



# SUBMISSION

Communications Legislation Amendment (Combatting  
Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023.

## **Abstract**

This submission objects most strenuously to the proposed legislation. It represents an attack on freedom of speech and its reach is nothing short of draconian.

Wendy Corfield PhD

## Purpose

The purpose of this submission is to provide feedback and to formally object in the most strenuous terms to the exposure draft of the *Communications Legislation Amendment (Combating Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023* proposed by the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts.

## Introduction

In an effort to ensure there is a single “approved” narrative, the Australian government is formalising, in lockstep with other western nations, its version of what is now colloquially referred to as the Censorship Industrial Complex. The bill proposes to legislate to provide the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) with “new powers to hold digital platforms to account and improve efforts to combat harmful misinformation and disinformation in Australia.” The bill is entitled *Communications Legislation Amendment (Combating Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023* (hereinafter referred to as the “misinformation/disinformation bill”) and seeks to amend *The Broadcasting Services Act 1992*, *Australian Communications and Media Authority Act 2005*, *Online Safety Act 2021*, and the *Telecommunications Act 1997*. While the information/disinformation bill seeks to target digital platforms rather than individuals, it has the unintended consequence of entrapping individuals by the inept yet guileful wording that litters the document. Perhaps this is the real intention? Ensure there’s enough wriggle room through sloppy drafting is an age-old strategy that law makers shamelessly deploy from time to time when they seek more controls in a particular area. Irrespective of the real intent, which we may never fully know, more on the impact on individuals and their rights will be discussed in the sections below.

Astoundingly, the “misinformation/disinformation bill” exempts information from government sources, “professional” news broadcasters, and “accredited” educational institutions. It is hard to imagine a democratic government from one of the so-called “enlightened” countries would usher in laws that so closely resembles George Orwell’s infamous Ministry of Truth that, at first blush, it is difficult to take it seriously. Surely it must be a joke, a fake, fictitious, not real. Yet here we are and having survived, particularly the last three years, we must take this war on information seriously, deadly seriously. Whenever this type of tyranny emerges, whether depicted in a fictitious dystopic novel like *1984*, or actual accounts from Solzhenitsyn’s *Gulag Archipelago* in Soviet Russia, or from the Third Reich in the last century, we are forewarned that when government powers begin to seize the canons of freedom, unless the people object *en masse*, the only outcome is unbridled tyranny. Lessons from history tell us that one of the first steps on the path to authoritarianism is the control of information. Only what comes from sanctioned sources is acceptable; all else must be quashed, silenced, and censored.

The war on information has been with us throughout the ages in its various forms, particularly involving censorship, usually for reasons involving public safety, national security, multi-dimensional existential threats, religious or ideological fundamentalism, and most importantly ensuring subordinate, often impoverished, classes are kept ignorant while ruled by powerful overlords. Censorship is much more than the control of information and

the messaging behind it; censorship is a key pillar to maintaining hegemony, without it the elites, in whatever form, lack the control they need to dominate and strip the human rights from the ordinary people. Does this sound familiar?<sup>1</sup>

*"Romans have been oppressing us for more than two thousand years. They and their successors wrote all the books we so diligently follow and pass on to our children. Their absolute control is in the subtle messages we see, hear and read each day without even knowing we are being manipulated and steered toward an end not of our choosing. That's propaganda."*

## What is misinformation and disinformation?

How are we then to define misinformation and disinformation? Do we start with what is true? The sun is hot, there is a moon, fish have scales, birds have feathers, water is wet; the kinds of things for which there is no dispute, most of which inhabit the three-dimensional observable realm. This would also include most scientific "hypotheses" including agreed formulae (a square has four equal sides, the circumference of a circle can be measured using the formula  $2\pi r$ , acceleration involves mass etc etc.), linear measurements, weights and volumes, chemical experiments able to be repeated over and over with exactly the same results, and other observable realities such as tides, seasons, calendars, units of time, biological taxonomic ranks and so on. However, while the scientific method can take us so far, debates continue to plague many areas of scientific endeavour, particularly where modelling is the benchmark for, or more frequently replaces, evidence.

