food and Drugs Act](#) which states:

“ “9 (1) No person shall label, package, treat, process, sell or advertise any drug in a manner that is false, misleading or deceptive or is likely to create an erroneous impression regarding its character, value, quantity, composition, merit or safety.” ”

Advertising the mRNA Covid-19 vaccine in a manner that suggests it has met “the same quality and safety standards as any other vaccine used in Canada” is highly questionable since it was not fully tested on animals, it was hurriedly released and administered under an emergency directive, and was an experimental product of gene manipulation very different from conventional vaccines.

[Réinfo Covid Québec](#) also raised many other concerns, including the matter of consent (particularly with regards to children), and with regards to the government following the Quebec health authority’ s (the [INSPQ](#)) [recommendation to vaccinate children in order to protect more vulnerable groups of society](#).

But to return to the main subject at hand, the following question must be addressed.

Are countries bound to the Nuremberg Code?

While many people around the world often make reference to the [Nuremberg Code](#), the following must be emphasized regarding this code [**emphasis added**]:

“The Nuremberg Code has not been officially accepted as law by any nation or as official ethics guidelines by any association. (*see the Significance section of the [Everipedia article](#)*)”

This is an important point, i.e., that it is not law adopted by any nation, and may thus not be considered legally binding.

However, the reference article does state:

“However, the Code is considered to be the most important document in the history of [clinical research ethics](#), which had a massive influence on global human rights.”

and,

“In addition, the idea of informed consent has been [universally accepted and now constitutes Article 7 of the United Nations’ International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#). It also served as the basis for [International Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research Involving Human Subjects](#) proposed by the World Health Organization.”

Are there any existing international laws?

While the Nuremberg Code is not considered *law*, the United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner’s [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#) (adopted by a General Assembly resolution on December 16th, 1966) obligates [member states](#), through [several treaties](#), to protect individuals and groups against human rights abuses and refrain from interfering with or curtailing the enjoyment of human rights.

Article 7 of the [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#) clearly states the following:

Article 7

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation.

“Article 7

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation.”

As no one shall be subjected without his or her free consent to medical or scientific experimentation, this clearly outlines people’s rights not to be forced to take a vaccination - certainly not an *experimental* one like those from Pfizer, Moderna, and other pharmaceutical companies providing Covid-19 vaccines.

Moreover, any person or entity enforcing such experimental pharmaceuticals upon others are in direct violation of this legal right, and could thus be subject to legal action and possibly prosecuted.

For the reader who wants to make sure that his or her country adheres to this covenant by the United Nations, the official list of [173 countries that have legalized this covenant in their own legislatures](#). (See Wikipedia - International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights - Parties to the Covenant, URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Covenant_on_Civil_and_Political_Rights#Parties_to_the_Covenant)

What about domestic and local laws?

Laws regarding activities surrounding health measures vary from state to state, or province to province.

On December 13, 2022 in the United States of America, Florida Governor Ron DeSantis held an [accountability roundtable regarding the Covid-19 mRNA injections](#).

On the same day, a [PETITION FOR ORDER TO IMPANEL A STATEWIDE GRAND JURY](#) was submitted to The Supreme Court of Florida.

The petition included concerns that are material to the issues discussed thus far in this section. Here are some notable [highlights of the petition](#):

8. Florida's prohibitions on vaccine requirements could not prevent all federal vaccine requirements, such as those for military members. Many Floridians serving in Florida and abroad were forced to submit to COVID-19 vaccination as a condition of employment. These mandates were imposed even as evidence surfaced of increased cases of myocarditis and pericarditis in those vaccinated.⁵

18. Only months ago, a Pfizer executive confirmed at a hearing in front of the European Parliament that the company did not test its COVID-19 vaccines before they entered the market to determine whether they prevented the transmission of COVID-19.²³

25. Florida law prohibits fraudulent practices, including the dissemination of false or misleading advertisements of a drug and the use of any representation or suggestion in any advertisement relating to a drug that an application of a drug is effective when it is not.

The following week, on December 22, 2022, the highest court in the state approved the [ORDER DIRECTING IMPANELMENT OF A STATEWIDE GRAND JURY](#) (CASE NO. : SC22-1710) to investigate events surrounding the experimental Covid-19 injections.

Supreme Court of Florida

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 22, 2022

CASE NO.: SC22-1710

STATEWIDE GRAND JURY #22

ORDER DIRECTING IMPANELMENT OF A STATEWIDE GRAND JURY

THE COURT has received a Petition from the Honorable Ron DeSantis, Governor of Florida, for an order to impanel a statewide grand jury. “[T]his Court’s responsibility in impaneling a statewide grand jury is ‘ministerial in nature’” and is limited to reviewing whether the petition meets the statutory requirements. *State ex rel. Reichle v. Edwards*, 409 So. 2d 1043, 1044 (Fla. 1982) (quoting *In re Advisory Opinion to the Governor*, 290 So. 2d 473, 474 (Fla. 1974)). Being fully advised of the relevant matters, the Court hereby finds as follows:

The principal matters to be investigated are listed on top of page 2:

(a) Individuals, persons, and entities, including, but not limited to, pharmaceutical manufacturers (and their executive officers) and other medical associations or organizations involved in the design, development, clinical testing or investigation, manufacture, marketing, representation, advertising, promotion, labeling, distribution, formulation, packing, sale, purchase, donation, dispensing, prescribing, administration, or use of vaccines purported to prevent COVID-19 infection, symptoms, and transmission;


The passage from the image above calls for individuals and entities which include health authorities - including medical associations, pharmaceutical manufacturers, and their executive officers, as well as other parties involved in the various activities surrounding the experimental Covid-19 vaccines in question.

The duration of the Grand Jury is set to last for a term of 12 months from the date of impanelment.

It will be interesting to see what comes of it, as its outcome may set a legal precedent for other states to follow suit.

So far, there doesn't seem to be other grand juries established in other jurisdictions around the world to conduct similar investigations. But, it may only be a matter of time before the citizenry demand for them.

The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 3



Episode 3 – Breaking The Veil Of The Real Conspirators

3.1 Vera Sharav on the Eugenics Movement & the Gates Family

At the 12:49 mark, Vera Sharav, a Holocaust survivor, touches upon the topic of eugenics:

“I think that we need to clarify that the mindset of Nazis is not limited or restricted to Germans. The mindset is guided by eugenics - which is an elitist hierarchical ideology that divides humanity into segments: inferior, and superior...The truth is that this has infected, eugenics has infected and continues to infect many societies, including so-called democracies. There are individuals who hold this kind of ideology, really like a religion. They regard some human beings as inferior, and therefore expendable. They established policies that do just that.”

Sharav then goes on to state the starting point, or **origins** of the eugenics movement:

“Eugenics was first put together as a[n] ideology, as a philosophy by the British. But it was really really given a push by the robber barons in the United States. Germany imported the eugenics agenda, and the how-to - the

practical way, from the United States. It is an extraordinary evil ideology. It looks at human beings as flies, as specs.”

What is Eugenics?

Prior to examining the holocaust survivor’s **claims on the eugenics ideology and movement**, we need to look at the term itself and what is meant by *eugenics*. Its [etymology](#) reads as follows:

eugenics (n.)

"doctrine of progress in evolution of the human race, race-culture," 1883, coined (along with adjective *eugenic*) by English scientist Francis Galton (1822-1911) on analogy of *ethics*, *physics*, etc. from Greek *eugenes* "well-born, of good stock, of noble race," from *eu-* "good" (see **eu-**) + *genos* "birth" (from PIE root ***gene-** "give birth, beget").

The investigation of human eugenics, that is, of the conditions under which men of a high type are produced. [Galton, "Human Faculty," 1883]

Though **definitions** vary from one dictionary to another, the following from Merriam-Webster encompasses the general meaning of the term along with an example usage:

eugenics noun

eu·gen·ics (yü-'je-niks ◀▶)

plural in form but singular in construction

[Synonyms of eugenics >](#)

: the practice or advocacy of controlled selective breeding of human populations (as by sterilization) to improve the population's genetic composition

In 1883 Francis Galton, in England, coined the term "*eugenics*" to encompass the idea of modification of natural selection through selective breeding for the improvement of humankind ...

—Jeremiah A. Barondess

A half-century ago, *eugenics* became associated with Hitler, genocide and master-race theories, and its reputation has never recovered.

—Dan Seligman

In short, we can simplify eugenics as a doctrine that espouses selective breeding to ensure a “good stock” (from the Greek *eugenes*) of human beings which can be facilitated or enabled by sterilization or other means.

The Eugenics Movement

What is perhaps readily noticeable from both of these entries above is that they both refer to the English scientist named **Francis Galton**.

At least according to one writer and researcher on the subject, Sharav does seem to correctly point out that the eugenics movement originated in Britain, was proliferated in the United States by “robber barons”, i.e., wealthy industrialists, and was only later adopted by the Germans [just before and during WWII].

The author who substantiates these three notions is **Edwin Black** who wrote the book [War Against the Weak](#). The book’s cover appeared in the film while Sharav was

WAR AGAINST THE WEAK

EUGENICS AND AMERICA'S CAMPAIGN TO CREATE A MASTER RACE

**E D W I N
B L A C K**

— AUTHOR OF THE
INTERNATIONAL BESTSELLER
IBM AND THE HOLOCAUST



EXPANDED EDITION

INCLUDES NEW ESSAYS ON STATE GENOCIDE PROGRAMS

The book, first published on January 1st, 2003, was also made into a [documentary film](#). The synopsis of the film reads as follows:

“War Against the Weak is the untold story of American Eugenics, a movement that attempted to breed a Nordic master race through the elimination of the “unfit’.”

“In the first three decades of the 20th Century, American corporate philanthropy, combined with the efforts of the scientific, academic and political elite, created the pseudoscience eugenics, and institutionalized race politics as national policy. The goal was to create a superior, white, Nordic race and obliterate virtually everyone else.”

“Under the Nazis, American eugenic principles were applied without restraint, careening out of control into the Reich’s infamous genocide. American eugenicists openly supported Germany’s program, with both financial and intellectual capital. Once WWII began, Nazi eugenics turned from mass sterilization and euthanasia to genocidal murder. War Against the Weak explores this complex relationship between American eugenics and the horrors of the Holocaust.”

During an [interview which aired on C-SPAN in 2003](#) (alternate link [here](#)), the book’s author, [Edwin Black](#), mentions that his 600–page book has no less than 1500 footnotes, most of which were almost all exclusively from *primary* sources gathered by a team of 50 volunteer researchers who searched through 50,000 documents from 110 historical archives.

Black’s work further corroborates the aforementioned claims made by Vera Sharav.

Here are some **highlights** from the interview [with **links added** by this post’s author for additional context and verification purposes]:

- Eugenics started in Victorian England (i. e., at the end of the 19th century, start of the 20th century) by scientist [Francis Galton](#) who was the [half–]cousin of Charles Darwin.
- In the early 1900s, the ideas of eugenics were imported into the United States during a period of great ethnic and racial upheaval and conflict amidst millions of Jews, Blacks, Asians, Mexicans joining American society.
- In the early 20th century, America was being led by post Civil War elites who considered themselves liberals, progressives, and utopians (as the author puts it). And their idea of a utopia, was a world that would exist where there would be nobody who did not resemble themselves.
- This all came at a time when [Mendel’s principles of heredity](#) (see also [here](#) and [here](#)), had been rediscovered and proliferated in the United States. In short, Mendel’s principles of heredity examined the transmission of genetic traits (*before anyone knew genes/DNA existed*) from one generation to the next, examining why some offspring could be left *purser* and others *damaged*.

- Thus, these elites believed that things like *poverty*, *criminality*, and *morality* – which they perceived as more omnipresent amongst the “lower classes” were genetic traits. And thus, the best way to get rid of these issues and improve the world was to get rid of these people who held these genetic traits.
- Corporate philanthropy engaged in *ethnic cleansing* thus became the mechanism by which they could improve society.
- The key institutions involved in this included the [Carnegie Institution](#), the [Rockefeller Foundation](#), and the [Edward Harry] [Harriman](#) railroad fortune. They would establish research facilities on how to “eliminate” the *defective* or *unfit* (as they saw them) types of human beings.
- Though methods such as the use of gas chambers were considered, they opted for [forced surgical sterilisation for which they obtained related legislation in no less than 27 states](#). Some 60,000 Americans were sterilised.
- Intermarriage restrictions and marriage annulments were also imposed.
- “Farms” and “colonies” such as in New Jersey and Massachusetts were used as concentration camps for the “feeble-minded” or “racially unacceptable” in which hundreds of thousands of individuals were incarcerated and forcibly sterilised because they were deemed to be “unfit.”
- Corporate philanthropy backed up these racist policies on the behest of “fake science” and “fake academics” promulgated from the likes of elite universities in Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and Princeton.
- The corporate philanthropists wanted to expand the eugenics movement *worldwide*. So, the Carnegie Institution began to sponsor pseudoscientific medical journals around the world to proliferate their ideas into other countries. They sponsored related legislation in countries such as Canada, Belgium, as well as in Scandinavia. And their particular “pet project” of interest was that of Germany.
- The ideas grew in significance in Germany in the 1920s and 1930s which came to the attention of Adolf Hitler. Hitler studied American eugenics theories and laws and openly admired them.

Several philanthropic organisations were indeed established by these rich industrialists such as Carnegie and Rockefeller.

John D. Rockefeller III founded the [Population Council](#) , an NGO (non-governmental organisation) involved in biomedical research and public health which is still in operation to this day and for which Everipedia describes its global reach as follows:

“Headquartered in New York City, the Population Council has 18 offices in Africa, Asia, and Latin America and does work in more than 60 countries. With an annual budget of around \$74 million, it employs more than 500 people

from 33 countries with expertise in a wide array of scientific disciplines.”

The [Rockefeller-funded](#) Population Council still exists and operates to this day. According to its website, it is largely [focused on promoting the United Nation’s 2030 agenda with its Sustainable Development Goals \(SDGs\)](#) - as discussed in [Part 2](#) of this [review](#) - though four “global goals” which include ensuring reproductive rights (i.e., access to contraceptives and abortion services), promoting the [Climate Change](#) and [DEI \(Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion\)](#) agendas heavily concentrated on the [African continent as well as in India and Pakistan](#).

On an interesting [side note](#), it should also be observed that it was the Rockefellers who donated the land in New York City on which the United Nations building resides. The elitist family was heavily involved in the formation and funding of the UN which [continues to this day](#).

The [American Eugenics Society](#), or [AES](#) established by [Madison Grant](#), [Harry H. Laughlin](#), among others, which lasted from 1926 to 1972 was another outfit whose purpose was to promote eugenics education programs and efforts in the United States. It must also be noted and emphasised that Harry H. Laughlin also served as the Superintendent of the [Eugenics Record Office](#) from its inception in 1910 to its closing in 1939, and was among the most active individuals in influencing American eugenics policy, especially compulsory sterilization legislation.

And the [Eugenics Record Office](#) research institute, located in Cold Spring Harbor, New York, was established by the **Carnegie Institution**, founded by billionaire oligarch [Andrew Carnegie](#).

As is referenced and documented in the links above, ample evidence exists which attests that these organisations were not only heavily involved in eugenics research, but actively promoted eugenical sterilization on select segments of the U.S. population.

In addition, according to a recent article Smithsonian Magazine, the [American Society of Human Genetics](#), which was founded in 1948 just after the Second World War, had to [apologised](#) for the participation of several of its former leaders in the American eugenics movement.

The article further noted [with **emphasis added**]:

“The field of genetics has historically been misused to justify pre-existing prejudices. **The early American eugenics movement, which believed that so-called “undesirable” traits were determined by genes, formed the basis for genocide in Nazi Germany.**”

“Eugenicists created a pseudoscientific footing for racism, classism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, ableism and sexism that began in the late 1800s and [still has an impact today.](#)”

The first passage from above - in which the American eugenics movement formed the basis for genocide in Nazi Germany - is consistent with the research presented in Edwin Black’s book, as highlighted above in addition to a [thesis dissertation](#) by Cameron Williams from East Tennessee State University. Williams cited Black’s work in his thesis, stating:

“He [Hitler] tried to legitimize his anti-Semitism by medicalizing it and wrapping it in the more palatable pseudoscientific facade of eugenics.”

“Hitler proudly told his comrades just how closely he followed the progress of the American eugenics’ movement. “I have studied with great interest,” he told a fellow Nazi, “the laws of several American states concerning prevention of reproduction by people whose progeny would, probably, be of no value or be injurious to the racial stock.””

According to a December 7, 2011 New York Times article titled [A Disquieting Book from Hitler’s Library](#), revealed that the Nazi leader praised the aforementioned eugenicist [Madison Grant](#) from the American Eugenics Society; further stating that his book [The Passing of the Great Race](#) was his most valued book, quoted Grant in his speeches, and had even sent him a letter describing the book as his “bible.”

International Herald Tribune | THE GLOBAL EDITION OF THE NEW YORK TIMES

IHT Global Opinion

WORLD U.S. N.Y./REGION BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY SCIENCE HEALTH SPORTS OPINION

OP-ED CONTRIBUTOR

A Disquieting Book From Hitler's Library

By TIMOTHY W. RYBACK
Published: December 7, 2011


Hitler’s most valued book on America was “The Passing of the Great Race,” by a Columbia-educated eugenicist, Madison Grant, who claimed that American greatness, built on the Nordic stock of its founding fathers, was being eroded by the allegedly inferior blood of immigrant races. Hitler quoted liberally from Grant in his speeches and is said to have sent him a letter describing “The Passing of the Great Race” as “my bible.”

The second passage from the Smithsonian Magazine article above links to a NIH National Human Genome Research Institute Fact Sheet titled [Eugenics and Scientific Racism](#) which provides an overview of the eugenics movement spanning from the 1800s to today, and affirms that **the unfortunate trend persists to this day.** It also

points to a [eugenics resource](#) from the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum's [Holocaust Encyclopedia](#) that sheds even more light on the matter, also affirming:

“Eugenics provided the basis for the Nazi compulsory sterilization policy.”

They also provide a German Nazi era eugenics poster entitled “[The Nuremberg Law for the Protection of Blood and German Honor](#)” which outlawed marriages between Aryans and non-Aryans to maintain the “purity of blood” of the German people:



The illustration is a stylized map of the borders of central Germany upon which is imposed a schematic of the forbidden degrees of marriage between Aryans and non-Aryans and the text of the Law for the Protection of German Blood. The German text at the bottom reads, “Maintaining the purity of blood insures the survival of the German people. Circa 1935 in Stuttgart, [Wuerttemberg] Germany. Source: [US Holocaust Memorial Museum](#), courtesy of Hans Pauli.

The Kaiser Wilhelm Society

The [Kaiser Wilhelm Society](#) was a German scientific institution established in the German Empire in 1911. It was an umbrella organisation with many institutes, testing stations, and research units created under its authority.

The Kaiser Wilhelm Institute and its research facilities were involved in weapons research, experimentation and production in both world wars.

Of particular note with regards to the American eugenics' movement adopted by the Germans is that of one [Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer](#).

In his interview, author Edwin Black mentioned this individual as the “Chief Nazi eugenicist” who had received funding in the form of grants from the [Rockefeller Foundation](#).

Though Black doesn't mention the outfit by name in the video, it can be confirmed that he was referring to the [Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics](#), founded in 1927 in Berlin, Germany, of which Verschuer was its director from 1935 to 1942.

During the later part of the Second World War around 1943, Verschuer used research material obtained from the [Auschwitz concentration camp](#) through his former student [Josef Mengele](#), a German Schutzstaffel (SS) captain who served there as a camp physician.

[Mengele's Experiments at Auschwitz](#) consisted of [research](#) conducted on prisoners - particularly of the Jewish and Roma (a European ethnic group whose ancestry can be traced to modern-day India and Pakistan) descent. Testing methods of mass sterilization and [murdering and dissecting prisoners for anthropological and medical research](#) figured among some of the types of experiments conducted at Auschwitz.

The [Max Planck Society](#) from Germany also noted the following:

“From 1943 onwards, Otmar von Verschuer was receiving specimens from the Auschwitz extermination camp from Josef Mengele for the KWI for Anthropology, Human Genetics and Eugenics. Between 1940 and 1945, the KWI for Brain Research in Berlin examined around 700 brains taken from mentally ill and mentally handicapped victims of the Nazi euthanasia that was happening at the same time.”

Verschuer had a particular research interest in twins and under his direction, Mengele sought out twins among the prisoners for his experiments.

Twins research was the holy grail of for the eugenics movement, [noted author Edwin Black](#). Because, with it, you could unlock the mysteries of defective reproduction.

At [Auschwitz](#), Mengele collected hundreds of pairs of twins. He ordered his staff to measure and record every aspect of the twins' bodies. He drew large amounts of blood from the twins and sometimes performed other painful procedures on them.



Dr. Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer comparing twins to an eye chart. Photo source: [Lubbock Avalanche-Journal](#) from a [Large Holocaust exhibit on loan to Museum of Texas Tech](#).

“Mengele also murdered sets of twins at the same time in order to conduct autopsies of their corpses. After he studied the autopsies, Mengele sent some of their organs to the KWI-A,” [notes](#) the United States Holocaust Museum.

After the war, Verschuer was never tried for war crimes despite his collaboration with Mengele.

According to [Wikipedia](#), a report to the German Research Council (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft; DFG) from 1944, Verschuer talked about Mengele's assistance in supplying the KWI-A with some “scientific materials” from Auschwitz:

“My assistant, Dr. Mengele (M.D., Ph.D.) has joined me in this branch of research. He is presently employed as Hauptsturmführer [Nazi Captain] and camp physician in the concentration camp at Auschwitz. Anthropological investigations on the most diverse racial groups of this concentration camp are being carried out with permission of the SS Reichsführer [Himmler]; the blood samples are being sent to my laboratory for analysis.”

In 1929, the [Rockefeller Foundation appropriated a stunning \\$317,000](#) towards the building program for the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics. That was a tremendous amount of money at the time; and if adjusted for inflation on a historical basis, it would amount to approximately [\\$5.5 million](#) today.

Furthermore, annual reports from [1932](#), [1933](#), [1934](#), and [1935](#) show funding for various research programs - including brain research and research on twins.

Whether or not the Rockefellers had direct knowledge about the previously mentioned atrocious research experiments and murders conducted by Verschuer and Mengele is disputable. What we do know, however, is that they provided a lot of funding for these activities at the institute. Either way, the American industrialists still cannot be exonerated; for, one cannot shield oneself from the acts committed by the members and institutions of one's foundation.

Though set in a different historical time frame, the same can be said about the other philanthropists such as Carnegie, Harriman, et al.

While many philanthropical causes past and present are noble and worthy of recognition, conducting such kinds of pseudoscientific research - much of which has been proven unethical, immoral, and harmful - remains highly questionable to this day.

Thus far, Vera Sharav's claims about the eugenics movement and its origins prove quite accurate.

Gates & Planned Parenthood

In the last part of this segment of the film, Sharav points out that **Bill Gates** is a eugenicist as were his parents. She then posits that philanthropic foundations that oligarchs such as Bill Gates form become empowered to decide overarching policies, essentially usurping the will of the people who have not elected them. Bill Gates has huge financial interests in everything he donates to, she asserts.

During this segment of the film, three key images are displayed: one showing **Bill Gates** as head of the [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation](#), another with his father [William Henry Gates II](#) under the banner of [Planned Parenthood](#), and a third of [Margaret Sanger](#) - the founder of Planned Parenthood.