How then are we to define what is true and correct information when even long held hypotheses established using the most rigorous scientific methods sometimes lack consensus among experts? As we will see below, this is a common feature of the academic community with its long tradition of engaging in complex debate, gifting to us how we might critically think about the most perplexing questions of humankind, such as free will versus determinism, innateness, morality, ethics and so on. What is absolute, or true or truth has been debated by the most influential thinkers for millennia, with some of the arguments stretching over hundreds, if not thousands, of years. So, for the information/disinformation bill to provide such obfuscating guidance about what is truthful, correct, acceptable, accurate and factual, how difficult might it be when such matters are referred to the courts? If this bill is passed, the legal system will be overwhelmed with parties from either side litigating through obscure definitions.

If then, we begin by attempting to define what is false information (since it is not true), that is pure folly as this is infinite. In other words, there is no end to what could be deemed false information in all its permutations and combinations. It is tautological and redundant to define what is false because it is not true. This is the same as defining something by what it is not. An example of this would be to define a glass sitting on the benchtop by what it isn't. Well, it is not a frog, nor is it a tree, nor is it a duck, nor is it a car, nor is it a dog, nor is it ... the possibilities are infinite. How bizarre and utterly pointless, unless of course what is deemed misinformation and disinformation is identified by those who seek to control what it is not. Clever mind games indeed. So, what exactly is the government trying to achieve with its definition misinformation and disinformation in the proposed bill:

---

<sup>1</sup> Edward Bernays. 1928. *Propaganda*. Adagio Press. NY. p. v.

*...dissemination of content using a digital service is misinformation on the digital service if:*

*(a) the content contains information that is false, misleading or deceptive; and*

*(b) the content is not excluded content for misinformation purposes; and*

*(c) the content is provided on the digital service to one or more end-users in Australia; and*

*(d) the provision of the content on the digital service is reasonably likely to cause or contribute to serious harm.*

The definition of disinformation is the same, but has an added sub clause:

*(e) the person disseminating, or causing the dissemination of, the content intends that the content deceive another person.*

This proposed legislation provides no fathomable guidance about misinformation or disinformation is. Providing and/or the intention to provide false, misleading, deceptive, and harmful information is what politicians, corporations, institutions, and the media in its various forms do every single day, irrespective of their country of origin or their time; it is what they do, always have done, and there is not a person alive who does not know this fact. Our so-called leaders drag us into useless wars, give us poisons that kill or maim us, steal our wealth through illegal taxation, keep us indebted and meek, all while ensuring their own fortunes flourish. How do we know this? The number of references to prove this would fill many libraries. It is a great misfortune for the people, that generally most do not realise this is happening and the war crimes and corruption are only found out many years later. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this submission the nature of misinformation and disinformation will be explored and further, proof that all the institutions named in the proposed legislation (for example, governments, media and health authorities) practice it with impunity.

Moving on, what a surprise it is to learn that the United Nations is in lockstep with our very own misinformation/disinformation bill, but is a little more helpful in its guidance:<sup>2</sup>

*For the purposes of the present policy brief, the difference between mis- and disinformation lies with intent. Disinformation is information that is not only inaccurate, but is also intended to deceive and is spread in order to inflict harm. Disinformation can be spread by State or non-State actors in multiple contexts, including during armed conflict, and can affect all areas of development, from peace and security to human rights, public health, humanitarian aid and climate action.*

*Misinformation refers to the unintentional spread of inaccurate information shared in good faith by those unaware that they are passing on falsehoods. Misinformation can be rooted in disinformation as deliberate lies and misleading narratives are weaponized over time, fed into the public discourse and passed on unwittingly. In practice, the distinction between mis- and disinformation can be difficult to determine.*

---

<sup>2</sup> United Nations. [Our Common Agenda Policy Brief 8 Information Integrity on Digital Platform](#). June 2023. p. 5.

## What content is excluded under the misinformation/disinformation bill?

*Excluded content for misinformation purposes means any of the following:*

- (a) content produced in good faith for the purposes of entertainment, parody or satire;*
- (b) professional news content;*
- (c) content produced by or for an educational institution accredited by any of the following:*
  - (i) the Commonwealth;*
  - (ii) a State;*
  - (iii) a Territory;*
  - (iv) a body recognised by the Commonwealth, a State or a Territory as an accreditor of educational institutions;*
- (d) content produced by or for an educational institution accredited:*
  - (i) by a foreign government or a body recognised by a foreign government as an accreditor of educational institutions; and*
  - (ii) to substantially equivalent standards as a comparable Australian educational institution;*
- (e) content that is authorised by:*
  - (i) the Commonwealth; or*
  - (ii) a State; or*
  - (iii) a Territory; or*
  - (iv) a local government*

So clearly, to the casual observer we are not given any further guidance as to what acceptable information is other than what the government or mainstream news outlet or accredited educational institution tells us what it is. In other words, the only true and correct information on digital platforms must come from major news networks, or [.gov.au](https://www.gov.au) or [.edu.au](https://www.edu.au) domains. While we assume misinformation and its close cousin disinformation does have something to do with intent and somehow harm, but beyond that, the people appear to be at the mercy of whatever the government of the day dictates what their version of truthful accurate information is.