As for Sharav' s claim that such philanthropic organisations and their unelected members often bypass the will of the people and are empowered to decide overarching policies, well, that has been largely covered and substantiated in [Part 2](#) of this review series.

Since Planned Parenthood figures as a prominent outfit for such policies, it is worthwhile to at least briefly examine its origins and key actors in order to verify the concern Sharav holds about them.

Planned Parenthood was [spearheaded by Margaret Sanger](#) in the early 20th century. Access to birth control for women was central to her cause.

An article titled [Eugenics in America: The Legacy of Sanger and Gates](#) from Catholic Stand does indeed tie into the earlier discussion in this section and sheds additional light on the motivations of Planned Parenthood and those who ran and funded it.

The article states “Her [Margaret Sanger] unwavering support of eugenics as a means of achieving economic stability and improved public health was well-documented in her [many essays](#) and speeches.” It further contends [with **emphasis added**]:

“The Eugenics Movement faded to the background after World War II amid the horrors of the Nazi holocaust. However, **it continues to exert an influence on the modern activities of Planned Parenthood, particularly regarding its relationship with African-Americans and other minorities. It also can be seen in the philanthropic activities of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.**”

Before looking at recent activities of Planned Parenthood, Catholic Stand draws up a reference to its founder, Margaret Sanger' s racist past whereby she openly embraced the eugenics movement as a means to reduce the populations of “unfit” groups, particularly with Blacks (African-Americans).

The article makes reference to both [The Negro Project](#) (*click the link for an introduction to the project*) and to an article - Birth Control and Racial Betterment - written by Sanger in the [February, 1919 edition of The Birth Control Review](#). In the latter, they quoted Sanger' s words on stopping the “reproduction of the unfit,” as can be evidenced in the following screenshot image of her article.

Birth Control and Racial Betterment

By Margaret Sanger

BEFORE EUGENISTS AND others who are laboring for racial betterment can succeed, they must first clear the way for Birth Control. Like the advocates of Birth Control, the eugenists, for instance, are seeking to assist the race toward the elimination of the unfit. Both are seeking a single end but they lay emphasis upon different methods.

Eugenists emphasize the mating of healthy couples for the conscious purpose of producing healthy children, the sterilization of the unfit to prevent their populating the world with their kind and they may, perhaps, agree with us that contraception is a necessary measure among the masses of the workers, where wages do not keep pace with the growth of the family and its necessities in the way of food, clothing, housing, medical attention, education and the like.

We who advocate Birth Control, on the other hand, lay all our emphasis upon stopping not only the reproduction of the unfit but upon stopping all reproduction when there is not economic means of providing proper care for those who are born in health. The eugenist also believes that a woman should bear as many healthy children as possible as a duty

judge of the time and conditions under which her child should be brought into the world. We further maintain that it is her right, regardless of all other considerations, to determine whether she shall bear children or not, and how many children she shall bear if she chooses to become a mother. To this end we insist that information in regard to scientific contraceptives be made open to all. We believe that if such information is placed within the reach of all, we will have made it possible to take the first, greatest step toward racial betterment and that this step, assisted in no small measure by the educational propaganda of eugenists and members of similar schools, will be taken.

One fundamental fact alone, however, indicates the necessity of Birth Control if eugenics is to accomplish its purpose. Unless contraceptives are used, a child is likely to be born within a year of the last one. Even when the mother is exceptionally robust this frequent child-bearing is a heavy drain upon her system and nine times in ten, it is a drain upon the offspring. The mother's system has not had time to replenish itself with

Extract of an article titled Birth Control and Racial Betterment by Margaret Sanger, from [The Birth Control Review, February, 1919.](#)

The article then states Sanger's most successful endeavor toward this goal was what she called "[The Negro Project.](#)" The link to the project points to a website, blackgenocide.org with an article titled [The NEGRO PROJECT: Margaret Sanger's EUGENIC Plan for Black America](#) which was written just over a decade ago by Tanya L. Green.

The scathing article showcases the grave injustices committed towards Blacks in America, particularly with regards to population control against the racial group and how Margaret Sanger demonstrated clear racism and aligned herself with the eugenicists whose ideology prevailed in the early 20th century. Merely one cited passage from Sanger in her essay [We Must Breed a Race of Thoroughbreds](#) demonstrates her clear contempt against these peoples:

"In it she argued that birth control clinics, or bureaus, should be established "in which men and women will be taught the science of parenthood and the science of breeding." For this was the way "to breed out of the race the scourges of transmissible disease, mental defect, poverty, lawlessness, crime ... since these classes would be *decreasing* in number instead of breeding like weeds."

The lengthy article cites too many instances of Sanger's racism to include here. Even Planned Parenthood [recently](#) had to [acknowledge their founder's heinous past and attempt to distance themselves from her](#), stating:

"Sanger's belief in eugenics undermined reproductive freedom and caused irreparable damage to the health and lives of generations of Black people,

Latino people, Indigenous people, immigrants, people with disabilities, people with low incomes, and many others. Planned Parenthood denounces Margaret Sanger’ s belief in eugenics.”

The Catholic Stand article proceeds to note that 79% of Planned Parenthood’ s abortion clinics are located in or within walking distance of predominately African-American and Latino communities. And that “African-Americans have a disproportionately high abortion rate; though they make up 13 percent of the U.S. population, they comprise 30 percent of the country’ s abortions (from ProtectingBlackLife.org).”

The other article referenced earlier about The Negro Project titled [Black & Unwanted](#) also corroborates the racist views and actions of Sanger and highlights the disproportionality of abortions among the Black population, stating:

“The intent of Sanger’ s Negro Project is firmly intact. Nearly 40% of all African-American pregnancies end in induced abortion. [8] This is by design. Abortion kills more black people than the seven leading causes of death combined (heart disease, cancer, strokes, accidents, diabetes, homicide, and chronic lower respiratory diseases) according to CDC data. [9 – *National Center for Health Statistics, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2008.*] Black women have abortions at over 3x the rate of white women.”

A 2009 documentary film called [Maafa 21](#) traces eugenic thoughts and practices that have been set against African Americans from the time of slavery through the present. It provides additional context into the grave matter at hand. Though the full documentary runs over two hours and 20 minutes and is filled with heart-wrenching accounts, the [trailer](#) can be seen hereunder.

Video: Maafa 21 Trailer

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zLnNi_qb7nY

The Catholic publication is not shy in its disdain for Bill Gates. Though they highlight that the [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation](#) has donated billions to the cause of improving global health, largely by sponsoring vaccine and agricultural programs in Third World countries, they dig up the roots as to why the cause is so dear to the Microsoft founder.

Specifically, they cite [Bill Gates’ 2003 interview with Bill Moyer from PBS](#) on why he was so interested in population issues and reproductive health. The interview showed some of these roots with Bill Gates stating [**emphasis added**]:

“When I was growing up, my parents were almost involved in various volunteer things. **My dad was head of Planned Parenthood.** And it was very controversial to be involved with that. And so it’s fascinating. At the dinner table my parents are very good at sharing the things that they were doing. And almost treating us like adults, talking about that.”

An [article from Salon](#) did further confirm that Gates Sr. was on the national board of Planned Parenthood.

Undoubtedly, such a position as a board member gave the elder philanthropist a tremendous amount of power over the activities of Planned Parenthood which included abortion operations and other population control efforts.

Apart from his involvement in Planned Parenthood, it should also be noted that [William H. Gates Sr.](#), Bill's father, [invested in the founding](#) of the **Bill and Melinda Gates Institute for Population and Reproductive Health** at Johns Hopkins University (the [Gates Institute](#)) which was his [initiative](#), notes [Population Services International \(PSI\)](#).

The Gates Institute at the John Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health aims to “achieve the goal of expanding access to quality contraceptive information, services, and supplies” through its [Advance Family Planning \(AFP\)](#) unit which itself consists of more than 300 organisations across 41 countries.

AFP also includes a key outfit called [Smart Advocacy](#) which is financially supported by 3 foundations: The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the [David and Lucile Packard Foundation](#) and [The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation](#) - the latter two being of the Hewlett-Packard (HP) fame. The three foundations combined account for nearly \$70 billion in endowments funds.

Interestingly, AFP boasts of their SMART—Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-bound—Advocacy approach, stating [**emphasis added**]:

“SMART Advocacy transforms the way family planning champions **maximize their time and funds to effectively persuade those in power to act.**”

Needless to say, stating their approach in such a manner can easily lead one to infer that they use their financial prowess to “persuade those in power to act” which essentially can be interpreted as buying local politicians or key players positioned in those countries' health and social institutions to advance their causes.

[Population Services International \(PSI\)](#) is yet another foundation that focuses on [reproductive health \(contraception\)](#) and [abortion](#) in [Third World nations](#) which is [funded by](#) The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF), their [key partner](#).

And it doesn't end there. [The Bill & Melinda Gates Medical Research Institute](#) represents yet another Gates outfit concerned with public health abroad.

Furthermore, the BMFG is also omnipresent in two United Nations outfits regarding family planning and related endeavours, namely the [United Nations Population Fund \(UNFP\)](#) and [FP2030, or Family Planning 2030](#). Moreover, BMFG [has been heavily](#)

[invested](#) in the UNFP for over a decade and has earmarked over [\\$1.4 billion to FP2030](#).

Catholic Stand asserts that Bill Gates is no different than his forebears who espoused a Malthusian eugenics philosophy, stating:

“Decreasing Population Through Better Health Care?”

As did Sanger, Gates believes in the eugenicist Thomas Malthus’ s idea that the sustainability of the world’ s resources is completely dependent upon maintaining population control. Ironically, Gates believes that improving health care, primarily through vaccinations, will accomplish this.”

They then refer to Bill Gates’ irreconcilable notion that improving global health care can be accomplished by reducing the world’ s population through vaccines and reproductive health services. Moreover, they are referring to Bill Gates infamous [2010 TED talk](#) on the goal of achieving zero carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions by 2050.



The formula for reducing CO₂ emissions, as per [Bill Gates 2010 TED Talk Innovating to Zero](#).

In the talk, Gates pointed to the “P” (population) factor and how it can be lowered to reduce CO₂ emissions. Specifically, Gates stated the following:

"Now the world today has 6.8 billion people that's headed up to about 9 billion. Now, if we do a really great job on new vaccines, health care, reproductive services, we could lower that by about 10 or 15 percent." – Bill Gates' TED Talk 'Innovating to zero!

While [many so-called fact-checking organisations](#) have stated that Gates' s didn' t mean to use vaccines as a way to reduce the world' s population and that his words were taken out of context, the fact remains that he did utter those words.

On a separate occasion, when asked by CNN' s Dr. Sanjay Gupta about his Decade of Vaccines initiative, [he said](#): "The benefits [of vaccines] are there in terms of reducing sickness, reducing population growth."

Moreover, these "fact-checking" outfits also fail to include the *historical context* as it pertains to the eugenics movement along with the mindsets and lineages these wealthy elite carry.

Furthermore, they also fail to admit the openly stated admissions and involvement in depopulation agendas which continue today through the likes of the Population Council, those others listed earlier, and a similar outfit called [Population Connection](#), formerly the Zero Population Council, or [ZPG](#), which has been criticised as a [genocidal movement fostered by John D. Rockefeller III](#).

More on The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

It should first be noted that the [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation](#) has been described as a [shell for tax avoidance](#) by philanthropist and accounting expert, Sheldon Drobny. To this point, *Techrights* has documented a lot of evidence regarding the endeavors and dubious connections of the foundation in their [Gates Foundation Critique collage](#). The many instances therein describe their pharmaceutical patent investments, investments in experimental and controversial crops, GMO ventures, numerous tax shelters, political connections, and more.

Other reports of malpractice and even manslaughter from the foundation seldom make the news headlines in the West. Nevertheless, they are documented.

In 2010, the Gates Foundation funded a phase 3 trial of GlaxoSmithKline' s experimental malaria vaccine, [killing 151 African infants](#) and [causing serious adverse effects including paralysis, seizure, and febrile convulsions to 1,048 of the 5,949 children](#).

More troubling revelations surfaced with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation's [polio program](#) when, in April of 2012, it was reported in the Indian medical press that some [47,500 children had become permanently disabled](#) as a direct result of the polio vaccination campaign.



Bill Gates administers an oral polio vaccine in New Delhi in 2000. Photo source and credit: The [Seattle Times June 30, 2008](#), Jeff Christensen.

But the number of paralyzed children from the oral polio vaccine administered under the Gates program was actually *much higher*, as indicated in a later (2018) medical research paper published by a team of Indian doctors in the International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. The August 15, 2018 paper was titled [Correlation between Non-Polio Acute Flaccid Paralysis Rates with Pulse Polio Frequency in India](#) which highlights the following staggering numbers [with emphasis added]:

“We calculated the number of paralyzed children each year which exceeded the expected numbers (assuming a NPAFP rate of 2/100,000) and the results are displayed in Table 2. A total of 640,000 children developed NPAFP in the years 2000 - 2017, suggesting that there were an additional 491,000 paralyzed children above our expected numbers for children with NPAFP.”

Childrens Health Defense had also reported on this, stating that [Indian doctors blame the Gates campaign for a devastating non-polio acute flaccid paralysis \(NPAFP\) epidemic that paralyzed 490,000 children beyond expected rates between 2000 and 2017](#) (see also [here](#) and [here](#)). In 2017, the Indian government dialed back Gates’ vaccine regimen and asked Gates and his vaccine policies to leave India. NPAFP rates dropped precipitously.

In 2014, the Gates Foundation funded tests of *experimental* HPV vaccines, developed by GlaxoSmithKline (GSK) and Merck (two pharmaceutical giants) on [23,000 young girls](#) between 10 and 14 years of age in remote Indian provinces. Approximately 1,200 suffered severe side effects, including autoimmune and fertility disorders. Seven died. [Indian government investigations](#) charged that Gates-funded researchers committed pervasive ethical violations: pressuring vulnerable village girls into the trial, bullying parents, forging consent forms, and refusing medical care to the injured girls. The case made it to the country’ s Supreme Court.

A February 9, 2017 article from The Economic Times India titled [Centre shuts health mission gate on Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation](#) confirmed that the country’ s advisory body - National Technical Advisory Group on Immunization (NTAGI) - cut ties with the BMGF due to conflicts of interests with pharmaceutical companies and other reasons; the article noted the following [link added]:

“There were questions about the Gates Foundation’ s ties with pharmaceutical companies and the possible influence this may have on the country’ s vaccination strategy. [Global Policy Forum](#), an independent policy watchdog that seeks to promote accountability in international organisations, raised some of these concerns in a study in December 2015.”

“The [study](#), called ‘[Philanthropic Power and Development -Who shapes the agenda?](#)’, had cautioned on “the growing influence of the large global philanthropic foundations, especially the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, on political discourse and agenda-setting in targeted fields, and fully

analyze the risks and side effects — intended and unintended — of these activities on sustainable development” ”

The [Global Policy Forum](#) describes itself as an independent policy watchdog that monitors the work of the United Nations and scrutinizes global policymaking. Their [study](#) (click link to access PDF) provides a good overview of philanthropic foundations, their influence on global health agenda - including the UN’ s 2030 Sustainable Development agenda, and how they use their power over agenda setting, often sidelining the role of governments. It is certainly worth the read.

According to an April 23rd, 2020 Children’ s Health Defense article titled [The Bill Gates Effect: WHO’ s DTP Vaccine Killed More Children in Africa Than the Diseases it Targeted](#) authored by none other than their Chairman Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., GAVI, Gates, and the WHO aggressively pushed the dangerous DTP vaccine program despite horrendous results. Moreover, they “strong-armed” African nations in the process. Here are some key excerpts from the article [with some **emphasis added**]:

“But Bill Gates and his surrogates, GAVI and WHO, [made DTP a priority for African babies.](#)”

“Dr. Mogenson and his team found that **girls vaccinated with the DTP vaccine died at 10 times the rate of unvaccinated kids.**”

“For African nations, GAVI and WHO use DTP vaccine uptake to gauge national compliance with vaccine recommendations. GAVI can financially punish nations that don’ t fully comply.”

“The researchers suggested that the DTP vaccine is killing more children than the diseases it targets. It’ s possible that millions of children are adversely affected.”

Note that GAVI is the short name for [The Vaccine Alliance](#) which was [set up by the Bill & Melinda Gates foundation in 1999 with seed money of US\\$ 750 million.](#)

GAVI has also received [millions in funding](#) from the [Rockefeller Foundation](#).

As a strong advocate of vaccination [destined towards the world’ s poorest countries](#), GAVI and its partners always stands to profit from large governmental orders of vaccines.

Yet another article, [12 Reasons to Get Angry about the Gates Foundation’ s Latest Project to Sterilize Women](#), from author [Susan E. Wills](#) points to another controversial [project](#) by his foundation, [Pfizer](#), and the [Children’ s Investment Fund Foundation \(CIFF\)](#) which subsidized the production of an injectable contraceptive Sayana Press, a different version of the [Depo-Provera](#) birth-control shot at \$1 per 3-month dose to women in 69 of the world’ s poorest countries. Wills notes the intolerable side effects in her article.

Eugenics by any other name

Over its evolution, the eugenics movement has had to redefine and reengineer itself due to societal pushback and due criticism.

In the early days, the movement frequently employed code words, or terms such as *feebleminded*, *unfit*, and *imbecile* to describe those they deemed to be of inferior *stock*, or races.

Over the decades though, many of these words became socially unacceptable and politically incorrect not only to the greater masses, but also for the political establishment.

Accordingly, certain of these code words needed to be toned down so as to placate negative feedback towards the eugenics movement itself, and the institutions that served it.

Many eugenics or population reduction institutions underwent such name changes.

One of the earliest, the *American Eugenics Society*, changed its name twice with the latest being the *Society for Biodemography and Social Biology*. The *Kaiser Wilhelm Society* became the *Kaiser Wilhelm Society for the Advancement of Science*. The *American Birth Control League* became *Planned Parenthood*. The *Zero Population Council* became *Population Connection*. And, though *Population Services International* hasn't changed its name, it is mostly referred to as PSI.

Most likely, such name changes occurred so as to not be associated with words like *control* and *population*, as in *population control*.

Even today, name changes for organisations and related code words are frequently reengineered, or reimagined to portray a more positive connotation. For instance, *family planning* or *family planning clinic* sounds less menacing than *abortion* and *abortion clinic*. *Contraception* also sounds more appealing and convenient than *birth control*. *Pro-choice* and *reproductive rights/freedoms* sound a lot better than *pro-abortion*. *Gender-Affirming Care* sounds a hell of a lot better than *genital mutilation/sterilization*. And so on, and so forth.

If we are to presume that the eugenics movement is still alive and well today, it should come as no surprise that the meticulous selection and use of socially and politically acceptable, though concurrently deceptive, verbiage would be imperative; by doing so, it would prove much easier to obfuscate true agendas and intentions that are related to population control or sterilisations.

3.2 Vera Sharav on Transhumanism

Sharav then shifts to how eugenics is now being revamped and revitalised into the upgraded technological movement of *transhumanism*:

“And at this point they want to transform the human species into transhumanists - partly robot, technology, and partly blood and sweat. But really something that they can control, totally. You’ve got biotechnology and surveillance technology. And when the two get together, that’s lethal. That leads to genocide.”



*Screenshot depicting a young lady accessing her bank account via a biometric facial recognition feature of her smart phone. Taken from [Part 3 - Breaking The Veil Of The Real Conspirators](#) from the docuseries *Never Again Is Now Global*.*

While the subject of [transhumanism](#) is rather broad and complex, it is worth examining it from Sharav’s point of view that it will be used as a **biotechnical surveillance tool for controlling human beings and their behaviour**.

At first, this thesis seems quite far-fetched.

But, one only needs to reconsider what has taken place over the last few years during the Covid-19 Pandemic.

It can certainly be argued that *Vaccine passports* employed in many countries were a form of biotechnical surveillance tools for tracking the movement of individuals. Moreover, they strongly incentivised human behavior in that those who refused to take the experimental Covid-19 vaccines saw their mobility rights strictly restricted.

Yet, transforming human beings into transhumanist beings to the extent that they can be *directly* controlled remains somewhat trailblazing at this juncture.

That doesn't mean, however, that there aren't outfits already working on such endeavours.

Billionaire entrepreneur Elon Musk's [Neuralink](#) project comes to mind.

Neuralink is an American technology company working on implantable [brain - computer interfaces \(BCIs\)](#) which can provide a direct communication pathway between the brain's electrical activity and an external device such as a computer.

For now, the technology seems mostly focused on improving neurological disorders, or restoring sensory and motor functions in afflicted individuals.

The following video from the YouTube channel AI Evolution titled [The future is now: Elon Musk says Neuralink is ready for human testing](#) provides a brief and informative overview of the technology, including its ethical implications and concerns.

Video: AI Evolution – The future is now: Elon Musk says Neuralink is ready for human testing

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n99ZAGGUcU>

As the author of the video mentions, concerns about the use, or *misuse*, of this technology include:

- the potential for hacking;
- invasion of privacy (to one's inner thoughts, inner sanctum);
- the potential for government and corporations to use this technology to *monitor or control* people's thoughts.

It is to be presumed that these concerns are the ones that Very Sharav are primarily worried about.

And with good reason.

Numerous lectures and appearances from a very controversial figure, [Yuval Noah Harari](#) - a widely published author and professor from the Department of History at Hebrew University of Jerusalem, have caused a certain level of outrage.

As far back as five years ago at the 2018 World Economic Forum's annual meeting, Harari referred to humans as "hackable" creatures in his [Will the Future Be Human?](#) lecture to the elites in attendance.

Video: World Economic Forum – Will the Future Be Human? - Yuval Noah Harari

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hL9uk4hKyq4>

During the lecture, Harari made several other stunning admissions regarding the contemplated endeavour of “hacking humanity.”

Addressing a room full of powerful elites in attendance he asked rhetorically before answering the following:

“Q: What do you need to hack humans?”

“A: You need two things: 1) A lot of **computing power**; 2) And you need a lot of **data** - especially **biometric data**.”

The Israeli professor and author posited that “**organisms** [such as humans] **are** [biochemical] **algorithms**,” thus postulating or suggesting the *means* by which humans are “programmable” creatures. In other words, biometric data of humans can be not only be accessed, but also *modified* which could lead to desired changes in the body and mind.

Harari further inquired:

“Q: How exactly will the future **masters of the planet** look like?”

“A: This will be decided by **the people who own the data**. Those who control the data, control the future, not just of humanity, but the future of life itself.”

The above response is quite a radical thesis, for it implies that people’s biometric data could be owned by parties other than themselves - something which completely eradicates bodily sovereignty and, inherently, freedom itself.

He also refers to how the ruling class can obtain absolute power over humanity and life itself.

In line with this thesis, Harari envisions the rise of a “Digital Dictatorship” whereby current democratic societies will need to cede their place to a single **technocratic dictatorship** where all the data and power is concentrated or centralised in *one* place.

He further contends that “control of data might enable human elites to do something even more radical than just build digital dictatorships,” whilst scoffing the notion of intelligent design by some “God above the cloud,” as he puts it. “By *our* intelligent design. And the intelligent design of *our* clouds: the IBM cloud, the Microsoft cloud; these are the new driving forces of evolution,” he indomitably asserts.