This is essentially a logical fallacy, that is, there are leaps of logic leading to fatal flaws in the reasoning, undermining the validity of the argument. In other words, content from “approved organisations” (governments, mainstream media, educational institutions etc) would not necessarily “dictate” what acceptable information is, rather digital platforms and by extension individuals who use digital platforms, will fall afoul of the proposed legislation if content is posted that goes *against* information promoted on sanctioned or official platforms and/or websites. So, the focus deceitfully becomes what is misinformation/disinformation rather than what is truthful and factual – meaning the “approved organisations” never need to demonstrate that their information is accurate, truthful, or correct. See how it works?

The ACMA’s digital platform rules (yet to be developed) will require digital platforms to conform, else prosecutions under the misinformation/disinformation bill may occur. Where

does this leave individuals when the ACMA has powers to investigate, gather information, seize records, force penalties, and publish offences? Perhaps with the extended powers of the ACMA, a Ministry of Enlightenment and Propaganda would help to clear these pesky matters up. Needing more information about how such a ministry would work? Unless it's been shoved down the memory hole, there's plenty out there about a chap called Joseph Goebbels who did head up a ministry with that very name nearly a century ago.

## Lockstep, again

Curiously, other countries (Canada, UK, Europe, US, etc) have also enacted or are proposing to enact legislation that aligns (in some instances almost word for word) with the proposed "misinformation/disinformation" bill.<sup>3 4 5 6 7 8</sup> It is quite understandable why many of us have intentionally blocked out much of what happened over the last three years, but somehow, we are also still capable of recalling the draconian precedents imposed upon us during the time of so-called SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Same messaging, same actions, same time frames, same information, same penalties, same authoritarian approaches. Keep the fear going, keep the messaging tight – fear fear fear – we all got it. However, for those who weren't so traumatised and managed to step back a little to ponder the government's motives, the fear campaign masked the more sinister predictable power grab with its all too familiar agenda – "do what you are told, don't question, or else," masquerading as "this is to keep you safe." In lockstep, most every nation was conditioned to accept the draconian measures forced upon us by our governments and health authorities under the guise of stopping the spread of a so-called deadly pandemic. Importantly, we were all conditioned to never question the official narrative, as this represents spreading misinformation or disinformation and will cause harm and kill grandma. This is not aging well as we will see in a more detailed discussion about SARS-CoV-2 below.

As already mentioned, right on queue the United Nations inserted itself into the crisis which provides multiple guidance materials to combat the "infodemic of misinformation".<sup>9</sup> In fact, the UN chief has recently called for new era of social media integrity in bid to stem misinformation.<sup>10</sup> How very convenient that this is all ready to be adapted by the member nations, prepared by unelected bureaucrats that live in Brussels. Launching the policy brief a few short months ago (June 2023) entitled "Information Integrity on Digital Platforms," Antonio Guterres highlighted the need for a "framework for global action through a Code of Conduct for information integrity on digital platforms, that outlines potential guardrails

---

<sup>3</sup> [Fact sheet on the work of the Government's Counter-Disinformation Unit and Rapid Response Unit](#). UK Government. 9 June 2023.

<sup>4</sup> Ken Klippenstein. [The Government Created A New Disinformation Office To Oversee All The Other Ones](#). *The Intercept*. 5 May 2023.

<sup>5</sup> Canadian Heritage. [Government of Canada announces expert advisory group on online safety](#). Government of Canada. 30 March 2022.

<sup>6</sup> Mary Carolan. [Working group set up to combat disinformation in Ireland](#). *The Irish Times*. 21 February 2023.

<sup>7</sup> New Zealand Government. [Report false or misleading information](#). Accessed 10 August 2023.

<sup>8</sup> Tom Jefferson, Carl Heneghan. [How New Zealand Dealt with "Disinformation."](#) *Brownstone Institute*. 20 February 2023.

<sup>9</sup> United Nations. [5 ways the UN is fighting 'infodemic' of misinformation](#). Department of Global Communications. 30 April 2020.