Needless to say, the notion of having powerful private corporations in charge of, and in control of our biometric data to reshape intelligent design in their ethos is a very dangerous thing. Companies like [IBM](#), [Microsoft](#), [Amazon](#), and [Tencent](#) have

already taken ownership of a lot of our personal data in terms of private personal information, shopping and online habits, and the like. Should they bring it to the next level of *biometric* data, the consequence could prove disastrous.

As was also noted in the third episode of the Holocaust docuseries, the leader of the World Economic Forum, Klaus Schwab, further confirmed Harari's vision during a [January 10, 2016 interview](#) when he predicted that within ten years, i.e., by 2026, humans would have chips implanted in their brains that will be linked to the digital world.

Video: 10 januari 2016 - Interview Klaus Schwab - World Economic Forum

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XQWoMy-URPk>

[Privacy International](#), an advocacy group based in the U.K. that promotes [privacy rights](#), warns that [governments](#) and [corporations](#) abuse their power to invade our privacy, threatening our freedoms. They provide a good overview of [biometrics](#) and how the [Surveillance-Exploitation Complex](#) seeks to access and exploit our personal data against us.

Most people would be stunned as to the extent to which their personal data, including biometric data, is being collected and exploited by both public and private entities.

[BiometricUpdate.com](#) is another outfit that provides many articles on the subject of [biometric](#) data collection and exploitation.

One of the main concerns people have with regards to the collection of personal biometric data is that of it being used against them for [surveillance](#) and the imposition of [Digital IDs](#) which may lead to becoming slaves to a [Central Bank Digital Currency](#), or [CBDC](#). The merging of these three pillars enabled via the common denominator of *biometric data* could indeed prove disastrous for human sovereignty and freedom.

To sum up this subsection, the “hackability” of humans, particularly through our personal and private biometric data, is indeed a highly sought-after prize from the likes of elite globalists from the WEF and other supranational organisations, as well as powerful corporate interests and governments. And they should definitely be of concern not only to Vera Sharav, but to us all.


3.3 Vera Sharav on how Covid-19 was planned Biowarfare

Near the 15:38 mark, Sharav makes her boldest claim that the **Covid-19 Pandemic** was undeniably *planned* and came about due to the United States' conducting illegal biowarfare research.

“It’ s hard to hold on to the fiction that the [Covid-19] pandemic was not planned because United States government was paying millions and millions of dollars which were, um, delegated really by Anthony Fauci to laboratories that were doing illegal biowarfare research under the euphemism gain of function. Gain of function research is biowarfare research. It is illegal by international law. But it’ s not being abided by. The evidence from the Wuhan lab in China is sufficient, totally sufficient, to show that it emanated from there within the context of gain of function research. So yes, it was in the planning stage for a long time, and then it happened. The two go together. ”

Overall, this claim has substantial merit and backing - if only by the documents referenced and flashed on the screen during the documentary film. Some of these will be referenced to and linked below.

First, a proposal for research into sequencing and reverse-engineering a SARSr-CoVs virus from bats to then test on humanised mice to assess the capacity to create or cause a SARS-like disease was indeed submitted on March 24, 2018 to the United States Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, better known as DARPA for its PREEMPT program. The proposed project’ s name was [Project DEFUSE: Defusing the Threat of Bat-borne Coronaviruses](#) by Dr. Peter Daszak, the President of EcoHealth Alliance.



Part of the cover page for [EcoHealth Alliance’ s Project DEFUSE: Defusing the Threat of Bat-borne Coronaviruses](#).

Section II**A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Technical Approach: Our goal is to defuse the potential for spillover of novel bat-origin high-zoonotic risk SARS-related coronaviruses in Asia. In TA1 we will intensively sample bats at our field sites where we have identified high spillover risk SARSr-CoVs. We will sequence their spike proteins, reverse engineer them to conduct binding assays, and insert them into bat SARSr-CoV (WIV1, SHC014) backbones (these use bat-SARSr-CoV backbones, not SARS-CoV, and are exempt from dual-use and gain of function concerns) to infect humanized mice and assess capacity to cause SARS-like disease. Our modeling team will use these data to build machine-

Part of the Executive Summary for [EcoHealth Alliance's Project DEFUSE: Defusing the Threat of Bat-borne Coronaviruses](#) with relevant parts underlined in red color.

The [proposal was rejected](#) for several reasons including its involvement in [Gain of Function](#) research which was not permitted by U.S. law.

In short, Gain-of-function research (GOFR) involves modifying microorganisms such as viruses to increase their transmissibility and virulence (to overcome a host's defenses and cause disease or damage).

What is perhaps peculiar from the title page's image from the proposal (as illustrated in the figure above) is the use of soldiers - so as to suggest a possible combat edge. EcoHealth Alliance was, after all, seeking funds from DARPA, a military organisation which is the central research unit of the U.S. Department of Defense. In other words, it suggests using more deadly viruses as a combat vehicle which many would refer to as a *bioweapon*.


Though the research proposal was rejected by DARPA mostly due to its illegality under U.S. law, Dr. Peter Daszak, the President of EcoHealth Alliance, nevertheless did manage to indirectly proceed with this particular gain of function research through the [National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases \(NIAID\)](#) for which Dr. Anthony Fauci was [Director](#) at the time.

It should be noted that from the onset of the Covid-19 Pandemic, Dr. Anthony Fauci served as one of the leading members of the [White House COVID-19 Response Team](#), also serving as [Chief Medical Advisor](#) to President Joe Biden. Dr. Fauci, a physician-scientist and immunologist and former director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) from 1984 to 2022, has been the most prominent figure in determining response efforts regarding the Covid-19 Pandemic in the United States.

The documentary film flashed many pages from documents which appear to come from DARPA showing that the gain of function research did take place with Dr. Fauci, as his NIAID had not rejected the proposal (for the same research). Many of the highlights from those pages can be viewed from [peakd.com](#) in their January 22, 2022 post titled [Excerpts from a DARPA document regarding COVID-19 origins](#).

The post highlights some passages from a DARPA report written by USMC Major Joseph Murphy which was obtained by [Project Veritas](#) (see [Military Documents About Gain of Function Contradict Fauci Testimony Under Oath](#)).

An August 13, 2021 unclassified document from DARPA which pertained to investigating the origins of SARS-CoV-2 (the virus that causes the Covid-19 disease) appears on the Peakd.com website, followed by excerpts of the said report which include the following:



“2. SARS-Cov-2, hereafter referred to as SARSr-CoV-WIV, is a synthetic spike protein chimera engineered to attach to human ACE2 receptors and inserted into a recombinant bat SARSr-CoV backbone. It is likely a live vaccine not yet engineered to a more attenuated state that the program sought to create with its final version. It leaked and spread rapidly because it was not ready to infect bats yet, which is why it does not appear to infect bats. The reason the disease is so confusing is because it is less a virus than it is engineered spike proteins hitch-hiking a ride on a SARSr-CoV quasispecies swarm. The close it is to the final live attenuated vaccine form, the more likely that it has been deattenuating since initial escape in August 2019.”

WIV refers to the [Wuhan Institute of Virology](#), a [biosafety level 4](#) lab, where the research on bat coronaviruses took place under the direction of EcoHealth Alliance.

The second paragraph, hereunder, is perhaps of more interest and significance (with some **emphasis added** for relevance):

“**Ivermectin** (identified as curative in April 2020) works throughout all phases of illness because it both inhibits viral replication and modulates the immune response. Of note, chloroquine phosphate (**Hydroxychloroquine**,

identified April 2020 as curative) is identified in the proposal as a SARSr-CoV inhibitor, as is interferon (identified May 2020 as curative).”

It basically states that [Ivermectin](#) and [Hydroxychloroquine](#) were *very effective* drugs at combatting the coronavirus *as early as April 2022*.

And it is also very worthwhile to note that at the height of the Covid-19 Pandemic both of these drugs were highly ridiculed as a treatment by not only the mainstream media, but also by various health authorities around the world, including the [Center for Disease Control \(CDC\)](#), [Food and Drug Administration \(FDA\)](#), and the [World Health Organization \(WHO\)](#).

Even the acclaimed medical journal The Lancet had to [retract](#) a sham study about Hydroxychloroquine being ineffective in the treatment of Covid-19 in the middle months of 2020 early on during the pandemic.

Returning to the Peakd.com report that was obtained by Project Veritas, we find that secrecy was the order of the day with regards to the gain of function research project:

A technological challenge as difficult as inoculating bats in China would be tried at DARPA first. The massive, “Manhattan Project”-level of information suppression executed by the government and the Trusted News Initiative indicates that it would be covered-up if something bad happened. The lab-leak hypothesis and squabbling between Senator Paul and Dr. Fauci indicated that the cover up was more localized. Further, an actual cover-up would be more disciplined with its paperwork. So I presumed that unclassified files would be concealed on a higher network and found them where I expected them to be. I understood what they were and their content, pushed the files off-site, and compiled this report.

The more incriminating part of this passage is: “The massive, “Manhattan Project”-level of information suppression executed by government and the Trusted News Initiative indicates that it would be covered-up if something bad happened.” For, it attests to the highest level of secrecy sought for the project and how the government and the Trusted News Initiative should suppress, or “cover-up” any leaked information that spilled the beans on the secretive work and its possible lab leak as the origins of the deadly virus outbreak.

For those unfamiliar with the [Trusted News Initiative \(TNI\)](#), it is a multi-level partnership created in 2019 by the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) to counter so-called fake news; or, as Substack author Jennifer Brown puts it, to serve as a grid of [global information control](#).

The TNI includes all the news giants such as Reuters, the BBC, AP, AFP, CBC/Radio-Canada, along with tech giants such as Microsoft, Facebook, Google, and YouTube.

In other words, it covers the vast majority of news that is viewed by the greater public, at least in the Western world.

Former CBC, CTV, Vancouver Sun, and Montreal Gazette journalist Rodney Palmer recently made a [presentation](#) exposing the broader systemic problem of mainstream journalism and the Trusted News Initiative itself. In the highly revealing presentation, Palmer demonstrates how mainstream outlets are highly coordinated and consistent in how narratives and messages are crafted and synchronously disseminated to the broader public. In other words, through the Trusted News Initiative, these outlets can easily suppress whatever it deems fake news or disinformation, regardless of whether that is the true state of reality.

Therefore, in the broader context of information suppression about the origins of Covid-19, it is important to consider such efforts that have been undertaken by the TNI and their media and Big Tech partners.

Thankfully, more independent news outlets have allowed for counter narratives to be published which challenge the narratives of mainstream outlets which, undeniably, are also highly-funded by pharmaceutical giants. One such outlet has been [The Intercept](#).

The aforementioned [Peakd.com article](#) cites from the report obtained by Project Veritas which attests that the SARS-CoV-2 *was* created by the EcoHealth Alliance research program at the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV).

Additional verification about this claim needs to be provided in order to substantiate Vera Shara's claim that it was created a bioweapon at the WIV.

Previous evidence has surfaced regarding a [massive coverup by the Chinese government](#) and apparent [pre-pandemic linkages between US-funded labs and the Wuhan Institute of Virology](#).

[Dr. Anthony Fauci](#) who was the Director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and a key leader in the United States regarding the handling of the Covid-19 Pandemic has repeatedly [lied](#) to the U.S. Congress and [denied](#) that any [gain-of-function](#) research (specifically, the bat coronavirus research project by EcoHealth Alliance) had taken place under his US government-funded National Institutes of Health (NIH) lab in Wuhan.

[Surfaced letters](#) have shone additional light on the matter demonstrating that [funding from NIH to EcoHealth Alliance](#) did indeed occur.

In addition, a [report from The Intercept](#) following a [FOIA](#) request produced 900 pages of materials relating to coronavirus research in China. Another Intercept article from just a few days later titled [NIH Documents Provide New Evidence U.S. Funded Gain-of-Function Research in Wuhan](#) further confirmed that the U.S. had indeed funded the research.

Furthermore, an email letter from [Peter Daszak](#) from [EcoHealth Alliance](#) dated April 18, 2020, [surfaced](#) whereby Daszak thanked Anthony Fauci, the head of the Covid-19 response team, for his [false] public comments regarding the origins of Covid-19.

News aggregator ZeroHedge ran an [article](#) on August 6, 2021 whereby virologist [Shi Zhengli](#) (also known as "Bat Lady") of the Wuhan Institute of Virology - whose lab received US funding to make coronaviruses more infectious to humans - warned that the virus will continue to [mutate](#) producing new strains.



Virologist [Shi Zhengli](#) (left), also known as "bat lady" photographed with [Peter Daszak](#) (right) from EcoHealth Alliance, source: [ZeroHedge](#) and [DailyMail](#).

And what is perhaps the most utterly farcical in this sordid affair is the fact that Peter Daszak was actually part of the [investigation team](#) lead by the [WHO](#) that sought to look into the lab leak theory of the virus' origins which affirms an egregious display of conflict of interest. Unsurprisingly, the investigation, which only took [three hours to conduct](#), resulted in a complete absolution of EcoHealth Alliance and the Wuhan Institute of Virology. If that doesn' t stink as a monumental cover-up, this author isn' t sure what does.

[Dr. Robert Malone](#), an internationally recognized scientist/physician and the original inventor of mRNA vaccination as a technology, also chimed in about the report leaked by [Project Veritas](#) in his January 11, 2022 Substack post titled [Tidal Wave of Documents on Gain-of-Function and the Leak of the Virus](#).



Screen capture showing a photograph of Dr. Peter Daszak, President of EcoHealth Alliance and Dr. Anthony Fauci, recent director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID). Taken from Project Veritas' January 10, 2022 article and video [Military Documents About Gain of Function Contradict Fauci Testimony Under Oath](#).

Finally, the report also revealed how mRNA-based Covid-19 vaccines cannot effectively defeat the virus due to their synthetic nature/composition:

The gene-encoded, or "mRNA," vaccines work poorly because they are synthetic replications of the already-synthetic SARSr-CoV-WIV spike proteins and possess no other epitopes. The mRNA instructs the cells to produce synthetic copies of the SARSr-CoV-WIV synthetic spike protein directly into the bloodstream, wherein they spread and produce the same ACE2 immune storm that the recombinant vaccine does. Many doctors in the country have identified that the symptoms of vaccine reactions mirror the symptoms of the disease, which corroborates with the similar synthetic nature and function of the respective spike proteins. The vaccine recipient has no defense against the bloodstream entry, but their nose protects them from the recombinant spike protein quasispecies during "natural infection" (better termed as aerosolized inoculation).

Although this author cannot independently verify the authenticity of the documents displayed by Project Veritas, they certainly appear to be authentic.

Regardless, there remains a substantial amount of incriminating evidence, not the least of which has been exhibited above in this post, to affirm that Dr. Anthony Fauci lied more than once about the gain of function research which led to the

production of the SARS-CoV-2 virus and its alleged dispersion from the Wuhan biosafety level 4 lab.

Thus far, Vera Sharav's claim of the virus that causes Covid-19 was conducted under gain of function, or biowarfare research, certainly holds water.

But what of her claim that the pandemic was planned?

Was Covid-19 planned Biowarfare?

Before answering this question, we can also append Dr. Zelenko's related claim in this episode that "Covid-19 is a man-made weapon of mass destruction," as he puts it.

Near the 44:27 mark, Dr. Zelenko asserts that he has traced a 20-year patent and peer-reviewed paper trail that shows how the virus was developed for such destructive purposes.

The following articles - many which are peer-reviewed published medical papers - appear on screen while he speaks and are listed hereunder.

- UNC (Univ. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) Baric to lead \$10 million NIH grant, Sept. 9, 2013
<https://sph.unc.edu/sph-news/baric-to-lead-10-million-nih-grant/>
- North Carolina Public Radio - Meet 'The Coronavirus Hunter' Ralph Baric
<https://www.wunc.org/health/2020-05-25/meet-the-coronavirus-hunter-ralph-baric>
- nature medicine - A SARS-like cluster of circulating bat coronaviruses shows potential for human emergence, Published: 09 November 2015
<https://www.nature.com/articles/nm.3985/>
- Science Daily - New SARS-like virus can jump directly from bats to humans, no treatment available, November 10, 2015 (source: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)
<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/11/151110115711.htm>
- nature - Engineered bat virus stirs debate over risky research, by Declan Butler, Published: 12 November 2015 ([cross-link from EcoHealth Alliance](#))
<https://www.nature.com/articles/nature.2015.18787>
- Univ. of North Carolina UNC School of Medicine - Baric lab: Circulating bat coronaviruses and the risk of SARS re-emergence, November 7, 2015
<https://www.med.unc.edu/microimm/baric-lab-circulating-bat-coronaviruses-and-the-risk-of-sars-re-emergence/> (also in [Pubmed](#))
- Chloroquine is a zinc ionophore, 2014 Oct 1
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25271834/>
- Zn²⁺ Inhibits Coronavirus and Arterivirus RNA Polymerase Activity In Vitro and Zinc Ionophores Block the Replication of These Viruses in Cell Culture, 2010 Nov 4
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2973827/>

Zelenko makes it clear that one person in particular has been at the forefront in every stage of the development of this bioweapon, namely **Ralph S. Baric**.

[Ralph Baric](#) is a professor of professor in the Department of Microbiology and Immunology at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Zelenko notes that Prof. Baric has been [funded](#) by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for many years for his research.

The [cited link](#) for this does indicate more than \$10 million to study pathogenic activity of viruses including severe respiratory syndrome (SARS), among others.

Zelenko then notes that in 1998-1999, Baric invented cross-species transmissibility, i.e., taking a virus of one species, manipulating it, and have it be able to infect another species; and that there are peer-reviewed papers on it.



Epidemiologist Ralph Baric inside his lab at the UNC Gillings School of Public Health. Image and caption source: [North Carolina Public Radio](#).

“In 2002, he was able to take a coronavirus and change its payload to destroy human lung tissue; and there’s a patent associated [with it],” Zelenko adds, though he fails to specify which specific patent was granted.

Zelenko then mentions that this particular coronavirus couldn't infect human beings yet and points to Baric's [work with Dr. Shi Zhengli](#) from the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV) in 2015.

And by then (2015) gain of function research - where a pathogen (virus) could be transformed into a

bioweapon, was being "outsourced" to China. And though such kind of research was outlawed in America, Baric's work was nevertheless being pursued in China at the WIV.

The result of the research was [published in a paper - New SARS-like virus can jump directly from bats to humans no treatment available](#) (November 10, 2015), and that they were able to take the bat coronavirus and make it infectious to human beings.

The following summary from Science Daily about the paper reads as follows:

"A new bat SARS-like virus has been discovered that can jump directly from its bat hosts to humans without mutation. However, researchers point out that if the SARS-like virus did jump, it is still unclear whether it could spread from human to human."

While Zelenko is referring to this particular research, two papers ([nature - Engineered bat virus stirs debate over risky research](#) and [Baric lab: Circulating bat coronaviruses and the risk of SARS re-emergence](#)) appear on screen which do attest to the controversial and risky nature of the research.

Here are some key excerpts from the first paper [Engineered bat virus stirs debate over risky research](#) [with emphasis added]:

"Lab-made coronavirus related to SARS can infect human cells."

"An experiment that created a hybrid version of a bat coronavirus — one related to the virus that causes SARS (severe acute respiratory syndrome) — has triggered renewed debate over whether engineering lab variants of viruses with possible pandemic potential is worth the risks."

"In an article published in Nature Medicine^[1] on 9 November, scientists investigated a virus called SHC014, which is found in horseshoe bats in China. The researchers created a chimaeric virus, made up of a surface protein of SHC014 and the backbone of a SARS virus that had been adapted to grow in mice and to mimic human disease. The chimaera infected human airway cells — proving that the surface protein of SHC014 has the necessary structure to bind to a key receptor on the cells and to infect them. It also caused disease in mice, but did not kill them."

These excerpts alone confirm that the pathogen was indeed *man-made* and that it could infect human airway cells. Moreover, the following warning appears in at the end of the Abstract for the linked paper ([A SARS-like cluster of circulating bat coronaviruses shows potential for human emergence](#)):

“Our work suggests a potential risk of SARS-CoV re-emergence from viruses currently circulating in bat populations.”

It should also be noted that the following editor’ s note to this paper was added on 30 March 2020:

30 March 2020 Editors’ note, March 2020: We are aware that this article is being used as the basis for unverified theories that the novel coronavirus causing COVID-19 was engineered. There is no evidence that this is true; scientists believe that an animal is the most likely source of the coronavirus.

A similar warning can also be found on the [Engineered bat virus stirs debate over risky research](#) article:

Editors’ note, March 2020 We are aware that this story is being used as the basis for unverified theories that the novel coronavirus causing COVID-19 was engineered. There is no evidence that this is true; scientists believe that an animal is the most likely source of the coronavirus.

This is a rather odd statement, proclaiming that the novel coronavirus was not “engineered” given that it explicitly states otherwise, i.e., that “The researchers created a chimaeric virus, made up of a surface protein of SHC014 and the backbone of a SARS virus that had been adapted to grow in mice and to mimic human disease.”

Though this author is not an expert in the field, the statement does appear to suggest that the virus was *fabricated* as a result of combining elements of the natural SARS virus with the SHC014 protein.

This author has contacted nature.com for clarification regarding this seemingly contradictory statement and also to ask for which sources they are referring to when stating “There is no evidence that this is true; scientists believe that an animal is the most likely source of the coronavirus,” but has yet to received a response as of publishing time; should one be received later on, it will be appended to this article as an Addendum.

As was outlined in Part 1 of this series, specifically under section [1.1. Dr. Vladimir Zelenko](#), the Jewish doctor had established a very effective protocol for treating Covid-19 early on in the pandemic around March, 2020.

In Part 3 of the docuseries (the one this post is reviewing), Dr. Zelenko mentions what had sparked the idea for his particular treatment of using Hydroxychloroquine with Zinc to treat his Covid-19 patients.

As he mentions, it was based on a 2014 research paper that was mentioned by Dr. Roger Seheult, co-founder of MedCram.com and on an earlier paper from 2010 authored by none other than Ralph Baric (among other authors).

The 2010 paper which was published in November of that year was titled [Zn²⁺ Inhibits Coronavirus and Arterivirus RNA Polymerase Activity In Vitro and Zinc Ionophores Block the Replication of These Viruses in Cell Culture.](#)

The other research paper of interest was called [Chloroquine Is a Zinc Ionophore](#) which was published on October 1st, 2014 (alternate link [here](#)). The main gist of the paper shows how zinc can be added to Hydroxychloroquine (Chloroquine) could stop RNA viruses from replicating and thus act as an effective countermeasure against SARS-CoV-2.

What is of particular interest here is the contention from Dr. Zelenko that after the successful deployment of his treatment protocol, for which by the way he had communicated to then President Donald Trump, and for which other doctors were using it with success, there was what appeared to be a coordinated effort by the mainstream media to marginalise and vilify these drugs (Hydroxychloroquine and Ivermectin).

Moreover, though the health agencies such as the [CDC](#), [FDA](#), [AMA](#), and [WHO](#) were aware of the potential benefits of using these drugs to treat Covid-19, they nonetheless blackballed their use and only limit their potential use to clinical trials.

Falsely, Ivermectin was often ridiculed as a drug used mostly for animals which should not be used for humans. A prime example of this was when [Dr. Sanjay Gupta](#), Chief Medical Correspondent for CNN had to backtrack about how Ivermectin was portrayed as a “horse dewormer” drug by his news outlet during an [infamous exchange with Joe Rogan](#).

Video: Joe Rogan exposes Sanjay Gupta and CNN's propaganda

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DkTXEexNB2E>

For readers who will readily brush off anything medical that Joe Rogan has to say about Ivermectin, they could instead refer to the words of Dr. Paul Marik who is the second most published ICU doctor in the world. Dr. Marik [testified about Covid-19 misinformation at a U.S. Senate hearing](#) on January 25, 2022. In his testimony, Dr. Marik contrasted the use of Ivermectin as an inexpensive, safe, and effective drug which reduced deaths significantly compared to costlier ones that were instead used to treat Covid-19 patients such as Remdesivir.

Video: Dr. Paul Marik - (11/26) COVID-19 Misinformation U.S. Senate hearing with Senator Ron Johnson

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0lgbZWUMKmk>

It should also be observed that the aforementioned research project proposal called [Project DEFUSE: Defusing the Threat of Bat-borne Coronaviruses](#) by Dr. Peter Daszak, the President of EcoHealth Alliance also contains the following with regards to the *team members* that would work on the project which figures at the bottom of the Executive Summary (with **emphasis added in red underlining**):

Management Approach: Members of our collaborative group have worked together on bats and their viruses for over 15 years. The lead organization, EcoHealth Alliance, will oversee all work. EHA staff will develop models to evaluate the probability of specific SARS-related CoV spillover, and identify the most effective strategy for delivery of both immune boosting and immune targeting inocula. Specific work will be subcontracted to the following organizations:

- **Prof. Baric, Univ. N. Carolina,** will lead targeted immune boosting work, building on his two-decade track record of **reverse-engineering CoV and other virus spike proteins.**
- Prof. Wang, Duke-Natl. Univ. Singapore, will lead work on broadscale immune boosting, building on his group's pioneering work on bat immunity.
- **Dr. Shi, Wuhan Institute of Virology** will conduct viral **testing** on all collected samples, binding assays and some **humanized mouse work.**
- Dr. Rocke, USGS National Wildlife Health Center will optimize delivery of immune modulating biologicals, building on her vaccine delivery work in wildlife, including bats.
- Dr. Unidad, Palo Alto Research Center will lead development of novel delivery automated aerosolization mechanism for immune boosting molecules.

We are requesting \$14,209,245 total funds for this project across 3.5 project years.

Notice the two names here - Prof. [Ralph] Baric and Dr. Shi [Zhengli]. The former was to "reverse-engineer" the virus with heightened pathogenicity while the latter would test its potency and efficacy on humanised mice whose DNA is close to that of humans. This certainly appears as a prime candidate for what was earlier referred to as gain of function research.

So, what does all this mean? Does it prove that Covid-19 was planned Biowarfare against the world's population?

Maybe not convincingly with what has been presented by this author above. But what follows may substantiate and validate the claim.

Event 201 and Bill Gates' machinations



For those unfamiliar, [Event 201](#) was a “Global Pandemic Exercise” that simulated the preparedness for a worldwide outbreak of a deadly coronavirus which took place on October 18th of 2019 - just a few months before the actual Covid-19 Pandemic broke out.

None other than Bill & Melinda Gates, the World Economic Forum (WEF) and the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security were behind the simulation and central to its [recommendations](#).

Official [videos](#) of Event 201 and their panel discussions can be seen from their website which show a bevy of eerie similarities between what occurred in the pandemic preparedness exercise and what actually took place in the months and years that followed with the Covid-19 Pandemic.

Writer Igor Chudov has prepared a post titled [“Creepy Conspiratorial Globalists” Were Behind Covid Lockdowns, UK Pandemic Files Show](#) which leaves little doubt as to the broader intentions of the Event 201 exercise and the subsequent power yielded by Bill Gates and the WEF over the global response to Covid-19. If the reader has the time, it is an eye-opening post.

To keep things brief, however, this author will simply highlight some of the most telling parts of his work.


In his piece, Chudov shows the modus operandi by which Bill Gates and the WEF planned the worldwide coordinated response through lockdowns and vaccine development, as was previously concocted and detailed in Event 201.

For this, Chudov highlights the **three essential components** required for such a grand plan to be materialised.

“Event 201’ s recommendations mention (1) *political decisions to slow or stop the movement of people and goods, a.k.a lockdowns*, (2) *vaccines*, and (3) *public-private cooperation*.”

bans, and the cancellation of airline flights and international shipping. A particularly fast-moving and lethal pandemic could therefore result in political decisions to slow or stop movement of people and goods, potentially harming economies already vulnerable in the face of an outbreak. Ministries of Health and other government agencies should work together now with international airlines and global shipping companies to develop realistic response scenarios and start a contingency planning process with the goal of mitigating economic damage by maintaining key travel and trade routes during a large-scale pandemic. Supporting continued trade and travel in such an extreme circumstance may require the provision of enhanced disease control measures and personal protective equipment for transportation workers, government subsidies to support critical trade routes, and potentially liability protection in certain cases. International

(1)



4. **Governments should provide more resources and support for the development and surge manufacturing of vaccines, therapeutics, and diagnostics that will be needed during a severe pandemic.**

(2)

In the event of a severe pandemic, countries may need population-level supplies of safe and effective medical countermeasures, including vaccines, therapeutics, and diagnostics. Therefore, the ability to rapidly develop, manufacture, distribute, and dispense large quantities of MCMs will be needed to contain and control a global outbreak. Countries with enough resources should greatly increase this capability. In coordination with WHO, CEPI, GAVI, and other relevant multilateral and domestic mechanisms, investments should be made in new technologies and industrial approaches, that will allow concomitant distributed manufacturing. This will require addressing legal and regulatory barriers among other issues.

5. **Global business should recognize the economic burden of pandemics and fight for stronger preparedness.**

(3)

In addition to investing more in preparing their own companies and industries, business leaders and their shareholders should actively engage with governments and advocate for increased resources for pandemic preparedness. Globally, there has been a lack of attention and investment in preparing for high-impact pandemics, and business is largely not involved in existing efforts. To a significant extent this is due to a lack of awareness of the business risks posed by a pandemic. Tools should be built that help large private sector companies visualize business risks posed by infectious disease and pathways to mitigate risk through public-private cooperation to strengthen preparedness. A severe pandemic would greatly interfere with workforce health, business operations, and the movement of goods and services.ⁱⁱⁱ A catastrophic-level outbreak can also have profound and long-lasting effects on entire industries, the economy, and societies in which business operates. While governments and public health authorities serve as the first line of defense against fast-moving outbreaks, their efforts are chronically under-funded and lack sustained support. Global business leaders should play a far more dynamic role as advocates with a stake in stronger pandemic preparedness.

Needless to say, these three components foreseen in Event 201 were *exactly* what resulted from the onset of the Covid-19 Pandemic.

Moreover, it is quite evident that one of the more stealthy and duplicitous aspects of this plan is the amount of power and control “private” entities would enjoy in this “public (government) - private (large corporations)” partnership and response.

This has indeed been clearly demonstrated early on since governments and health authorities around the world have obligingly acquiesced to these private interests’ proposed measures such as mask wearing, lockdowns (for individuals, businesses, and supply chains), as well as the highly coordinated push for vaccine development, promotion, and use.

The Chudov article goes on to exhibit how no stone would be left unturned in that a coordinated media response narrative would help glue the scheme together. To provide evidence for this bold allegation, Chudov outlines how Bill Gates used his foundation to *incentivise* mass media outlets such as the U.K.’s The Guardian to stick to the prescribed narrative script which would solidify the goals of their global plan. More specifically, Chudov shows how the U.K. media was sponsored by Bill Gates:

- The Daily Telegraph - \$3,446,801
- The Guardian (including [TheGuardian.org](https://www.theguardian.org))- [\\$12,951,391](#)
- Rockhopper Productions (U.K.) - [\\$2,480,392](#)
- Financial Times - \$2,309,845
- [BBC](#)

In one mere example of how Gates uses his influence over editorial contents, Chudov highlights the following:

News Opinion Sport Culture Lifestyle More ▾

World ▶ Europe US Americas Asia Australia Middle East **Africa** Inequality Global development

Opinion
Global development

! ↓

Global development is supported by
BILL & MELINDA GATES foundation

About this content
Mon 8 Feb 2021 03:30 EST

f t e


Magufuli died under strange circumstances
Mar 17 2021

This article is more than 1 year old

It's time for Africa to rein in Tanzania's anti-vaxxer president

vava tampa

John Magufuli's cavalier disregard of Covid's impact in the great lakes region is fuelling conspiracies and endangering lives



John Magufuli needs to be challenged openly and directly!' Photograph: Khalfan Said/AP

What is wrong with President John Magufuli? Many people in and outside **Tanzania** are asking this question.

Magufuli claimed last year that **God had eliminated Covid** in the east African country of 60 million people, and has since made **dismissing Covid vaccines** his central priority - leaving many people asking: why?

As the reader can observe from the above image, an article to denigrate an African nation's president as an "anti-vaxxer" is quite the display since The Guardian explicitly states that this content is supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Chudov also demonstrates how Bill Gates used his financial prowess and influence over the main institutions that were responsible for developing the Covid-19 pandemic **models** at the onset of the crisis [with **emphasis added**]:

"The main institutions developing "pandemic models" were Johns Hopkins and Imperial College. *Johns Hopkins* was a major pandemic preparedness player that sponsored the above-mentioned Event 201 and [received \\$1,048,972,282](#) from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. *Imperial College*, based in the

UK, received [\\$318,891,807](#) from Bill Gates. I will skip the rest of them to keep the size of my post manageable.”

Let that first figure, \$1,048,972,282 sink in for a minute. Over a billion dollars given to the organisation, Johns Hopkins, that was primarily used as the basis and foundation for the Orwellian Covid-19 policies employed to hundreds of millions of people in multiple countries during the crisis.

Money talks. And Bill Gates, who is one of the richest in the world, has plenty of it, as has also been clearly demonstrated earlier in this post.

It's also no secret that a lot of the Western media is financed, through advertising, by Big Pharma who had a direct stake and interest in the development of Covid-19 vaccines. As such, they seldom, if ever, allow negative articles or reports about the problems with the rushed experimental vaccines that were authorised under emergency measures.

Chudov also notes how [POLITICO](#), a fairly mainstream news and political outlet, reported on how Bill Gates was [instrumental and abusive in his “takeover” and handling of the Covid-19 global response](#).



The Rockefeller Lockstep Simulation

It wasn't only Bill Gates who was simulating a global crisis scenario, for the Rockefeller Foundation was also busy contemplating one such authoritarian endeavour back in 2010.

A document entitled [Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development](#) published in 2010 by the Rockefeller Foundation foresaw a pandemic occurring on the global stage by just a few years later, in 2012.

On page 18 of the document, under the header 'LOCK STEP: A world of tighter top-down government control and more authoritarian leadership, with limited innovation and growing citizen pushback' you can find the following text (the particularly *precognitive* sections are encased in red boxes):

LOCK STEP

A world of tighter top-down government control and more authoritarian leadership, with limited innovation and growing citizen pushback

In 2012, the pandemic that the world had been anticipating for years finally hit. Unlike 2009's H1N1, this new influenza strain—originating from wild geese—was extremely virulent and deadly. Even the most pandemic-prepared nations were quickly overwhelmed when the virus streaked around the world, infecting nearly 20 percent of the global population and killing 8 million in just seven months, the majority of them healthy young adults. The pandemic also had a deadly effect on economies: international mobility of both people and goods screeched to a halt, debilitating industries like tourism and breaking global supply chains. Even locally, normally bustling shops and office buildings sat empty for months, devoid of both employees and customers.

The pandemic blanketed the planet—though disproportionate numbers died in Africa, Southeast Asia, and Central America, where the virus spread like wildfire in the absence of official containment protocols. But even in developed countries, containment was a challenge. The United States's initial policy of “strongly discouraging” citizens from flying proved deadly in its leniency, accelerating the spread of the virus not just within the U.S. but across borders. However, a few countries did fare better—China in particular. The Chinese government's quick imposition and enforcement of mandatory quarantine for all citizens, as well as its instant and near-hermetic sealing off of all borders, saved millions of lives, stopping the spread of the virus far earlier than in other countries and enabling a swifter post-pandemic recovery.

Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development
18

“The pandemic also had a deadly effect on economies: international mobility of both people and goods screeched to a halt, debilitating industries like tourism and breaking global supply chains. Even locally, normally bustling shops and office buildings sat empty for months, devoid of both employees and customers.”

This just happens to be *exactly* what happened during the Covid-19 Pandemic.

Part of the second passage highlighted reads as follows:

“However, a few countries did fare better — China in particular. The Chinese government's quick imposition and enforcement of mandatory quarantine for all citizens, as well as its instant and near-hermetic sealing off of all borders, saved millions of lives, stopping the spread of the virus far earlier than in other countries and enabling a swifter postpandemic recovery.”

This also amazingly turned out to be mostly accurate. At the start of the Covid-19 Pandemic, the Chinese government did act quickly to impose harsh and grueling quarantine lockdowns. And they were quick to close their borders to international travel.

Also, on April 21, 2020, the Rockefeller Foundation issued a white paper titled [National COVID-19 Testing Action Plan — Strategic Steps to Reopen Our Workplaces and Our Communities](#).

While this author could outline in detail the dirty little details found in the plan, for sake of brevity and not making this post go beyond its already lengthy exposition, the following four areas of interest represent the **major objectives** openly sought in this Rockefeller Foundation plan:

1. Profit motive: Positioning their Corporate Partners (Testing & Vaccine manufacturers)
2. Tagging & Tracking motive
3. Centralizing Medical Records (of all citizens)
4. Creating a Response & Enforcement Arm

If one really wishes to dive into the [plan](#), the motives and benefits will become quite apparent.

While such scenario planning could be coincidental, the fact that both the [Rockefeller Foundation](#) and the [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation](#) foresaw such a pandemic crisis occurring coupled with a highly-coordinated authoritarian global response seems to suggest otherwise.

Furthermore, the extent to which both of [these organisations](#) have been working in lock-step with the [World Economic Forum](#) - which most often uses private partners to strongarm public policy makers, i.e., governments and their public health authorities - shows how they are abusing their philanthropic power for a greater evil versus one that is genuinely concerned with upholding the sovereign rights of individuals and nation states.

Lastly, a [Twitter Post by Truth Justice](#) provides a succinct summary of the overall situation and embeds a video from a website called [Plandemic](#) which, though at first glance appears quite conspiratorial, turns out to be mostly factual.


Summary & Conclusion (for Part 3)

If the reader has made it this far in this post which extends over 45 pages in length, a sincere congratulations is in order. For, in today's world of Twitter tweets and Tik Tok 10-second videos, attention spans run quite short.


Though the initial intent was not to stretch this post as a seemingly never-ending collage of facts to read through and digest, the abundance of evidence encountered in the research process has made it such.

Three major claims from Part 3 of the docuseries [Never Again Is Now Global](#) were examined for their merits. And, for the most part, all three claims have turned out to be true, mostly factual, and valid, as has been thoroughly evidenced and referenced in this work.

Thank you to the reader for making this far in this [multi-part review series](#) and feel free to share it with other and on social media. For, what appears to be occurring worldwide really needs to be scrutinised more closely and carefully.



The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 4



Episode 4 – This Time Around We’re All Jews

The [fourth episode](#) (click the link to watch) aired on January 30, 2023.

<https://live.childrenshealthdefense.org/chd-tv/events/never-again-is-now-global/Never-Again-Is-Now-Global-Part-4/>

The same methodology for a review of this fourth part of the docuseries applies and, once more, a few of its major claims will be scrutinised on the merits of their accuracy and validity - mostly through a thorough examination and verification of the key allegations and associated facts.

4.1 Dr. Michael Yeadon former Pfizer VP on the absurdity of Covid-19 measures

Near the 07:18 mark, **Dr. Michael Yeadon** - who has a degree in biochemistry and toxicology, a PhD in respiratory pharmacology and who has worked for 32 years in pharmaceutical R&D, including working until 2011 for Pfizer’s Allergy & Respiratory Group - stated the following regarding the response to the Covid-19 Pandemic [**emphasis added** to emphasise his main claims]:

“...so lock down and wait for a vaccine. That that’s the wrong strategy. What you need to do is provide maximum protection, social immunological good diet. And then if people get sick treat them symptomatically with cheap, well understood anti-inflammatories, antivirals, anticoagulants like [Dr.]

Pierre Kory, [Dr.] Pete[r] McCullough, um [Dr.] Zelenko and others have done. So, that's what we should have done. The elderly who were most vulnerable are vulnerable because their immune systems don't respond well to new threats...They're also people who don't respond well to injected vaccines. And that that fits the [scientific] data as well that you know the vaccines don't seem to do anything useful at all...This fraud, for me, can be divided into three easily digested chunks...Well, it turns out now that however you analyze the data, the threat does not seem to be exceptional...you wouldn't shut the world down for this. So, exaggerated threat, why? To make me [us] frightened. Fear, fear, fear. But then the next chunk I would describe as useless and injurious measures. So, lockdown[s], masking, social distancing, business closures, school closures, border restrictions...And even if I'm completely wrong, ignore what I think; the literature is very clear now...lockdowns didn't save a single life. But lockdowns smashed the modern world, absolutely eviscerated sort of middle class businesses, small-medium-sized enterprises. And I believe that that was deliberate. I think that's part of the Great Reset. But the long and short of it is [that] all of the measures imposed, including lockdowns and masks, do not, did not, and you knew could not do anything useful whatsoever."

While the citation above is long, it can be summarised as the Covid-19 Pandemic measures taken, including lockdowns, masks, social distances, and closures, were not only useless, but injurious and harmful.

Dr. Yeadon then contends that the *ulterior motive* was to separate people - not for preventing transmissibility of the virus, but rather to preventing them from sharing with one another:

"So, this idea that separating everybody from everybody else is utter nonsense...You don't need to stay away from someone else. You never needed to. It was a lie. It was to segregate people. Why? Because people converse with each other, they get close and say: what do you think about this? And people would work it out. They knew if they didn't separate people in the first few weeks, they'd probably crack it and they would have done [so]...There are literally scores of peer-reviewed journal articles that compare communities where lockdown was applied or not applied very vigorously versus not what's called stringency of lockdown. There's not the slightest connection you would if it works, the more rigorously it was applied, the lower number of deaths. Not so. The more rigorously it's applied, actually, the more the deaths...So,, they lied about the threat to make you frightened. And then they imposed all sorts of anti-human measures and they knew they did not work."

For the last part of this statement from above, Dr. Yeadon backs his words citing the World Health Organization's own document (dated 19 September, 2019 - *before*

the Covid-19 Pandemic) - which the health authorities knew about and that such measures would not work.

Verification about this particular statement is quite easily done. The document Dr. Yeadon was referring and which was flashed on the screen while he was speaking is the WHO' s

[Non-pharmaceutical public health measures for mitigating the risk and impact of epidemic and pandemic influenza](#) (PDF download [here](#)).

Non-pharmaceutical public health measures for mitigating the risk and impact of **epidemic** and **pandemic** influenza



World Health
Organization

Cover page for the [Non-pharmaceutical public health measures for mitigating the risk and impact of epidemic and pandemic influenza](#) document, published 19 September, 2019 by the World Health Organization.

Several passages from the 91-page document appear during the docuseries including the following [**emphasis added** exactly as in the film]:

- **Face masks:** Face masks worn by asymptomatic people are conditionally recommended in severe epidemics or pandemics, to reduce transmission in the community. Although **there is no evidence that this is effective in reducing transmission**, there is mechanistic plausibility for the potential effectiveness of this measure.
- **Surface and object cleaning:** Surface and object cleaning measures with safe cleaning products are recommended as a public health intervention in all settings in order to reduce influenza transmission. Although **there is no evidence that this is effective in reducing transmission**, there is mechanistic plausibility for the potential effectiveness of this measure.
- **Contact tracing:** Active contact tracing is not recommended in general because **there is no obvious rationale for it** in most Member States. This intervention could be considered in some locations and circumstances to collect information on the characteristics of the disease and to identify cases, or to delay widespread transmission in the very early stages of a pandemic in isolated communities.
- **Quarantine of exposed individuals:** Home quarantine of exposed individuals to reduce transmission is not recommended because **there is no obvious rationale for this measure**, and there would be considerable difficulties in implementing it.
- **School measures and closures:** School measures (e.g. stricter exclusion policies for ill children, increasing desk spacing, reducing mixing between classes, and staggering recesses and lunchbreaks) are conditionally recommended, with gradation of interventions based on severity. Coordinated proactive school closures or class dismissals are suggested during a severe epidemic or pandemic. In such cases, **the adverse effects on the community should be fully considered** (e.g. family burden and economic considerations), and the timing and duration should be limited to a period that is judged to be optimal.
- **Entry and exit screening:** **Entry and exit screening for infection in travellers is not recommended**, because of the lack of sensitivity of these measures in identifying infected but asymptomatic (i.e. pre-symptomatic) travellers.

Other measures appear in the document such as ‘Workplace measures and closures’ and ‘border closure’ for which they also deem to be generally not recommend.

As can be easily be observed, there is a certain consistency that can be observed in these statements enumerated above. Namely, that **they consistently state that there exists no evidence that they are effective.**

To be fair, the WHO does indicate some *potential* benefits of these measures which must surely be considered. However, these appear to be more of a *speculative* nature, rather than based on proven scientific knowledge and data.

So, one was to wonder *why* the WHO would go against their own guidelines and fully recommend the strict implementation of these measures to their member countries across the globe.

Who at the World Health Organization decided this?

In the absence of clarity and transparency from the WHO regarding these important questions, it is not unfounded to believe that the decision to recommend such measures may have been driven by less honorable intentions.

Prior to Dr. Yeadon referencing the WHO's document, many other articles regarding these measures implemented across the globe during the pandemic appeared on the screen which seem to further suggest that they were ineffective and thus wrongfully recommended. Here are the ones that were included in this segment of the docuseries along with **key highlights from each for additional context**:

- American Institute for Economic Research (AIER) - [New Study Indicates Lockdowns Didn't Slow the Spread of Covid-19](#), January 19, 2021
key highlights: *“A team of Stanford University researchers recently published a study in the European Journal of Clinical Investigation concluding that harsh lockdown policies have had minimal impact on preventing the spread of Covid-19 compared to lighter policies. ...it seems to be the case that lockdown policies around the world have failed to produce the results that we were told they would.”*
- Foundation for Economic Freedom (FEE) - [Sweden's Top Infectious Disease Expert Says COVID-19 Lockdowns Are Not Based on Science. History Shows He Could Be Right](#), May 19, 2020
key highlights: *“While Sweden has endured a great deal of criticism for its “laissez-faire” approach, Anders Tegnell, the nation's top infectious disease expert, recently defended his policies, stating that while a degree of social distancing is the right approach, lockdowns are not grounded in actual science. “Nothing to do with [them] has a scientific basis,” Tegnell said, [according to The Guardian](#).”*
- Johns Hopkins Institute for Applied Economics, Global Health, and the Study of Business Enterprise - [A LITERATURE REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF LOCKDOWNS ON COVID-19 MORTALITY](#) by Jonas Herby, Lars Jonung, and Steve H. Hanke, January 2022 (click link to access the 62-page study).
Alternate [article](#) link.
key highlights: *“Abstract: This systematic review and meta-analysis are designed to determine whether there is empirical evidence to support the belief that “lockdowns” reduce COVID-19 mortality...After three levels of screening, 34 studies ultimately qualified. Of those 34 eligible studies, 24 qualified for inclusion in the meta-analysis. They were separated into three*

groups: lockdown stringency index studies, shelter-in-place-order (SIPO) studies, and specific NPI studies...an analysis of each of these three groups support the conclusion that lockdowns have had little to no effect on COVID-19 mortality. More specifically, stringency index studies find that lockdowns in Europe and the United States only reduced COVID-19 mortality by 0.2% on average.”

- New York Post - [The data shows lockdowns end more lives than they save](#) (Opinion), March 22, 2021
key highlights: “Now that the 2020 figures have been properly tallied, there is still no convincing evidence [that strict lockdowns reduced the death toll](#) from COVID-19. But one effect is clear: more deaths from other causes, especially among the young and middle-aged, minorities and the less affluent. ...Nearly 40 percent of workers in low-income households lost their jobs during the spring, triple the rate in high-income households...Minority-owned small businesses suffered more, too. During the spring, when it was estimated that 22 percent of all small businesses closed, 32 percent of Hispanic owners and 41 percent of black owners shut down...The deadly impact of lockdowns will grow in future years, due to the lasting economic and [educational consequences](#)...More than two dozen studies have challenged the effectiveness of lockdowns, showing that closing businesses and schools does little or nothing to reduce infections and deaths from the virus.”
- Healthline - [Depression Symptoms 3 Times Higher During COVID-19 Lockdown](#)
key highlights: “A new study found that depression symptoms are three times higher during the COVID-19 lockdown...It has caused physical, emotional, and psychological distress, and not just for patients of the virus...In a recent [study](#), researchers analyzed survey data from 1,441 participants, all U.S. adults aged 18 years or older. It found that depression symptoms were three times higher during COVID-19 lockdown than before the pandemic, up from 8.5 percent before COVID-19 to 27.8 percent during.”
- [Have Lockdowns Caused Suicides During COVID-19?](#) Dec 18, 2020
- American Institute for Economic Research (AIER) - [Death by Lockdown](#), November 2, 2020
key highlights: “On March 28 - very early in the pandemic - AIER published an article that I felt at the time received far too little attention. “[Drugs, Suicide, and Crime: Empirical Estimates of the Human Toll of the Shutdown](#)” by economists Audrey and Thomas Duncan cited empirical literature on the human toll of economic devastation. This article forecasted more than 100,000 excess deaths due to drug overdoses, suicide, alcoholism, homicide, and untreated depression - all a result not of the virus but of policies of mandatory human separation, economic downturn, business and school closures, closed medical services, and general depression that comes with a loss of freedom and choice...Here we are seven months later and the worst has come true.”
- American Institute for Economic Research (AIER) - [More “Covid Suicides” than Covid Deaths in Kids](#), March 17, 2021
key highlights: “The biggest increase in youth deaths occurred in the 15-24

age bracket — the age group most susceptible to committing suicide, and which constitutes 91% of youth suicides. Indeed, as early as July 2020 — just four months into the pandemic — CDC Director Robert Redfield [remarked](#) that “there has been another cost that we’ve seen, particularly in high schools. We’re seeing, sadly, far greater suicides now than we are deaths from COVID. We’re seeing far greater deaths from drug overdose.” ... Between March and August the National Alliance on Mental Illness HelpLine reported a [65% increase](#) in calls and emails... In August 2020, FAIR Health [found](#) a 334% spike in intentional self-harm claims among 13-18 year olds in the Northeast compared to the same month in 2019.”

- The New American - [Major Spike in Business Bankruptcies Due to COVID Lockdowns](#), February 28, 2021

key highlights: “Almost a year after governments at all levels used COVID-19 as a pretext for forced quarantines for the non-sick, causing many businesses to fail, those that survived on loans are now declaring bankruptcy at an all-time high. Court records show that Chapter 11 filings were up nearly 20 percent in 2020 compared with 2019.”

It is worth noting that regarding the third bullet point above - the Johns Hopkins Institute for Applied Economics, Global Health, and the Study of Business Enterprise study, fact-checking site **Snopes** had published a so-called debunking article about the study itself titled [Here’s What We Know About ‘Johns Hopkins Study’ on Lockdowns](#). It doesn’t take long to see that Snopes is being both dishonest and misleading in their hit piece. First, they incorrectly state that it was not a study affiliated with Johns Hopkins which is false since on the first page of the [study](#), the logo of this very institution appears on it and it is also acknowledged [on their website](#) that this division is “the core institution of Johns Hopkins University’s Homewood campus.” Second, they are misleading in that they treat it as a *single* working paper and also that it wasn’t peer-reviewed. As noted above, the study examined 34 papers in all for which 22 were in fact peer-reviewed (see page 14 of the report where it states: “*Out of these 34 studies, 22 were peer-reviewed and 12 were working papers.*”) There exist other holes and inconsistencies in the Snopes article, but for sake of brevity, enough is said on the matter.

This author has contacted Johns Hopkins for comment as well as one of the authors of the article, Prof. Steve H. Hanke, for comment. The latter replied. One question was about whether they had faced pressure to retract the paper. Hanke replied in the negative, saying that, in fact, “As a result, the working paper (II) has been expanded, edited, peer-reviewed, and will be published this year as a book.”

Hanke was kind enough to send a PDF version of the expanded version of the article which contains 115 pages, compared to 62 with the original. Appendix II of the expanded version is titled ‘**The Anatomy of the Negative Spin-Meisters**’ which stated [**emphasis added**]:

“The working paper’ s findings - that lockdowns had little to no public health effects measured by mortality - and its policy conclusions - that lockdown policies are ill-founded and should be rejected out of hand - **attracted considerable attention in the media, in the White House and halls of the U.S. Congress, among public health experts,** and within the chattering classes around the world. But, it was the strong endorsement of Dr. Marty Makary, a distinguished Professor of Medicine at the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, during his February 2 appearance on *Tucker Carlson Tonight* that set off a media firestorm.”

It also stated that the Science Media Centre in London had consequently issued a press release with statements by **Prof. Neil Ferguson** and others, all affiliated with **Imperial College London**. “The release contained several criticisms of our working paper from the Imperial College team, many of

which were unscientific or clearly flawed. Those were authored by Prof. Ferguson, Dr. Flaxman, and Prof. Bhatt,” the expanded paper added.

For those unfamiliar, it was [Prof. Neil Ferguson](#), a British epidemiologist, who was primarily responsible for the mathematical modeling of the Covid-19 death projections that led to the [Chinese-style](#) national lockdowns which, *de facto*, were proven to be [significantly exaggerated and inaccurate](#).

“The results in Sweden, which did not lockdown, have proven his model to be worthless, and responsible for the destruction of the lives of millions across the globe,” [noted](#) long-time writer Jim Quinn.

In a November 2022 [commentary](#) published in the Epoch Times by Jeffrey Tucker, [Founder and President of the Brownstone Institute](#), observed how bizarre it was for the world of science to have gone so silent “as the world locked down and lives were shattered by the billions by governments the world over,” stated Tucker, adding:

“We went from a March 2, 2020, [letter](#) signed by 800 public health experts associated with Yale University—which warned against quarantines and closures—to a strange disappearance of nearly all clear voices a few weeks later. And so things stood for the better part of two years.”

Getting back to Appendix II of the previously mentioned expanded study, five of the most scientific criticisms raised in Science Media Centre, which apart from Snopes included those from Foreign Policy, USA Today, and FactCheck, had “little or no merit.” They added, “Our purpose is to illustrate how biased and politicized the media was when it came to its reportage of our working paper.”

What do peer-reviewed studies reveal about Dr. Yeadon’ s claims?

To objectively evaluate whether Dr. Yeadon's claims about the effectiveness and purported destructive consequences regarding the imposition of measures such as masking, social distancing, school closings and lockdowns, it is worthwhile to have a look at some additional studies and peer-reviewed papers which have been published on the subject from reputable and credible sources. Some are presented hereunder with key highlights on the matter in question.

- Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS), a peer reviewed journal of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) - [Evaluating the effects of shelter-in-place policies during the COVID-19 pandemic](#), March 25, 2021
key highlights: *“Previous studies have claimed that shelter-in-place orders saved thousands of lives, but we reassess these analyses and show that they are not reliable. We find that shelter-in-place orders had no detectable health benefits, only modest effects on behavior, and small but adverse effects on the economy.”*
- Oxford Academic, CESifo Economic Studies - [Did Lockdown Work? An Economist's Cross-Country Comparison](#) (PDF), 29 March 2021
key highlights: *“Comparing weekly mortality in 24 European countries, the findings in this paper suggest that more severe lockdown policies have not been associated with lower mortality. In other words, the lockdowns have not worked as intended. Further tests also show that early interventions offered no additional benefits or effectiveness and even indicate that the lockdowns of the spring of 2020 were associated with significantly more deaths in the particular age group between 60 and 79 years.”*
- Wiley Online Library - [Assessing mandatory stay-at-home and business closure effects on the spread of COVID-19](#), 05 January 2021
key highlights: *“Conclusions: While small benefits cannot be excluded, we do not find significant benefits on case growth of more restrictive NPIs. Similar reductions in case growth may be achievable with less-restrictive interventions.”*
- New Zealand Economic Papers - [Government mandated lockdowns do not reduce Covid-19 deaths: implications for evaluating the stringent New Zealand response](#), 20 Nov 2020
key highlights: *“Lockdowns do not reduce Covid-19 deaths. This pattern is visible on each date that key lockdown decisions were made in New Zealand. The apparent ineffectiveness of lockdowns suggests that New Zealand suffered large economic costs for little benefit in terms of lives saved.”*
- The Lancet's eClinicalMedicine - [A country level analysis measuring the impact of government actions, country preparedness and socioeconomic factors on COVID-19 mortality and related health outcomes](#), July 21, 2020
key highlights: *“A country level exploratory analysis was conducted to assess the impact of timing and type of national health policy/actions undertaken towards COVID-19 mortality and related health outcomes...Rapid border closures, full lockdowns, and wide-spread testing were not associated with COVID-19 mortality per million people.”*

- Frontiers in Public Health - [Covid-19 Mortality: A Matter of Vulnerability Among Nations Facing Limited Margins of Adaptation](#), 19 November 2020
key highlights: *“Stringency of the measures settled to fight pandemic, including lockdown, did not appear to be linked with death rate...Countries that already experienced a stagnation or regression of life expectancy, with high income and NCD rates, had the highest price to pay. This burden was not alleviated by more stringent public decisions.”*
- The New England Journal of Medicine (Correspondence), [51 Citing Articles - Open Schools, Covid-19, and Child and Teacher Morbidity in Sweden](#), January 6, 2021
key highlights: *“Despite Sweden’s having kept schools and preschools open, we found a low incidence of severe Covid-19 among schoolchildren and children of preschool age during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Among the 1.95 million children who were 1 to 16 years of age, 15 children had Covid-19, MIS-C, or both conditions and were admitted to an ICU, which is equal to 1 child in 130,000.”*
- NIH Pubmed - [Young children’s voices in an unlocked Sweden during the COVID-19 pandemic](#), 2022 Jul 7
key highlights: *“Aims: During the COVID-19 pandemic, Sweden was one of the few countries that rejected lockdowns in favour of recommendations for restrictions, including careful hand hygiene and social distancing. Preschools and primary schools remained open. Several studies have shown negative impacts of the pandemic on children, particularly high levels of anxiety. The study aim was to explore how Swedish school-aged children aged 6-14 years, experienced the COVID-19 pandemic and their perceived. Results: The results showed generally low levels of anxiety, with no significant sex differences. Conclusions: These Swedish children generally experienced low levels of anxiety, except those who refrained from social activities. Life was nonetheless mostly experienced as normal, largely because schools remained open. Keeping life as normal as possible could be one important factor in preventing higher anxiety and depression levels in children during a pandemic.”*

Of course, not all papers support and vindicate Dr. Yeadon’s claims.

One paper published in NIH Pubmed titled [The Efficacy of Lockdown Against COVID-19: A Cross-Country Panel Analysis](#) supports a countering conclusion to some of those listed above. Their results showed that “lockdown is effective in reducing the number of new cases in the countries that implement it, compared with those countries that do not.” And in their conclusion, they suggest that “lockdown is effective in reducing the R0, i.e. the number of people infected by each infected person.”

Though not peer-reviewed, a working paper by Stanford’s Institute for Economic Policy Research (SIEPR) titled [Lives saved: An examination of lockdown policies](#) suggests that “social distancing clearly saves lives,” and “social distancing

behaviors clearly matter in terms of reducing mortality and infection rates.” The paper considered drivers and factors such as density population and timing of lockdowns when looking at disease transmission. “county lockdown policies — including stay-at-home and business closure restrictions — reduced disease transmission rates by 9 to 14 percent between early March and mid-April,” the study found. However, when examining the economic impacts of lockdown policies, the study found “that they reduced consumer spending by 7 percent and small business employment by 12 percent.”

While it probably wouldn't be difficult to find studies countering those listed above coupled with the fact that, in aggregate, the impacts of these restrictive health measures are quite broad in scope and multifaceted, it nonetheless remains rather apparent that much damage has resulted from these, particularly with regards to their detrimental effects on school-aged children and the economic strangling of small & medium sized businesses which has resulted in financial hardship for millions of people worldwide.

4.2 Dr. Michael Yeadon on planned Digital IDs & CBDCs

Near the 42:00 mark, Dr. Yeadon follows up on how measures undertaken by the pandemic were tyrannical, warning that if the masses continue to “acquiesce” to them, the tyranny won't stop. It will only get worse. Dr. Yeadon then forecasts what those responsible for this planned pandemic have in mind, namely **Digital IDs** and **CBDCs** which would spell the “end of human freedom.”

Referring to these globalist planners, Yeadon said [with some **emphasis added**]:

“They told us they want to introduce central bank digital currencies [CBDC] - that's cashless digital money. But, if there's no cash and everything is digital, I can assure you that the big computer in the sky knows exactly what you are about to buy from whom where and if they don't want you to, the algorithm will deny you. It won't be personal [inaudible] to look over your shoulder. If they say look, you're not allowed to be more than five miles from your home and you're 5.5 miles from your home and you try and buy a pizza, I'm sorry, the algorithm will say you're not permitted to buy it...If you're Tony Blair, I'll let you spend anything anywhere. You still on the system...If you let the executive get rid of cash and replace it with, as it were, computer based geo-located digital money, it is the end of human of human freedom forever. It's also the end of politics.”

In a March 29, 2023 [tweet by Bitcoin News](#), Dr. Yeadon can be seen issuing a very similar warning.

It is worthwhile to first paraphrase some of the lingo Dr. Yeadon uses in the statements above so as to clarify his meaning.

By “the big computer in the sky”, he is referring to a centralised computer system which would run the Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) comprised of programs and algorithms which would hold the decision-making power on how the digital money can be spent.

Moreover, when he says “the algorithm will deny you,” he is referring to the *programmability* of the CBDC money.

CBDCs are conceived with programmability in mind, not that dissimilar to the well-known cryptocurrency Bitcoin (albeit that Bitcoin operates on a *decentralised* system rather than a *centralised* one - which a CBDC would). In other words, its code can be programmed to include specific *rules* on what the digital money is permitted to be spent on, what time period in which it can be spent, to whom it can or cannot flow to, and so on.

For instance, government-issued food stamps in the form of a CBDC could only be used to purchase groceries.

These types of features have already been proposed by the Deputy Managing Director at the International Monetary Fund (IMF) [Bo Li](#). At an IMF conference called [Central Bank Digital Currencies for Financial Inclusion: Risks and Rewards](#) held in October 2022, Li said:

“By programming CBDC, those [sic] money can be precisely targeted for what kind of people can own and what kind of use this money can be utilised; for example, for food.”

More of what Li Bo said can be seen at a prior post from this author called [UK’ s PM Rishi Sunak desperate for G7 countries to launch their CBDCs](#).

Needless to say, such kinds of features would give a tremendous amount of control and power by the issuer of the CBDC which is usually a country’ s Central Bank.

[Augustin Carstens](#), the General Manager of the Bank for International Settlements (BIS) - the central bank of central banks said the following about how central banks would hold *absolute control* with regards to CBDCs’ use (as oppose to cash):

Video: The BIS CBDC Absolute Global Control of the Digital Ecosystem.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wi2dbHC6vd4>

On an important side note, most countries’ central banks are *private entities* (corporations) which are *not* part of the government. Rather they are entities that make loans to governments whose decisions and actions are controlled by their executive directors.

This, in itself, is quite worrisome, for it would cede complete power over the *issuance and management* of the digital currency to the central bank.

In other words, these entities could **bypass the will of governments and their citizens.**

In short, if they are granted complete control over CBDCs, that would indeed spell the end to financial sovereignty.

Next, when Yeadon states that “computer based **geo-located** digital money” would limit mobility rights of individuals, he is not wrong. For, a CBDC could be programmed with geolocation (GPS) markers or ranges in which the digital money could be spent. Yeadon uses the example of a person unable to purchase a pizza who is located outside a designated area.

This assumption presumes two things. First, that people would hold some kind of CBDC **wallet** - a place to store their digital money which would require a unique identifier affirming their ownership of the funds; for this, a **Digital ID** would be expected since it can confirm the identity of the person holding the funds in the associated **CBDC account**. And second, it would most likely entail that that wallet be stored on peoples’ smartphones which have built-in GPS location capabilities - which most do. Moreover, most people carry their smartphones with them at all times wherever they go.

This assertion from Dr. Yeadon would thus confirm the necessity of some kind of **national Digital ID** tied to that nation’ s respective CBDC.

Yeadon continues, touching upon the Orwellian vaccine passport system that is currently the norm in China:

“That’ s what’ s happening in China right now; they turn people’ s vaccine passports, red [color], literally grab click click and they change them to [sic] [for] those people; literally, they can’ t leave their apartment building, get into a train because they have to use their mandatory digital ID to move around. **That’ s what vaccine passports are. They are a rehearsal for mandatory digital ID**...So, you have no freedom. You can’ t actually decide on your own rights, to be anywhere or do anything ever again...Don’ t let it happen. I think it’ s really close, really close now.”

This is correct. This author lived in China for thirteen years until late 2021. During the Covid-19 Pandemic, it was impossible to move about without the vaccine passport program installed on one’ s smartphone. A red-colored QR code banned anyone from entry to areas outside their residential communities.

In fact, in 2022 the Chinese government *intentionally* switched certain citizens’ QR codes to red who were attending protests (about their funds being stolen from a certain bank). As most of those protesters were from out of province and wanted to protest in another, their movements were effectively impeded since they could not travel outside their home area.

Video: China: Protests over freezing of bank deposits; police, bank depositors clash in Zhengzhou | WION

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SGJBKIGOWGM>

As can be seen in the video above, such a feature could easily be used (and abused) by central authorities to **crush dissenters** or those deemed to have committed certain infractions.

Who is to say that the authorities will not use this kind of feature for those they deem are spreading “misinformation” or “disinformation” online or who are critical of their politics?

This kind of restrictive feature would not be difficult to program and implement in CBDC technology.

The Mark of the Beast

“And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads: And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.” - Revelation 13:16-17

“They are a **rehearsal** for **mandatory digital ID**,” Yeadon states when referring to vaccine passports.

As we saw during some of the harshest months of the Covid-19 Pandemic, citizens mobility and travel rights were largely restricted by the use of these **vaccine passports**.

Thankfully, following a lot of outrage about them and with the eventual easing of the health measures, they have mostly been phased out.

In Canada, this measure is not completely or officially withdrawn, for it is only *suspended*.

According to many surveys conducted in different countries, it is encouraging that most citizens appear to be against not only vaccine passports, but also national Digital IDs.

Those who are designing CBDCs **know that for them to be secure and effective, they need to be tied to citizens’ IDs** which will inherently have to be converted into *digital* form.

Most likely, this will be accomplished using physical identifiers unique to each individual such as a finger print, a voice print, an iris (eye) scan, or the like, i.e., their biometric data.

Crypto expert Guy from [The Coin Bureau](#) who has over 2.2 million followers on YouTube recently came out with an [outstanding video](#) showcasing the **dangers** such a Digital ID system would entail. It may be viewed hereunder and is definitely worth the watch for a complete comprehension of its devastating implications.

Video: Coin Bureau – Digital IDs Are HERE!! Why You Should Be WORRIED!!

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uwRSzNTp2ko>

Interestingly, the video begins with a mention of the *same* partnership that was outlined in [Part 2](#) of this series, namely the one signed between the [United Nations and the World Economic Forum](#) to accelerate the implementation of the [UN' s Sustainable Development Goals \(SDGs\)](#) by 2030.

[Introducing Digital IDs is integral](#) to these SDGs, as stated in their official document [**emphasis added**]:

“The continuing evolution of the digital economy across the globe and at the national level **requires individuals to be able to assert their identity in order to participate in that digital economy.** The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals provide the **ambitious target that all people will be able to obtain a “legal identity” by 2030 (SDG 16.9).**”

SDG 16.9 calls for “legal identity” for *all people worldwide*, including birth registration, by 2030.

BiometricUpdate.com has been following all of the technical implications regarding the development and implementation of SDG 16.9, particularly in terms of its [biometric implications](#), including how [20 African nations](#) are testing grounds on track for implementation of Digital IDs.

Though the UN' s [SDG 16](#) goal (described as *‘Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels’*) appears geared towards securing ‘inclusion’ for all, [Privacy International](#) notes that the ID scheme would fail to meet this promise and would instead “**build a system for surveillance and exclusion.**”

The Privacy International article titled [The Sustainable Development Goals, Identity, and Privacy: Does their implementation risk human rights?](#) lists various other **risks and dangers** associated with the SDGs, and SDG 16 in particular. They further warn [**with emphasis added**]:

“An ID system can become **a mechanism used for government surveillance and control**, often with limited safeguards. [Our research](#) has shown that the fears of the growing scope of ID, including when tied to biometric technologies such as facial recognition, **can give governments the potential for unprecedented control and monitoring over populations.**”

Such statements do indeed confirm Dr. Yeadon's apprehensions on Digital IDs.

Moreover, this author warned about government surveillance for Canada in a November 2022 post titled [Digital Surveillance in Canada 2023](#) as well as the nation's plans for its very own [Digital ID](#) and [CBDC](#).

Getting back to the Coin Bureau [video](#), here are some **key points and highlights** that ought to be retained from it [links added, as per Guy's mentions - click for more detailed information about these respective topics]:

- The [World Bank \[Group\]](#) has been testing [Digital ID \(ID4D\)](#) in Africa and India. Guy mentions that the endeavour is largely funded by none other than the [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation](#).
- Three organisations have been pushing hard for Digital IDs: the [International Monetary Fund \(IMF\)](#), the [aforementioned] [Bank for International Settlements \(BIS\)](#), and the [Financial Action Task Force \(FATF\)](#).
- The IMF & BIS are mainly interested in Digital IDs for the [rollout of CBDCs](#).
- For the FATF, the interest comes from the interest to have public institutions (mostly from governments) to *standardize* Digital ID systems around the world. In March of 2020, the FATF published a [report](#) suggesting Digital ID [standards](#) (also see the [brief](#) summary); a screenshot is presented hereunder [with emphasis added in red underlining]:

10.* Financial institutions should maintain, for at least five years, all necessary records on transactions, both domestic or international, to enable them to comply swiftly with information requests from the competent authorities. Such records must be sufficient to permit reconstruction of individual transactions (including the amounts and types of currency involved if any) so as to provide, if necessary, evidence for prosecution of criminal activity.

Financial institutions should keep records on the identification data obtained through the customer due diligence process (e.g. copies or records of official identification documents like passports, identity cards, driving licenses or similar documents), account files and business correspondence for at least five years after the business relationship is ended.

The identification data and transaction records should be available to domestic competent authorities upon appropriate authority.

- Almost all countries will have a national Digital ID by 2025 - a timeline given by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), as per a 2023 report published in February.
- In 2019, consulting firm [McKinsey & Company](#) published a report called [Digital identification: A key to inclusive growth](#) (PDF [here](#))' a few screenshots are presented hereunder [with emphasis added in red underlining]:

Furthermore, this report specifically examines “good” digital ID, which we refer to as “digital ID.” Good digital ID requires the following four attributes:

- **Is verified and authenticated to a high degree of assurance.**⁶³ High-assurance digital ID meets both government and private-sector institutions’ standards for initial registration and subsequent acceptance for a multitude of important civic and economic uses, such as gaining access to education, opening a bank account, and establishing credentials for a job. This attribute does not rely on any particular underlying technology. To achieve unique high-assurance authentication and verification, a range of credentials can be used, including biometrics, passwords, QR codes, and smart devices with identity information embedded in them.

Adequate identification can be a requirement for access to the digital economy, cutting off individuals without an ID. Registration of individuals using prepaid SIM cards is mandatory across 147 countries, and telecom companies are required to validate identification documents or biometrics in countries such as China, India, Indonesia, and Peru.⁶³ As a result, individuals without an ID are often excluded from mobile ownership and internet connectivity.


- “Coincidentally”, the [Event 201](#) Pandemic simulation exercise conducted in 2019 was in partnership with the [WEF](#) (who partnered with the [UN for its SDGs](#)) and the [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation](#) which has spent billions in Digital ID development.
- The [United States](#) is working on its [Digital ID program](#) through its [Improving Digital Identity Act of 2022](#) (bill). If passed into law a nationwide Digital ID could be rolled out by 2025 (on schedule with the UNDP). By mid-2023 the Federal Reserve (the central bank of the U.S.) may release its [FedNow Service](#). Though not a CBDC per say, it could act as one depending on its features and characteristics.
- In [Europe](#), the [unelected] European Commission (*see [Part 2](#) for related notes on this entity*) has been working on a **bloc-wide Digital ID system** since 2014. The [Digital Identity for all Europeans](#), or **eID**, is a personal digital wallet for EU citizens and residents. Efforts were intensified during the pandemic. The **ID will be tied to a Digital Wallet system**. EC Commissioner Thierry Breton said “The European digital identity wallets offer a new possibility for them to store and use data for all sorts of services from checking in at the airport to renting a car.” Guy contends that it will be used for *everything* and also notes that Thierry Breton has been pushing for **ensorship** in the European Union via the [Digital Services Act](#) (see also the [Digital Market Act](#)), and publicly threatening to [ban Twitter](#) in the bloc. The EU Digital Wallet is due to be rolled out sometime in 2024, ahead of the UNDP deadline of 2025.
- The [European Central Bank \(ECB\)](#)’ s **digital euro CBDC** is expected to be rolled out in 2025 or 2026 after regulations are passed.

- The United Kingdom [legislation](#) for Digital IDs was introduced last year and English bloc is expected to introduce their [CBDC](#), dubbed the ‘Bitcoin’ , in 2024. (*see also this author’s 2022 post on the U.K.’s CBDC efforts titled [UK’s PM Rishi Sunak desperate for G7 countries to launch their CBDCs](#)*).

Addendum to this section (added 2023-04-08):

As per an April 8 report published in [ZeroHedge](#) (originally published on April 7 in [Cointelegraph](#)), [European Central Bank \(ECB\) President Christine Lagarde](#) made some revealing admissions about the kinds of *controls* the ECB was considering in their design and implementation of their upcoming CBCD (which is intended to be rolled out in October).

What is quite interesting about the [exchange](#) (click the image below to play) is that Mrs. Lagarde was under the impression that she was in a *private conversation* with Volodymyr Zelenskyy, President of the Ukraine. However, she was actually the victim of a [prank call](#) of which she was completely unaware of. And thus, was willing to share more than she would normally have.



During the exchange, then “Zelensky” noted that “the problem is they [European protestors] don’ t want to be controlled” by a central bank digital currency, Lagarde admitted that:

“there will be control, you’ re right. You’ re completely right,”

She added:

“We are considering whether for very small amounts, anything that is around 300, 400 euros, **we could have a mechanism where there is zero control. But that could be dangerous.**”

These passages above are quite revealing. The former further authenticates Dr. Yeadon’ s assertion concerns. The latter shows just how egregious the

programmability, i.e., the rules of control in the permissibility of transaction authorization, would be under the European-wide CBDC.

In 2022, we saw during the Truckers Convoy in Canada just how abusive the government can be in that they **froze the funds and bank accounts** of persons involved in the movement – and even ordinary citizens who had donated to the cause – without any legal due process or court order. Some who had their accounts frozen donated amounts less than \$100. So, this is not dissimilar to what Lagarde stated about freezing funds of people for transactions as low as a few hundred euros.

What was not mentioned in the ZeroHedge and Cointelegraph articles, however, is that Lagarde made a really hypocritical statement in the following [**emphasis added**]:

“I don’ t want Europe to be dependent on an unfriendly country’ s currency. For instance, I don’ t know, you know, the Chinese currency, the Russian currency, whatever. **Or, dependent on a friendly currency what which is activated by a private, corporate entity** like, you know, Facebook, or Google, or anybody like [that].”

What she seems to be totally ignorant of in her statement is the fact that most central banks around the world – including the issuers of some of the most used and traded currencies in the world such as the U.S. dollar and the British pound – **are private corporations.**

The fact that she was sharing this kind of information about the inherent control (through programmability) of such kinds of features considered in the design and implementation of the European CBDC is quite telling as to how it can be abused by the central authority, the European Central Bank (ECB).

To add to this, throughout the interview she kept using “I” before her statements (e.g., “I don’ t want Europe to…” It’ s as if she is *personally* deciding what characteristics or features will be chosen for the design of the ECB’ s CBDC.

Summary & Conclusion (for Part 4)

Though only two of the major claims have been presented in this post for the fourth episode of the [Never Again Is Now Global docuseries](#), they remain intricately bound with each other in that they both refer to a broader (global) system of power and control.

It now remains hard to believe that the highly-coordinated rollout of the measures undertaken across the world has been honorable. They have been proven to be focused on power and control rather than the actual health and well-being of citizens around the world.

The numerous studies outlined in this post have greatly evidenced this as being the case.

Therefore, Dr. Yeadon's warning about Digital IDs and CBDC - which are being planned by the same bad actors and entities such as the WEF and the UN, among other private and non-elected players (including the European Commission), is a matter of great concern to citizens across the globe.

Should governments and private entities - including central banks - be allowed by the citizenry to rollout these systems, it will indeed spell the end of human sovereignty and freedom.

The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 5



Episode 5 – Never Give In – Never Give Up

The [fifth episode](#) (click the link to watch) aired on January 30, 2023.

<https://live.childrenshealthdefense.org/chd-tv/events/never-again-is-now-global/Never-Again-Is-Now-Global-Part-5/>


The same methodology for a review of this fourth part of the docuseries applies, but this time only one claim will be scrutinised on the merits of its accuracy and validity - mostly through a thorough examination and verification of they key allegations and associated facts.

5.1 Monica Felgendreher on who is funding the fact-checking outfits

Near the 1:05:45 mark, **Monica Felgendreher**, and [artist and activist living in Berlin](#), Germany, contends that many of the fact-checking outfits concerned with verifying Covid-19-related information are not impartial, for she questions *who* is funding them.

“It’ s incredible that people believe that it’ s okay to have fact-checkers and they don’ t even look who’ s paying them. This cannot last forever...We have censorship right now on everything that’ s critical.”

During this segment several images of fact-checking outfits appear on screen such as [Politifact](#), [Snopes](#), [FactCheck.org](#), [CIR \(Center for Investigative Reporting\)](#), and [Poynter](#), followed by an animated infographic which displays links (relationships) across these entities.



Screenshot of media and foundation relationships infographic from [Never Give In - Never Give Up](#) of [Never Again is Now Global](#) depicting cross relationships between fact-checking outfits and their funders.

It is thus important to verify whether this claim holds merit since these outfits offer information in the form of articles and fact checks about Covid-19 to the global public.

It is no secret that funding usually comes with strings attached. “Don’ t bite the hand that feeds you,” the old saying goes.

The main funders listed in the infographic flashed on screen include billionaire [George Soros](#) (and his foundations), the [Ford Foundation](#), the [Knight Foundation](#), the [Tides Foundation](#), the [Logan Foundation](#), and the [Democracy Fund](#).

Other outfits listed in the infographic include the [Poynter Institute for Media Studies](#) and non-profit media organisations such as [ProPublica](#) and [Media Matters for America](#).

It is worthwhile to have a closer look at what some of these outfits do, who figures among their top executives, their funding activities, and also what influence they provide on the coverage of Covid-19 related information, including fact-checking.

The Poynter Institute for Media

The Poynter Institute [describes itself](#) as a “global leader in journalism.”

“It is the world’s leading instructor, innovator, convener and resource for anyone who aspires to engage and inform citizens,” it follows continuing “Poynter champions freedom of expression, civil dialogue and compelling journalism that helps citizens participate in healthy democracies.”


In their [2021/22 Impact Report](#), they boast that **PolitiFact.com** is Poynter’s **fact-checking site**, also affirming that Poynter is the headquarters of the [International Fact-Checking Network \(IFCN\)](#) for which it states it has created a code of principles to promote standards and transparency for fact-checking with signatories from 133 countries. That is quite an impressive network, to say the least.

But right off the bat, you can already spot a non-transparent and possible bias about a topic of great importance in world headlines, namely towards Ukraine in the Russia-Ukraine War, for on the [same page](#) it states the following [with **emphasis added**]:

“In 2021, the IFCN administered \$3 million in grants to journalists, academics and researchers, and is now **leading a global collaboration to fight disinformation about the war in Ukraine.**”


For a supposedly transparent organisation for fact-checking, they issue \$3 million in grants to fight “disinformation.” No information is provided as to how they determine what *disinformation* regarding this conflict is. Moreover, providing grants to journalists, academics, and researchers already poses potential conflicts of interests, as they similarly do in science.

While many examples can be cited regarding Poynter’s own misinformation about the Russia-Ukraine War, here is but one obvious one. On their fact-checking article titled [Global fact-checkers unite to battle disinformation about Russia’s invasion of Ukraine](#), the outfit boasts of its own [#UkraineFacts database](#) which supposedly debunks disinformation about the war. Yet, on its [home page](#) you can see the following reference about Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky (bottom right) that is completely false:



Screenshot of *ukrainefacts.org* taken on April 24, 2023.

If one clicks on the Zelensky article the following window appears:



Related debunks



- Lack of context: Zelenskyy did not ask the USA to send soldiers to Ukraine (**Correctiv, Germany**)
- Zelensky called the US to war? Words out of context! (**Demagog, Poland**)
- Disinformation: Zelenskyy urges the US to send their children to fight in Ukraine. (**Myth Detector, Georgia**)
- Manipulation: Zelenski's statement in which he talks about a hypothetical situation, taken out of context (**Truthmeter, North Macedonia**)

While a lot of the bullet points say that Zelensky's statement was misrepresented or taken out of context, the real video, as this author revealed in a [prior post](#), shows otherwise (watch from the 03:00 mark):

Video: Col. MacGregor: Ukraine has been DESTROYED and there's nothing left | Redacted with Clayton Morris

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jl4OyPwLF8w>

Here is what Zelensky stated verbatim (translated into English):

“The U.S. will have to send their sons and daughters exactly the same way as we are sending our sons and daughters to war. And they will have to fight because it's nature that we're talking about. And they will be dying, God forbid, because it's a horrible thing.”

So, unless this author has been duped by a deep fake (i.e., a doctored video), the fact is that Zelensky *did* utter these words, as is presented in this *primary source*.

Consequently, for Poynter to report otherwise provides a clear instance of their bias in their so-called fact-checking.

If this is what the general public is to make of Poynter’ s fact-checking activities, then how will they be able to retain credibility with their similar endeavour in the [#CoronaVirusFacts Alliance](#) to fight so-called [misinformation](#) surrounding Covid-19?

While there are many such false and misleading posts from Poynter’ s network of fact-checkers, including [Healthfeedback.org](#) (more on them later), here is but [one instance](#); in their fact-check post titled [NO EVIDENCE: “The FDA hid the evidence that HCQ \[hydroxychloroquine\] was effective in the early treatment of the disease. Hundreds of thousands of people died as a result of this lie.”](#) dated 2022/09/21 they fail to provide a link to the specific large clinical trial study they say doesn’ t show hydroxychloroquine provides benefits to COVID-19 patients. This lacks transparency for, it is like we are just to take their word for it (that no such study exists).

In addition, in their [linked Health Feedback article](#), they state “Smaller clinical trials found that early treatment with HCQ didn’ t provide significant benefits to patients compared to placebo,” which is patently false.

Author note: Poynter’ s network of fact-checkers which includes HealthFeedback.org, among others, will be further scrutinised in section *5.2 Supplement: The WHO & its own Network of Fact-Checkers* of this post.

In [Part 1 of this review series](#), this author pointed to the work from the same, highly-acclaimed, Dr. Harvey Risch (which Poynter tries to discredit) in this [paper](#), published on May 27, 2020, stating that there was indeed clinical trials (from [Dr. Vladimir Zenlenko](#)) which showed success in early treatment with HCQ.

This one instance shows how Poynter is not being honest in their fact-checking, but rather appear intent on discrediting the renowned Epidemiologist from Yale who is one of the most respected and published practitioners in his field.

While the outfit as a whole shouldn’ t be rejected outright based on just a few incorrect claims as shown above, it certainly leaves much to be desired on whether they truly represent a *transparent* and *independent* source for news verification.

Lastly, with regards to it [stated values](#) of *accuracy*, *independence*, and *fairness*, it has indicatively proved otherwise by including the following video on the [last page of their 2021-2022 Impact Report](#) by [comedian John Oliver](#) with regards to the safety of the Covid-19 vaccines:

COMMUNITY VOICES



John Oliver, host of "Last Week Tonight," references a PolitiFact report during an episode about vaccine misinformation on May 2, 2021.

Video: Covid Vaccines: Last Week Tonight with John Oliver (HBO)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gPHgRp70H8o>

“but our best way out of this mess, long term, is clearly vaccines. - John Oliver”

Really?

A comedian used by the fact-checking outfit to attest to the viability of the Covid-19 vaccine?

Poynter’s top funders can be viewed [here](#) which include the Knight Foundation and support from the Democracy Fund, Meta, the Google News Initiative, and Microsoft, among others.


PolitiFact.org

As observed in the previous section above, [PolitiFact](#) is one of many fact-checking outfits from the Poynter Institute and it is quite a well-known fact-checking organisation, at least in North-America.

It [describes](#) itself as a “nonpartisan fact-checking website to sort out the truth in American politics.” Having been acquired by the Poynter Institute, it has access to the same [funders](#).

Media giants Google, Meta (Facebook), Tiktok, and YouTube also [contribute to its revenues](#), along with many other funders such as Microsoft, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Knight Foundation, the Democracy Fund, and others.

PolitiFact is perhaps most famous for its [Truth-O-Meter](#) visual tags provided in fact-checking articles which makes it easy for their viewers to determine the validity of a claim.



PolitiFact [article](#) showing indicating a “False” attribution in its Truth-O-Meter (top-right).

As the outfit has a huge partnership with Meta and provides [fact-checks for Facebook and Instagram posts](#) which accounts for a mammoth amount of fact-checking on the world’s largest social media platform. For this partnership as well as the one with TikTok, another social media giant, PolitiFact fact-checkers examine posts and provide feedback to the social media companies as to the accuracy of the claims made in the posts. But they [state](#) that while PolitiFact determines the accuracy of the posts, TikTok and Facebook decide what, if any, action to take on their platforms.

Their [methodology page](#) has a [video](#) which explains how they select facts to check whereby a very small set of only about a few dozen [PolitiFact journalists](#) examine the claims.

While these fact checkers are bound to an [ethics policy](#) to avoid “biases and ensure independence and fairness,” they are not experts in fields as complex as those they report on such as the [SARS-CoV-2 virus and the Covid-19 disease](#). Accordingly, using such staff to verify claims (as complex as associated [excess](#)

[deaths](#), [cancers](#), and [gain of function research](#) is certainly well beyond the level of expertise that is required to properly verify such claims. Is it not?

And while the fact checkers will be transparent to include certain experts in related fields (such as in [Report proves that COVID-19 vaccines caused 300,000 excess deaths in 2022](#)), it remains that these are merely *opinions* of select individuals and seldom include counter-opinions or peer-reviewed studies to support the claim under question.

As such, the process employed by PolitiFact is carelessly irresponsible, lacks proper ethics in the respective field of study, and can thus cause medical misinformation or disinformation that thousands, if not millions, might rely on while reading their Facebook and TikTok warnings.

In addition, the overall quality of posts found in the [coronavirus](#) section of their website are of *poor quality*.

For instance, in the post ["Biden admin negotiates deal to give WHO authority over US pandemic policies,"](#) the fact-checker [Jeff Cercone](#) incorrectly states that "The draft doesn't enable WHO to dictate pandemic responses to the U.S. or any country." As was extensively outlined in [Part 2 of this series](#), the WHO would indeed have the power and authority to *supersede* the constitutions and laws of 194 member countries, removing decision making away from democratically elected governments, as was referenced by no less than [six of the WHO's own documents](#). And this was before more documents have been published by the [WHO regarding their sought rights over nations and their health agencies](#).


As for another example, their post titled ["Pfizer just got caught doing gain of function to mutate covid intentionally for vaccines,"](#) by [Madison Czopek](#) - who has no apparent training or credentials whatsoever in health or medicine - is also quite weak.

In it, she refers to a claim "going around the internet [that] takes a more nefarious view, saying that in a quest for profit, vaccine researchers [at Pfizer] tried to make the virus more dangerous," which she desperately tries to disprove, mostly on the basis of labeling the claim as an *absolute* "gain-of-function research," and with two related tweets.

This is a common tactic for fact-checkers, they alter important terms in contention to deviate from the original claim. The original claim in this story by Project Veritas was that Pfizer was performing "*directed evolution*" research, not "gain-of-function," as the fact-checker states.

It is clear from Pfizer's own website that they are engaged activities related to both of these kinds of research, including [gene-editing](#) and "directed evolution" itself, as can be confirmed by the pharmaceutical giant's [own web](#)

[page](#) from 2022 (archived [here](#)) in which they praise the work of [IGNITE](#) (archived [here](#)):



Screenshot (with added emphasis in red) taken on 2023-05-01. Source: Pfizer Investor Insights: Using Viruses to Fight Cancer: A New Approach to Treating Solid Tumors, March 1, 2022, URL: <https://insights.pfizer.com/using-viruses-to-fight-cancer-a-new-approach-to-treating-solid-tumors/> (also archived [here](#))

Former Pfizer insider and patent expert [Karen Kingston](#) recently elaborated on such “directed evolution” research in [her interview on Greg Hunter’s USAWatchdog.com](#).

Though PolitiFact’s fact-checker does reference an infamous video of the claim whereby [Jordan Trishton Walker](#), Pfizer’s Director for Worldwide R&D Strategic Operations [boasted \(on hidden camera\) about his company exploring a way to “mutate” COVID via “Directed Evolution” in order to anticipate new strains for their Covid-19 vaccine](#) [for additional [profit-making](#)], she fails to link to the primary source which completely confirms Walker’s incriminating statements.

Accordingly, Czopek’s piece merely dances around the issue, relying instead on two other weak [Newsweek](#) and [Forbes](#) fact-checking articles on the subject, a [2016 Washington Post article](#) questioning James O’ Keefe’s [from Project Veritas] under-cover tactics, and a [2020 New York Times article](#) stating Pfizer’s early vaccine data shows its shot is 90% effective.

The obvious lack of objectivity, clear bias, and utter incompetence speaks for itself, dragging the whole PolitiFact facade and reputation down with it.

Snopes

[Snopes](#) is a fact-checking site that has been around for many [years](#).

They seem to be more open with their [disclosures](#) and don't appear have any major funders that were previously mentioned; and those who make contributions of over \$10,000 will be listed.

Snopes [team of writers and editors](#) cover selected news articles and does [fact checks](#).

Snopes [covers Covid-19](#) contentions, though those who write on them do not appear to have any health- or medical-related training or relevant background experience.

As for the accuracy of their fact-checking, it would be best to evaluate them piece by piece.

In Part 4 of this series, I wrote about how [Snopes had inaccurately covered a scientific research paper on pandemic lockdowns by Johns Hopkins University](#) for which I had contacted its principal author regarding Snopes. In his reply, he provided me with an extended version of the paper which specifically dealt with fact-checking sites' criticisms regarding their paper as 'Appendix II: The Anatomy of the Negative Spin-Meisters' which said the following about the Snopes review:

“Snopes, which advertises itself as a “fact-checking” website, was quick to jump on the bandwagon. A few hours after the Science Media Centre press release, Snopes published a report that contained eight criticisms, Evon (2022). Of those, five were lifted from the Science Media Centre press release. And three new but irrelevant “criticisms” were added, see Figure 20 and footnote 121.”

To be fair, compared to PolitiFact Snopes appears more thorough in some of its pieces.

An interesting case in point is their post titled [Breaking Down the Project Veritas Video About Pfizer Purportedly Exploring 'Mutating' COVID-19](#).

Unlike with the PolitiFact piece mentioned above which covers the same topic, Snopes at least provides many relevant and well-sourced references on the topic and more prudently questions the allegations. They were more thorough. They have repeatedly contacted Pfizer for comment, and even sent emails to the Pfizer employee at the center of the controversy, [Jordan Trishton Walker](#), which did not

bounce back - proving an email account existed at Pfizer for a worker under that name. In addition, they linked to the official response from Pfizer ([Pfizer Responds to Research Claims](#)).

However, it fails to provide an actual verdict on the matter, keeping it as a “developing” story. And this despite the fact that Pfizer *never denied* that [Mr. Walker](#) was under their employment or contract. This fact coupled with [other evidence](#) provided in their story such as his [prior LinkedIn page](#) attesting to his work at Pfizer, should have merited a “true” claim on the matter.

On an interesting side note, there are two [prior links](#) to Mr. Walker’s LinkedIn page. Neither can be displayed on the [Wayback Machine](#); the latter link provides dates of various backups with the earliest dating [January 26, 2023](#) - the day before the story broke, yet if one clicks on the link a blank page appears (which is totally unusual for the Wayback Machine). Make of this what you will.

FactCheck.org

[FactCheck.org](#)’s [funding page](#) does mention that its initial founders were principally comprised of the [Annenberg Foundation](#) and the [Flora Family Foundation](#) (which is actually the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation). The Annenberg Foundation still contributes funds to this day (2023).

Accordingly, it is worthwhile to note that both of these foundations have financially supported Planned Parenthood with the latter very much concerned with population control issues, [having funded the Population Council](#), among other similar outfits. InfluenceWatch notes the following about the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation [original links included]:

“Since its first year of grantmaking in 1967, for example, Hewlett’s population program has continuously supported [Planned Parenthood](#), the combative abortion-rights association and abortion provider.”

And,

“Hewlett granted nearly \$100 million to Planned Parenthood between 2000 and 2016, and as of 2017, is the organization’s second largest private benefactor after the [Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation](#).”

The Susan Thompson Buffet Foundation is the one from billionaire Warren Buffet which is one of the largest funders of population control measures, as per InfluenceWatch:

“STBF is a quiet but massive financial supporter of pro-abortion activities and population control policies. It is reportedly the largest non-governmental funder of “reproductive health and family planning” in the world, including substantial investments in abortion and contraceptives. 5

One estimate found that STBF had given over \$1.2 billion to organizations which advocate for pro-abortion policy, perform elective abortions, or helped develop the chemical abortion pill RU-486. As of 2012, STBF had provided nearly \$300 million to the controversial abortion clinic network Planned Parenthood and its national headquarters, Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA). [6](#)”



[Leonore Annenberg](#) (bottom-right) appearing with other power brokers such as George Soros, David Rockefeller, William Gates Sr., Ted Turner, and Brooke Astor (with the black hat).



The two photographs displayed above seem to come from 2001 for which most of the people in the photograph were Honorees of the [Carnegie Medal of Philanthropy](#) for the [2001](#) edition. Apart from the honorees, prominent members of the American media were present, as listed in the caption. In addition, and, quite oddly, Dr. Anthony Fauci was present at the event. Back in 2001 he was serving as the director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID).



Without wanting to speculate about the coincidental present of Dr. Fauci, one has to wonder why he was present with the likes of the Annenbergs, [Gates'](#), and [and](#)

[Rockefeller who have strong leanings about and who donate to population control causes.](#)

In addition, PolitiFact receives funding from the [Robert Wood Johnson Foundation](#). According to [Wikipedia](#), its founder - Robert Wood Johnson II was the son of Robert Wood Johnson I of the Johnson & Johnson (J&J) pharmaceutical empire and he left 10,204,377 shares of Johnson & Johnson stock to the foundation upon his death in 1968.

It should be noted that Johnson & Johnson was one of the leading pharmaceutical firms which provided experimental Covid-19 vaccines during the pandemic.

In addition, as was flashed in this part of the docuseries, the current President and CEO of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation is [Richard E. Besser](#) who also happened to be the [acting director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention \(CDC\) in 2009](#), but worked there for 13 years.

It doesn' t take long to see what types of causes Richard Besser supports, at least from his Twitter feed.

← Tweet



Rich Besser
@DrRichBesser

As my colleagues from @RWJF say- “No decent person wants to hurt children.” Here’s what that should mean:
Youth and gender-affirming care: let’s start with ‘do no harm’
statnews.com/2022/06/15/you... via @statnews



statnews.com

Youth and gender-affirming care: let's start with 'do no harm'

Adhering to a few simple principles won't bridge America's cultural divide or tone down the political rhetoric around gender-affirming care, but it will help ...

8:15 AM · Jun 15, 2022

June 15, 2022 [tweet](#) (archived [here](#)) from Richard E. Besser.

Though at first glance the tweet’s text and the referenced article - [Youth and gender-affirming care: let’s start with ‘do no harm’](#) - appears to protect children, a closer look reveals that it staunchly advocates for the use of puberty blocking medications and even irreversible surgical interventions to change genders for minors, though they sugar-coat it as “gender-affirming care.” The piece is deceptively manipulative and worrisome, to say the least. And it should be [noted](#) that the outfit behind it, Stat News, is [Boston Globe Media](#) which is known for [funding](#) eugenics outfits such as the [Carnegie Corporation of New York](#) and George Soros’ [pro-abortion Foundation to Promote Open Society](#). Moreover, Stat News’ [Executive Team](#) is comprised of [Linda Henry](#),

the CEO of Boston Globe Media Partners (of [The Boston Globe](#) fame) who is [listed](#) on the World Economic Forum (WEF)'s website. It is also most likely no coincidence that the WEF is a [strong promoter](#) of the [LGBTQ agenda](#).

In addition, during the pandemic Richard Besser also [heavily promoted](#) the [Covid-19 vaccines](#) to, and for [children](#). One of Besser's [tweets](#) was about [NBC Nightly News Kids Edition \(December 9, 2021\)](#) in which he directly answered childrens' questions about the Covid-19 vaccines. In another tweet, he points to how [Sesame Street](#) "[a great way to get COVID vaccine questions answered](#)." Keep in mind this is coming from a former CDC Director and that these vaccines were experimental at the time with associated risks; yet, none of these risks were ever touched upon by either Besser or NBC News.

Moreover, as [CEO of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation](#) many would argue that he is not impartial, for the foundation is funded by one of the Covid-19 vaccine (Johnson & Johnson) manufacturers. Though this author is not a [legal](#) or [advertising](#) expert, suffice it to say that such kind of behavior remains highly questionable, and perhaps even unethical or immoral.

Getting back to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation itself, let it be observed that its Chief Operation Officer (COO) of the foundation is [Melvin J. Galloway](#) who also has strong eugenics leanings, for prior to his post at the foundation, Galloway "served as the executive vice president and chief operating office for Planned Parenthood Federation of America and Planned Parenthood Action Fund."

Planned Parenthood [receives grants](#) from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and champions other causes, including "[environmental justice](#)" ([climate change](#)) and "[LGTBTQ+ justice](#)" for which FactCheck's articles seem to disproportionately defend.

As was clearly exhibited in [Part 3 of this review series](#), [Planned Parenthood](#) has an unwavering legacy veiled in [eugenic programs](#) which continue to this day.

On their funding page, FactCheck does state the following:

"[SciCheck's COVID-19/Vaccination Project](#) is made possible by a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation."

Though they do add the disclaimer "The foundation has [no control](#) over our editorial decisions, and the views expressed on our website do not necessarily reflect the views of the foundation," viewers would be [hard-pressed to find any negative news](#) about pharma giant Johnson & Johnson, the manufacturer of one of the leading Covid-19 vaccines.

In fact, their [COVID-19 Misconceptions](#) page makes poor attempts to disparage contentions which oppose prescribed narratives by using labels such as

[“Conspiracy Theories”](#) and by largely dismissing claims that counter those narratives.

For example, they outrightly dismiss any possibility that those who have [“died suddenly”](#) was due to them taking the Covid-19 experimental vaccines even though [plenty of medical evidence exists to corroborate it](#), not excluding compelling testimonies from embalmers in the field such as the [licensed funeral director and embalmer Laura Jeffery from Canada](#), among others in the field.

In another example, they incorrectly state that [No Evidence Pfizer Conducting Any Inappropriate Coronavirus Experiments](#), for evidence which has been presented above undeniably states otherwise.

Moreover, it is difficult to claim that the foundation has “no control” over any editorial decisions. Firstly, in their [SciCheck](#) section which “focuses exclusively on false and misleading scientific claims,” they actually published a February 27, 2021 article titled [A Guide to Johnson & Johnson’s COVID-19 Vaccine](#) which inherently compromises the fact-checking outfit’s *objectivity* when providing information on claims related to J&J. Moreover, its author, [Lori Robertson](#), is a journalist with no health- or medical-related training.

Despite claims of transparency and independence, it doesn’t take long to see where the lion’s share of funding for FactCheck’s activities come from. These are very powerful entities with deep pockets; accordingly, one would have to be extremely naïve to think that such funding is void of influence.

CIR (Center for Investigative Reporting)

The [Center for Investigative Reporting \(CIR\)](#) is described as a non-profit investigative journalism organisation which publishes on its [Reveal News](#) as well as in public radio and podcasts.

Its predominant entity, Reveal News posits that their bottom line is “the public interest,” also stating that they have “the courage, freedom and independence to dedicate our entire newsroom to this work because we’re powered by support from foundations, individual donors, and readers and listeners like you.”

But, as [InfluenceWatch](#) notes, the CIR is “is funded by many left-of-center grantmaking nonprofits, including [George Soros’s Open Society Foundations](#), the [Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation](#), and the [Tides Foundation](#),” of which some of these financial ties were mentioned by Monica Felgendreher.

Actually, they have many more funders which are stated on their [website](#) and in InfluenceWatch’s [section](#) on the matter, not excluding the Ford Foundation, Democracy Fund, the Knight, Tides, and Logan foundations, in addition to the aforementioned Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

Incontrovertibly, the outfit is quite [charged](#) with the same kind of powerful players as the other fact-checking outfits under examination in this work.

Such a *consistent* pattern across these fact-checking organisations cannot be merely coincidental.

[Jonathan Logan](#), the founder and CEO of the [Jonathan Logan Family Foundation](#), figures among Reveal News' [Board of Directors](#).

And, according to InfluenceWatch, the foundation provides grants to [InsideClimate News](#), a center-left environmentalist media website which “publishes content supporting the theories of catastrophic manmade climate change and global warming.” Accordingly, it would come as [no surprise that Reveal News seldom publishes anything that counters](#) the prevalent narratives surrounding climate change and global warming. Their [news headlines](#) on the matter wreak of climate doom warnings.

In addition, as is [stated](#) in Jonathan Logan' s Berkeley Journalism page, his foundation has provided grants to ProPublica, known for its [left-leaning bias](#), and the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ) - two significant outfits in journalism. Accordingly, his and his foundation' s impact on journalism is quite noteworthy.

In terms of editorial independence and integrity, it is not difficult to see that articles published on the site for certain sections are lopsidedly [anti-Trump](#), [pro-DEI](#), [pro-open-borders](#), [pro-abortion](#) and [reproductive rights](#).

Media Matters for America

As a [left-leaning](#) media outfit that is mostly pro-Democrat, it is overtly critical of “[right-wing media](#),” and [Fox News in particular](#).

As per [InfluenceWatch](#), [Media Matters for America](#) was founded with \$2 million in funding from wealthy progressives funneled through the [Tides Foundation](#) with additional funding from [MoveOn.org](#) and the New Democrat Network; in 2010, [George Soros](#), the billionaire who founded the [Open Society Foundations](#), which has generously funded Planned Parenthood and the [Population Council](#), gave the group \$1 million.

There is also a connection between Media Matters and former U.S. Presidential candidate Hilary Clinton as was referenced in the infographic shown near the beginning of this post. Media Matters' founder [David Brock](#) who was once a fierce opponent of Hilary Clinton later became her and her [Democratic Party](#)' s staunch ally, fiercely [opposing Donald Trump](#) and the [Conservatives](#).

Looking at their [websites articles about the 2020 Elections](#) provides little doubt as to its Democratic and anti-Conservative leanings.

With regards to articles on the subject of [LGBTQ](#), Media Matters states that it monitors LGBTQ-related narratives with a focus “on dismantling conservative misinformation harmful to the LGBTQ community.” Just from the language they use - “conservative” - it is quite apparent that they will favor more “progressive” or left-leaning stances to defend the LGBTQ narratives and that is quite apparent if one scans their headlines for the [many articles](#) they have in this section.

Moreover, they state “Media Matters LGBTQ Program works with partner organizations across the country to share research, offer targeted media monitoring, and highlight LGBTQ issues and the bad actors affecting LGBTQ equality,” which undoubtedly means they push articles that are mostly in defense of the LGBTQ community.

While that is not necessarily a bad thing in that it can help defend the rights of the group, it becomes a much more contentious matter when they promote certain ideals of the [LGBTQ agenda](#) such as transgenderism and gender-related issues with regards to children and young teenagers.

A slippery and controversial example is that of the “[grooming](#)” and “[gender affirming care](#)” (which is eugenics code word for using psychological, pharmaceutical, and medical interventions on helpless and highly-impressionable children who are not able to fully comprehend their ramifications, yet alone their own personal identities).

How Media Matters appears to be on-board with these kind of egregious abuses lies in the deceptive manner in which they cover these issues; for example, their article titled [Fox News is lying that New Jersey schools are “grooming” and torturing kids based on an LGBTQ-inclusive resource](#) leaves little doubt on how they are hell-bent on attacking those who seek to protect innocent children.

In similar fashion, Media Matters coverage on Covid-19 most predominantly appears to be on the mainstream consensus side, often [attacking experts on the subject such as Robert Kennedy Jr.](#) from [ChildrensHealthDefense.org](#) and those from the [conservative media with opposing narratives](#) while protecting people like [Bill Gates](#) and [Dr. Anthony Fauci](#) who has been known to have [lied](#) on [multiple occasions](#) about [funding gain-on-function research](#) on coronaviruses and who reaped personal financial profits from his relationships with players in the industry.

Overall, the reach and influence that Media Matters has over mainstream news outlets such as [MSNBC](#), [CNN](#), the [New York Times](#), and the [Washington Post](#), and even the [Canadian Broadcasting Corporation \(CBC\)](#), Canada’s leading media outlet, is quite impressive. As such, the extent to which their narrations impact traditional mainstream news outlets ought to be seriously considered and further scrutinised.

Suffice it to say, that Media Matters for America appears to limit themselves as a being a mostly one-sided, left-leaning, echo chamber with a steadfast mission on countering opposing views that are considered conservative or right-of-center.

ProPublica & the Democracy Fund

The last two that will be covered that appeared in the infographic from Episode 5 - Never Give In - Never Give Up of Never Again is Now Global from earlier in this post, are ProPublica and the Democracy Fund.

[ProPublica](#) describes itself as follows:

“ProPublica is an independent, nonprofit newsroom that produces investigative journalism with moral force. We dig deep into important issues, shining a light on abuses of power and betrayals of public trust — and we stick with those issues as long as it takes to hold power to account.”

Though ProPublica enjoys one of the best reputations in the field of investigative journalism, the group’s story choices and rhetorical framing appears to indicate a *left-leaning bias*, [notes](#) InfluenceWatch. They add that as of 2018, ProPublica works with 184 “publishing partners,” from national publications to local news outlets, since its creation.

Furthermore, its inter-connected network of funders which include the [Robert Wood Johnson Foundation](#) (of Johnson & Johnson fame), the [Sandler Foundation](#), and John Podesta’s [Center for American Progress](#) which are left-leaning outfits with pro-abortion stances.

They also receive funding from the [Democracy Fund](#), George Soros’ [Foundation to Promote Open Society](#) which is a firm proponent of abortion and [LGBT rights](#) as well as anti-Catholic Church stances.

Regarding ProPublica’s coverage of [Covid-19](#) and its [vaccines](#), it appears less “pro-narrative” (i.e., to mostly “follow the science” and that the vaccines are all “safe and effective”) than with the aforementioned outfits. But nonetheless, [some](#) of [their articles](#) on the matter have included their own fair share of disinformation.

Once more, a common problem with reporting on such complex health issues by [reporters](#) with very limited, if at all, experience in the related sciences of health and medicine and who come more from journalistic backgrounds, is that it can grossly and carelessly mislead their audiences.

Finally, with regards to the [Democracy Fund](#), it is another [left-leaning](#) foundation that is chaired and principally funded by eBay founder and former

chairman [Pierre Omidyar](#). It has an extensive list of organisations it donates to, mostly through grants. These include the Poynter Institute for Media Studies (which [oversees PolitiFact](#)) to which it provided a \$525,000 grant in 2017, and ProPublica.

Prior to funding the Democracy Fund, Omidyar public policy philanthropy had supported the likes of George Soros’ s Open Society Foundations and the [Ford Foundation](#), with the latter having historically been heavily involved in [population control](#) endeavours and more recently in [LGBTQ causes](#).

Concluding

What these media and fact-checking organisations have in common, apart from the consistent blend of common funders with similarly aligned goals, is that they are all, without exception, *left-leaning* outfits that are more apt to support “left” and “progressive” agendas - particularly those espoused by the [World Economic Forum](#) - whilst criticizing *right-* or *conservative-leaning* stances on the issues they cover.

In addition, as has been referenced above, most of them have presented fact-checks and articles about Covid-19 that very seldom, if at all, offered views that were counter to the prevailing narratives regarding the pandemic measures and the so-called “safety and efficacy” of the vaccines.

Moreover, as former Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) officer and investigator [Vincent Gircys](#) noted, a mostly [single-sided narrative](#) coupled with the suppression of information (censorship) is a form of incriminating evidence in and of itself.

5.2 Supplement: The WHO & its own Network of Fact-Checkers

This section is an extension of the claim examined in section 5.1.

As the main claim examined in this work is about fact-checking outfits and who funds them, it is worthwhile to examine how the World Health Organization (WHO) uses them along with their own respective credentials, goals, and funders.

If one clicks on Poynter-affiliated HealthFeedback.org’ s About link, it will redirect to its sister site [ScienceFeedback.co](#)’ s own [About page](#) for which you will notice the following (emphasis added in red color):

Health Feedback is a member of the World Health Organization's Vaccine Safety Net, a network of websites that provide reliable information on vaccine safety.



The 'member' hyperlink points to [an official WHO page](#):

A screenshot of a web browser showing the WHO website. The address bar shows 'https://www.who.int/teams/regulation-prequalification/regulation-and-safety'. The page title is 'Health Feedback'. The breadcrumb trail is 'Home / Teams / Regulation and safety / Pharmacovigilance / Vaccine Safety Net / VSN members / Health Feedback'. The main content area features a blue header with the Health Feedback logo and a quote: 'Health Feedback is a worldwide network of scientists sorting fact from fiction in health and medical media coverage. Their goal is to help readers know which news to trust.' Below this, there is a 'Description of the website' section with a red underline, stating: 'The website of Health Feedback is a member of the WHO-led project Vaccine Safety Net (VSN)'. Other details include 'Country: France', 'Last evaluation: 2023', and 'Website audience(s):'. A red vertical bar highlights the description text.

The WHO's [Vaccine Safety Net \(VSN\)](#) describes itself as follows:

“The Vaccine Safety Net is a global network of websites, established by the World Health Organization, that provides reliable information on vaccine safety.”

VSN boasts its impressive and wide-reaching [network](#) of 104 member sites in 44 countries around the world and states [original link included]:

“A key player in the Project is the Global Advisory Committee on Vaccine Safety (GACVS), established by WHO in 1999, to respond promptly, efficiently, and with scientific rigour to vaccine safety issues of potential global importance. [See GACVS webpage](#)”

Though the GACVS leads to a dead end (and seems to have [never existed](#)), its main page can be accessed under the '[VSN Members](#)' (which, by the way, includes

three key organisations for Canada), specifically here: Global Advisory Committee on Vaccine Safety (GACVS) which encourages viewers to visit the Vaccine Safety Net portal.

An overview of the WHO’ s GACVS reads as follows [with **emphasis added**]:

“The Global Advisory Committee on Vaccine Safety (GACVS) **provides independent, authoritative, scientific advice to WHO on vaccine safety issues of global or regional concern with the potential to affect in the short or long term national immunization programmes.** This includes providing advice on urgent matters as needed. Issues to be considered by the Committee are jointly decided by the WHO Secretariat and the Committee.”

The key terms to pay attention to here are ‘**independent**’, ‘**vaccine safety issues**’, and ‘**national immunization programmes.**”

Accordingly, it is important to verify the individuals who figure amongst its former and current membership.

Without going through each of the 12 individuals which comprise the current expert cohort, this author will focus on one in particular since she is from Canada, namely **Ève Dubé** - a professor at Laval University in the province of Quebec.

Professor Dure Samin Akram (Vice chair since Dec 2020)	Founder, Honorary Chairperson and President; Health, Education and Literacy Program, Karachi, Pakistan	June-2016 (reappointed in Dec 2019)	Dec 2023
Dr Rita Helfand (Chair since Dec 2020)	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Clifton Road, Atlanta, GA, USA	Dec-2015 (reappointed June 2019)	Dec 2023
Professor Narendra Kumar Arora	Executive Director, The INCLIN Trust International, New Delhi, India	June-2019	June-2022 extended to 30 June 2025
Dr Nguyen Van Cuong	Former EPI Consultant, National Institute of Hygiene and Epidemiology (NIHE), Hanoi, Viet Nam	June-2019	June-2022 extended to 30 June 2025
Mrs Delese Darko	Chief Executive Officer, Food and Drugs Authority, Accra, Ghana	June-2019	June-2022 extended to 30 June 2025
Professor Eve Dubé	Professor in Social and Prevention Medicine, Université Laval, Québec City, Canada	Dec 2019	Dec 2022
Dr Steven Anderson	Office of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Center for Biologicals Evaluation and Research, FDA, Maryland, USA	May 2020	May 2023

As will be evidenced hereunder, Mrs. Dubé is a staunch pro-vaccine advocate.

But, in order to get an objective, independent view regarding her background and stances on vaccines, this author reached out to Mr. Chrystian Leray, a spokesperson for [Réinfo Covid Québec](#) - an arm of an international collective of 4,000 doctors and 80,000 members - who stated the following about her [translated from French]:

“She is an [anthropologist](#), she seems to have limited knowledge about vaccines, whether we are talking about “traditional” vaccines or mRNA. I’ve never seen her cite any scientific studies where she talks about mRNA. She therefore seems in the dogma that it is safe and effective, does not understand why people do not believe it and thinks it is because of the “conspirators”.”

As for her personal stance on vaccines, looking at the tweets from her [Twitter feed](#) easily leads us to infer that she is quite [pro-vaccine](#).




A re-tweet from [Ève Dubé's Twitter feed](#) from April 5, 2022.

https://twitter.com/DubeEve

Eve Dubé
488 Tweets Follow

Eve Dubé @DubeEve · Jan 28, 2022

5 mythes sur les personnes non vaccinées | Agence Science-Pressé



sciencepresse.qc.ca

5 mythes sur les personnes non vaccinées

L'attention accordée ces derniers mois aux plus bruyants des non vaccinés, tout comme la part disproportionnée des hospitalisés qui ...

2 4

A January 28, 2022 [tweet](#) from Ève Dubé linked to an article from Agence Science Presse titled [5 mythes sur les personnes non vaccinées](#) (English: 5 myths about the non-vaccinated). Archived [here](#).

Amidst the 5 myths of the [article](#) in the “key points to retain” section, the author states “La désinformation et l’adhésion aux théories du complot viennent brouiller les cartes et élargissent le spectre des non vaccinés.” (English: “Misinformation and adherence to conspiracy theories are clouding the waters and widening the spectrum of the unvaccinated.”) They also link to three articles about vaccine hesitancy.

The article figures in the ‘Health & Medicine’ section of [Agence Science Presse](#) under its “Détecteur de rumeurs” (“rumor detector”) [fact-checking](#) rubric.

The outfit describes itself as an *independent* media agency with nearly 50 years of scientific and journalistic rigor, holding [training workshops](#) to fight against misinformation and false news, even [drafting \(writing\) scientific articles](#).

However, some may question its independence, for they [clearly state](#) that their financing is “assured by the governments of Canada and Quebec.”

[Other tweets](#) from Ève Dubé’s Twitter feed also attests to her pro-vaccine leanings.



It should also be noted that [since 2008](#) (archived [here](#)), Mrs. Dubé has worked for the INSPQ, also serving as Chair in Applied Public Health on the Anthropology of Vaccination Issues INSPQ-ULaval since [January of 2022](#).

[INSPQ](#) is the center of expertise and reference in public health in the province to support Québec’s Minister of Health and Social Services.

A March 24, 2019 news post from the INSPQ titled [Un vaccin contre la désinformation? Dre Ève Dubé à Tout le monde en parle](#) confirmed Dubé’s presence on ‘Tout le monde en parle’, a popular TV show that airs on Radio-Canada, the French equivalent of the CBC. The titled of the post translates to “A vaccine against misinformation? Dr. Ève Dubé at Everybody’s talking about it.”

Early on during the ramping up of the Covid-19 Pandemic, Mrs. Dubé was interviewed by a reporter from the Journal de Montréal in a piece called [Crise de confiance de «Big Pharma»](#) (English: “Big Pharma’s crisis of confidence”) in which she sought to dispel the “lies and misinformation” about vaccination. As this was in April of 2020, no Covid-19 vaccine was yet available.

The article also mentioned that Mrs. Dubé had just received a \$500,000 grant from the federal government to analyze the circulation of information concerning COVID-19 and the impact of fake news on public health efforts.

In a more recent news post dated October 21, 2022, titled [Pourquoi certaines personnes hésitent-elles à se faire vacciner?](#) (English: Why are some people reluctant to get vaccinated?), the INSQP Chair once more covers vaccine hesitancy while promoting them as safe and effective. In the article, she states the following [with some **emphasis added**]:

“« Il est essentiel de bien comprendre ces préoccupations et d’identifier les barrières rencontrées par les personnes qui n’ont pas reçu les vaccins recommandés **afin de mettre au point des interventions adaptées aux enjeux des communautés ayant des taux de vaccination sous-optimaux.** »

English: It is essential to fully understand these concerns and identify the barriers faced by people who have not received the recommended vaccines **in order to develop interventions adapted to the challenges of communities with suboptimal vaccination rates.**”

« La mission de la Chaire sera de générer des connaissances afin **d’élaborer des stratégies qui encouragent la vaccination** de façon équitable, durable et efficace.» (English: “The mission of the Chair will be to generate knowledge in order to **develop strategies that encourage vaccination** in an equitable, sustainable and effective manner,”) the article further emphasises.

And, the article confirms that the Chair, will receive \$1.1 million from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) for these purposes.

Dubé authored a series of papers for the [Public Health Agency of Canada \(PHAC\)](#) regarding vaccination hesitancy:

- PHAC - [Optimizing communication material to address vaccine hesitancy](#), February 6, 2020;
- PHAC - Canada Communicable Disease Report (CCDR) - [Vaccine acceptance: How to build and maintain trust in immunization](#), May 7, 2020;
- PHAC - Canada Communicable Disease Report (CCDR) - [Designing tailored interventions to address barriers to vaccination](#), March of 2021.

Also at the federal level, early in 2022, Mrs. Dubé was [selected as an Applied Public Health Chair](#) with the following Chair aim:

“Eve Dubé, Université Laval, Faculté des sciences sociales (Quebec)

Chair aim: Develop our understanding of vaccine hesitancy in the general population and health professionals, as well as develop and evaluate solutions to promote informed vaccination decisions.”

Another [web page](#) from the CIHR Institute of Population & Public Health (CIHR-IPPH) and the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC) described her role as “Understanding and acting to address vaccine hesitancy.”

And at the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) also highlighted the [focus of her research](#) which is largely concerned with vaccine uptake.

With all that has been exhibited above, it is quite clear what was to be expected by her by both the provincial and federal health authorities. In other words, her well-funded mandates were to specifically focus on vaccine hesitancy and related barriers, rather than examining vaccine safety and efficacy.

To date, and with at least \$1.6 million in government funding, Mrs. Dubé only appears to have published two research papers:

1. [COVID-19 vaccination attitudes and intention among Quebecers during the first and second waves of the pandemic: findings from repeated cross-sectional surveys](#), published July 28, 2021;
2. [Stigma and blame related to COVID-19 pandemic: A case-study of editorial cartoons in Canada](#), published in March, 2022.

Her first paper’s Abstract states “the success of the COVID-19 vaccination campaign relies on high uptake by the public.”

She and her co-authors added “It was **reassuring to note** that intention to be vaccinated is the highest among older age groups that are prioritized to be vaccinated first…As more doses and vaccines will be available **it will be important to enhance vaccine acceptance and uptake**,” for which the **bolded** phrases indicate clear, not impartial, bias by its authors, for the study was supposed to examine the “*attitudes and intentions*” of Quebecers towards vaccination.

Apart from numerous grammar and punctuation mistakes, the paper’s Conclusion clearly demonstrates the *loaded* goal, or intent, of the study:

“Our findings could however to develop tailored interventions to enhance **vaccine acceptance targeted to groups that are less willing to be vaccinated** (i.e., younger adults, those feeling less at risk, those with lower level of education and those living in more deprived areas). The launch of COVID-19 vaccination **provides an important opportunity to address vaccine hesitancy in Canada**. Beyond providing information about the safety and effectiveness

of COVID-19 vaccines, successful strategies will need to be culturally sensitive, tailored and multicomponent (i.e., increase access to vaccination services, **address vaccine hesitancy**, build support among community leaders and engage healthcare providers).”

This author contacted Mrs. Dubé by email for comment, but no response has been forthcoming.

The broader question the reader should ponder here, however, is *why* was Mrs. Dubé specifically selected to be on the WHO’ s Global Advisory Committee on Vaccine Safety (GACVS) panel?

If they were really concerned with vaccine *safety* as they [state on their web page](#), then why would they specifically choose a “health expert” who was no expertise on vaccine safety, but was rather known as a vaccine-hesitancy specialist prior to her appointment?

It would be interesting to see what backgrounds the other 11 [members](#) of the WHO’ s Vaccine Safety Net. But, as this post is already running quite long, the reader is invited to examine the matter further, and even add related findings in the comments section of this post.

Fact-checker HealthFeedback.org & the CBC’ s “expert” Tim Caulfield

As mentioned earlier, [Healthfeedback.org](#) figures among Poynter’ s network of fact-checkers which also includes a sister site called ScienceFeedback.co which share the same [About page](#). On that page, it is indicated that Health Feedback is a member of the WHO’ s Vaccine Safety Net which was also described earlier.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, most often referred to as the CBC is Canada’ s prominent news broadcaster. As with any major broadcasting outlet, it hires and connects with experts from various fields to obtain and sometimes help validate data, facts, and information for its news reporting.

During the Covid-19 Pandemic, the CBC often used and uses two experts in [Maya Goldenberg](#), a vaccine hesitancy expert from the University of Guelph and [Tim Caulfield](#) who is a [professor](#) at the University of Alberta’ s Faculty of Law and a long time [vaccine advocate](#).

In his [testimony at the National Citizens Inquiry \(NCI\)](#), former long-time journalist [Rodney Palmer](#) who worked at the CBC criticised his former employer for using Caulfield as a regular expert on matters related to Covid-19.

Part of that criticism, Palmer pointed out at the inquiry, was due to the fact that Tim Caulfield was receiving a [\\$381,000 grant](#) to [combat Covid-19 misinformation](#) even though Palmer contended that a lot of the Covid-19-related

news the CBC was reporting, itself, contained a lot of misinformation and that the broadcaster was pushing propaganda throughout the pandemic.

The following image is from a slide of Palmer' s presentation at the NCI.

**CBC
Regular "Experts"**


Tim Caulfield*,
Law Professor,
U of Calgary

* April 2020 received \$381,000 in federal and provincial grants to combat COVID misinformation

* April 2021 received \$1.75 Million from Federal Health Minister to counter vaccine misinformation.


Maya Goldenburg*,
Vaccine Hesitancy expert,
U of Guelph

• April, 2022 Received Government of Canada funding to study the politics of health and the root causes of medical distrust.

Strongly favouring particular interests: Propaganda

  <https://www.cbc.ca/radio/whitecoat/dose-covid19-vaccines-children-1.6211257>

Palmer' s slide also indicates an additional \$1.75 million in federal funding that was earmarked for a [campaign for countering vaccine misinformation](#).

A quick look at Timothy Caulfield' s [Twitter feed](#) also leaves little doubt as to this personal stance on vaccines.



Timothy Caulfield

78.8K Tweets

Follow



Timothy Caulfield @CaulfieldTim · Apr 28

This is great stuff! 🙌

Do vaccines cause #autism? No.

Does the #HPV vaccine cause infertility? No.

Does mRNA in some #COVID vaccines alter DNA? No.

Do vaccines cause cancer? No.

Etc., etc., etc.

#VaccinesWork! #ScienceUpFirst



Lydia Greene, Poker of Bears, Kicker of W... @FormerA... · Apr 28


I was given the opportunity to coauthor a public health booklet from the lens of a formerly antivax parent. I talk about the tropes I wholeheartedly believed and how I realized I was so wrong about them. #WhyIVax #VaccinesWork
immunizekansascollection.org/documents/Vacc...

[Show this thread](#)

VACCINE FEARS


Caulfield has at least [two tweets](#) whereby he uses HealthFeedback.org's reporting to help justify his personal views on complex medical issues such as vaccination for which he has no formal medical or scientific training in the field of vaccines other than a [Bachelor of Science](#).

← **Tweet**

 **Timothy Caulfield**
@CaulfieldTim

Perspective: "Multiple studies show that face masks reduce the spread of COVID-19; a Cochrane review doesn't demonstrate otherwise"
healthfeedback.org/claimreview/mu... via @HealthFeedback

"Claims that face masks don't work... are unsupported & misrepresent the conclusions of the review..."



Face masks are ineffective at reducing the spread of COVID-19 and other respiratory diseases

MISLEADING

substack

SOURCE: Robert Malone, Substack, 1 Feb. 2023

DETAILS

Inadequate support: Claims that face masks are ineffective at reducing the spread of COVID-19 based on a Cochrane review didn't take into account the limitations of the review. While many users presented this review as the highest-quality evidence, the individual studies it evaluated varied greatly in terms of quality, study design, populations studied, and outcomes observed, which prevented the authors from drawing any definitive conclusions.

KEY TAKE AWAY

Randomized controlled trials are considered the gold standard when assessing the effectiveness of an intervention. However, this type of study can vary ...

healthfeedback.org

Multiple studies show that face masks reduce the spread of COVID-19; a Coc...

2:22 PM · Feb 18, 2023 · 11.3K Views

Timothy Caulfield's [tweet](#) from February 18, 2023.

So, for him to be a key consultant to the CBC on matters related to the *safety* of vaccines is perhaps not optimal. For, as a pro-vaccine advocate - like Mrs. Ève Dubé and Maya Goldenbert (from the slide image above) - he is presenting and indirectly conveying to viewers of the CBC that vaccines are safe, ignoring the possible downsides to the medical procedure.

As retired Ontario Provincial Police Vincent Gircys [previously noted](#), the CBC and mainstream media at large have been presenting [single-sided narratives](#)

throughout the Covid-19 Pandemic. “Authoritarianism, intense propaganda by the state media, along with intense censorship are contributing factors which have led to the current state of affairs in Canada,” Gircys [stated](#) in this author’s recent one-on-one interview with the seasoned investigator.

This author sought comment from Mr. Caulfield via one of his Twitter posts, but did not receive a reply.

Summary & Conclusion (for Part 5)

Though this fifth part of the [review series](#) only examined one claim from the [fifth episode](#) of the docuseries [Never Again is Now Global](#), it was an important one since it focused on fact-checking outfits that are extremely instrumental in how news about the Covid-19 has been constructed and disseminated.

The main contention of the claim was challenging the parties that are funding these fact-checking outfits. And, indirectly, what influence and sway they hold on the outfits whom they generously fund.

This 30+ page post has examined these relationships in detail. And for the most part, this claim has proven to be quite validated.

A deep dive into *checking the fact-checkers* has led this author down many other avenues whereby it has been found how even a very small group of so-called experts in the field of public health have been utilised (or weaponised?) to help members of the corporate media propagate a consistent narrative about the assured safety of the Covid-19 vaccines, the dangers of so-called disinformation surrounding possible wrongdoings from key actors during the pandemic, and the unforgivable sin that is vaccine hesitancy.

This same handful of highly-biased individuals have also been extremely influential in guiding public policy makers from public health agencies on how to “better” handle these health matters and deal with individuals who are skeptical and reluctant to get the jab.


In addition, this post examined the WHO’s own role in the matter of fact-checking information and facts about the issues surrounding Covid-19.

Of course, it goes without saying that such a position is indeed essential for global public health.

But sadly, it also has been evidenced that though the WHO projects an apparent genuine concern for the safety of vaccines, they certainly appear to have chosen individuals who are from pro-vaccine backgrounds like Mrs. Ève Dubé to sit on their Global Vaccine Safety’s expert cohort.

If they were genuinely concerned with vaccine safety, wouldn't they prefer to fill their 12-member team with those who could more objectively assess the safety and efficacy of the Covid-19 vaccines?

An expert in the field such as [Dr. Tess Lawrie](#) from the [World Council for Health](#), recently [contended](#) that the WHO wants to introduce **500 new vaccines by 2030** in their [Immunization Agenda 2030 \(IA2030\) program](#) (archived [here](#)), as can be confirmed from the WHO's website [emphasis added in red]:



The screenshot shows the WHO website's navigation bar with options: Health Topics, Countries, Newsroom, Emergencies, Data, and About WHO. The main content area is titled "The Targets" and lists "Targets to be achieved by 2030 include:" followed by three bullet points. The third bullet point, "Completing 500 national or subnational introductions of new or under-utilized vaccines", is highlighted with a red box. Below this is "The Path Forward" section, which lists strategic priorities. At the bottom, there is a search bar and search options: Highlight All, Match Case, Match Diacritics, Whole Words, and 1 of 1 match.

What does this tell us about the World Health Organization for health challenges, future pandemics, and vaccination programs going forward?

Stay tuned for the **Conclusion** post for this series. The author intends to assemble all parts into a single PDF file which will be made available in the Conclusion or in a subsequent post.

“Truth is truth, even if no one believes it.

A lie is a lie, even if everyone believes it.”

Note: Special thanks to Dave Ratcliffe for [referring to the Never Again Is Now Global series and this review series](#) on his website [radical earth journal](#).

The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 6 – Series Conclusion



This is the sixth and final post in a **six-part review** of the documentary film called **Never Again Is Now Global**.

The series is structured as follows:

1. [The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 1](#)
2. [The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 2](#)
3. [The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 3](#)
4. [The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 4](#)
5. [The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 5](#)
6. [The Covid-19 – Holocaust Comparison, Part 6](#)

Parts 1 to 5 Recap

[Part 1](#) of this six-part series presented the documentary film under review, [Never Again Is Now Global](#), and the methodology to examine its merits from an independent and objective lens.

For this, **key claims** (shown hereunder) from each episode of the documentary film are presented and evaluated. Here is what has been examined thus far:

- **Part 1:**
 - 1.1 [Dr. Vladimir Zelenko on the deliberate suppression of early treatment](#)
 - 1.2 [Rabbi Michoel Green on the parallels between the Holocaust and the Covid-19 Pandemic](#)
 - 1.3 [Dr. Hervé Seligmann on false science and disinformation](#)

- **Part 2:**
 - 2.1 [Dr. Vladimir Zelenko on AIDS caused by the Covid-19 vaccines](#)
 - 2.2 [Vera Sharav on global concentration of power](#)
 - 2.3 [Joshua Stylman on the violation of the Nuremberg Code & international laws](#)

- **Part 3:**
 - 3.1 [Vera Sharav on the Eugenics Movement & the Gates Family](#)
 - 3.2 [Vera Sharav on Transhumanism](#)
 - 3.3 [Vera Sharav on how Covid-19 was planned Biowarfare](#)

- **Part 4:**
 - 4.1 [Dr. Michael Yeadon former Pfizer VP on the absurdity of Covid-19 measures](#)
 - 4.2 [Dr. Michael Yeadon on planned Digital IDs & CBDCs](#)

- **Part 5:**
 - 5.1 [Monica Felgendreher on who is funding the fact-checking outfits](#)
 - 5.2 [Supplement: The WHO & its own Network of Fact-Checkers](#)

Series Conclusion

On January 30, 2023, a five-part documentary series called [Never Again is Now Global](#) premiered.

The film, produced by Holocaust survivor [Vera Sharav](#), highlights the parallels between Nazi Germany and global pandemic policies and mandates related to Covid-19.

Each part of the series lasts about an hour and is filled with poignant testimonies and captivating visuals along with observations and claims made by [participants](#) about various abuses suffered by billions around the globe during the pandemic.

This author embarked on a mission to objectively review some of these key claims, setting aside the rhetoric and drama of the film itself, instead focusing on the facts about the events and measures surrounding the pandemic in order to arrive at the truth on these matters.

In all, **12 claims** brought forth by participants in the film **were reviewed for their veracity and accuracy by thorough examination of supporting evidence.**

The range of topics about these claims are listed in the previous section of this post (Parts 1 to 5 Recap).

All claims but one proved to be completely true, and the supporting evidence is quite undeniable.

The only claim that wasn't entirely proven true is that of [Dr. Vladimir Zelenko about how the Covid-19 vaccinations were causing the equivalent of AIDS in patients](#). While this particular claim had some backing from scientific data and literature, as was outlined in Part 2 of this review series, more research is needed into the subject to fully substantiate it.

When we set aside the melancholic tone and rhetoric of the documentary, the overall substance of its subject matter remains mostly true and honest.

Despite the events of the Holocaust and the Covid-19 Pandemic being nearly eight decades apart, the comparisons are uncannily similar.

The level of technology may have changed since, but the concepts and tactics are the same.

FEAR and **PROPAGANDA**, in particular, have been employed with great skill and deception during both periods.

In the years leading up to World War II, Adolf Hitler's Nazi party created the [Propaganda Ministry](#) which took control of film, radio, theatre, and the press.

The Propaganda Ministry aimed further to control the content of news and editorial pages, handing down instructions to editors and journalists.

[Newspapers](#) in Germany printed cartoons that used antisemitic caricatures to depict Jews in a negative light.

We can easily compare how the mainstream Western press has similarly fomented copious amounts of fear at the onset of the Covid-19 Pandemic and propagated consistent, [single-sided narratives](#) regarding pandemic measures and the so-called "safety and efficacy" of the Covid-19 vaccines throughout the debacle.

Moreover, a large part of the mainstream press ran articles which vilified people who chose to not be subject to the experimental vaccinations, often labelling them "anti-vaxx" or "anti-vaxxers" who "don't believe in science," as the Canadian Prime Minister often uttered. They also regularly shamed and ostracised medical doctors who questioned the efficacy and safety of these novel experimental treatments, rather than giving them an opportunity to present their legitimate concerns.

On television and via social media outlets, entertainers and celebrity figures also chimed the same narratives, rarely deviating from the established orthodoxy.

During the Nazi era of WWII, **MEDICAL EXPERIMENTATION** was performed on Jews and other minorities as [eugenics](#) disguised as science – which was really *pseudoscience*.

Similarly, but on a much larger scale, medical experimentation was at the forefront of with billions of citizens across the globe serving as unsuspecting guinea pigs during the Covid-19 Pandemic.

Most were [psychologically manipulated](#) or [coerced](#) into taking highly unproven and experimental mRNA technologies which were [not even technically vaccines](#) even though cheaper, safer, and more effective drugs such as [Hydroxychloroquine](#) and [Ivermectin](#) were available for treatment of the Covid-19 disease.

In [Part 1](#) of this review series, it was hypothesized, through a [Canadian researcher's work](#), that the number of deaths from the Covid-19 vaccines worldwide could amount to around 13 million – more than twice the amount of deaths attributable to the Holocaust from WWII (and nearly [double the actual deaths attributable to the Covid-19 disease](#)).

Whether this figure eventually proves to be valid certainly remains to be seen. Time will tell. Regardless, the sheer number of individuals who have [died or suffered serious adverse effects](#) from taking the experimental “vaccines” is enormous and is most likely to grow as months and years pass by.

Many of the health institutions (such as the [CDC & FDA](#)), hospitals and their leaders (such as [Dr. Anthony Fauci](#)) around the world have proven themselves to be far too obliging in support of the [financial interests of pharmaceutical giants](#) like [Pfizer](#), [Moderna](#), and [Johnson & Johnson](#).

Though it was not a claim that was explored in this review series, the film *Never Again is Now Global* touched upon the subject of **FASCISM** and how corporate giants such as [Ford and General Motors \(GM\)](#), [IBM](#), John D. Rockefeller's [Standard Oil](#), and [Dupont](#) profited from the war and contributed and even enabled the atrocities committed against the Jewry.

The series also outlines the fascist parallels that are occurring today. Not only are pharmaceutical giants in on the action, but also hoards of private enterprises that are benefitting from the Covid-19 gravy train.

[Part 2](#) of this review series focused on the [symbiotic relationships](#) between private corporations, governments, and public institutions for profit-making and the aggrandizement of power and control.

Some of the principal power players involved in these fascist endeavors include the likes of members of the [World Economic Forum](#), the [World Health Organization \(WHO\)](#), and [United](#)

[Nations](#) with their [Sustainable Development Goals \(SDGs\)](#).

The [promise](#) of gargantuan profits and the enlargement of power are central to this corporate takeover which takes the form of biomedical/pharmaceutical products, [Digital IDs, Central Bank Digital Currencies \(CBDCs\)](#), [vaccine passports](#), increased surveillance and censorship, among other power grabs.

Finally, **EUGENICS** figures among the major arcs and parallels between the Holocaust and the Covid-19 Pandemic.

[Part 3](#) of this review series was the longest of the lot and focused on three main aspects of the Eugenics Movement: its origins, the quest for the purest and fittest of human species – what we now refer to as transhumanism, and biowarfare.

As was [explored, thoroughly documented and evidenced](#), the origins of the Eugenics Movements has its ideological roots from the elites and tycoons of Britain and the United States. Hitler's Germany espoused and imported their lethal methods so as to more systematically exterminate Jews and other races they deemed as inferior stock, or breed.


In the 20th century, organisations largely funded by the industrialists' so-called *philanthropic* foundations emerged to further accelerate the depopulation of the unwanted classes by means of access to birth control, abortion, sterilisation, and vaccines.

While claiming that the Eugenics agenda is continuing to this day may, at prima facie, appear far-fetched or even absurd, there is plenty of evidence to confirm that it is occurring at an accelerated pace, not the least of which includes [plummeting fertility rates](#) which are particular steep in African nations – the main targets of “global health” (which really means eugenics) by foundations of the billionaire classes, many of which have been exposed in [Part 5](#) of this series.

And while it is still early to tell just how much of the [carefully planned biowarfare methods](#) that were used against the global population during the Covid-19 Pandemic have resulted in the extermination of relatively healthy people, the global scale at which it is occurring is rather alarming.

The silver lining in this monumental Covid-19 plot – with all its fear porn, mandates, diktats, and malevolence – is that [people have risen up](#), resisted, and are rejecting unlawful and immoral commands which seek to shred their God-given freedoms and human dignity.

“It's a race between enslavement and expansion of global human consciousness,” stated Dr. Vladimir Zelenko in the Never Again Is Now Global [trailer](#).



Dedication

This work is dedicated to all the lost souls who have suffered the ultimate fate of Covid-19 as well as all the courageous persons who have never lost their integrity and common decency to speak out about abuses. These include nurses and doctors such as [Dr. Daniel Nagase](#), [Dr. Mark Trozzi](#), [Dr. Patrick Phillips](#), [Dr. Crystal Luchkiw](#), [Dr. William Makis](#), [Dr. Paul Alexander](#), [Dr. Peter McCullough](#), [Dr. Robert Malone](#), along with many others. It also dedicated to truth warriors such as [Steve Kirsch](#), [Karen Kingston](#), [Peter Halligan](#), [Prof. Patrick Provost](#), former Ontario Provincial Police investigator [Vincent Gircys](#), and Christian Leray from [Réinfo Covid Québec](#).

For we wrestle not against
flesh and blood, but against
principalities, against powers,
against the rulers of the darkness
of this world, against spiritual
wickedness in high places.

Ephesians 6:12