<sup>10</sup> United Nations. [UN chief calls for new era of social media integrity in bid to stem misinformation](#). UN News. 12 June 2023.

while safeguarding the rights to freedom of expression and information.” There are no points for guessing that the proposed “misinformation/disinformation bill” for Australia contains all the key elements of the UN guidance papers on the subject, including codes of conduct. Just so we are clear the United Nations is staffed by unelected bureaucrats who are not answerable to the people from the member countries.

## **The scientific method – historical context**

Because we have inadequate definitions and logic flaws in the misinformation/disinformation bill, a brief discussion about the importance of the scientific method is required here for completeness and context. Different views on what is known, how it is known, and what can be known have been debated for millennia. In other words, to get more of an idea about the notion of misinformation and disinformation in the current context, we can turn to previous generations from the western academic traditions to inform us what they meant by what is true or what is false. This is essentially the genesis of the scientific method. Plato (428-348BC) in *The Republic* distinguished the realms of things into the visible and the intelligible where intelligible truths could be known with the certainty of geometry and deductive reasoning. Aristotle disagreed, and instead embraced observation and reasoning about the natural world through empiricism and careful observation.

Truncating a gargantuan field of academic endeavour and moving quickly through the ages we note Galileo (1564–1642) and Francis Bacon (1561–1626) added to the scientific method with the language of mathematics, geometry, and number. Building upon the growing popularity of science, Isaac Newton (1642–1727) theorised about the implicit method of experiments and reasoning, and the explicit methodological rules that followed. George Berkeley (1685–1753) attacked the mathematics of the new science while David Hume (1711–1776) came up with his inductive justification theories. All this motivated Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) to seek new foundations for a more empirical method for the scientific method. Karl Popper (1902-1994) used the idea of falsification to differentiate between pseudo and proper science. Popper stressed that, regardless of the amount of confirming evidence, we can never be certain that a hypothesis is true without first determining what is not true. Importantly, Popper introduced the notion of corroboration as a measure for how well a theory or hypothesis has survived previous testing. In around about way, we may be getting closer here to an understanding of what the misinformation/disinformation bill is trying to achieve.

Why is this historical perspective about famous influential thinkers who lived hundreds or even thousands of years ago important to know, and why include it in this submission? It is proof that the methods for determining what is true, correct, and provable information has been fiercely debated for aeons. While what is true is eminently more complex than what is described here, it turns on what is considered ‘evidence.’ We can see that rather than seeking consensus, it has been the custom for theologians, scientists, mathematicians, and scholars from every academic discipline to challenge existing theories through philosophical arguments and scientific methods to determine what is true or accurate.

Just a quick word on the use of the word ‘true.’ In science, for example, there is no such thing as the truth or absolutes. There are only hypotheses, based on data and evidence,

which are subject to change if new information comes along, for example. It is troublesome to decree that only 'true' information should be allowed to be disseminated to the public, when there is no consensus about what is true and what is false. Quite obviously this will stifle debate which, arguably, is what is being sought with the information/disinformation bill. At least for the moment, classical libraries in every good tertiary institution are filled to the rafters with a veritable treasure trove capturing academic contests about various hypotheses. Yet, despite the tradition of philosophical debate and the idea that the scientific method should factor prominently in contemporary discourse about determining what is true, it has largely been abandoned. Instead, we now see that western, and many other countries for that matter, take their instructions from governments backed by obscurely funded global organisations, international banks, and giant corporations which openly declare that the science is 'settled' and debate is no longer acceptable about a whole range of topics. This leads to the notion of 'single source of truth;' only the government-sanctioned information is allowed to be circulated, and any deviation from official positions must be heavily censored, cancelled or even criminalised. This sounds familiar. Numerous history books describe despotic regimes throughout history which have excelled in such totalitarian censorship.

Thus, scientific knowledge, by its very nature, can never be absolute as there is always more knowledge that may be discovered about whatever aspect is being examined.<sup>11</sup>

*True science is about discovering what 'is' not what 'ought to be.' It's about the rigorous application of the 'scientific method,' which values free open enquiry, embraces dissent and stands or falls on empirical observation. This means, for example, that when a once-plausible theory is 'falsified' by real world data, that theory becomes bunk-no matter what all the learned scientific institutions may claim to the contrary.*

This misinformation/disinformation bill is seeking to formalise what is already occurring by imposing even more draconian legalistic measures to stop the Australian people from questioning/researching/exploring/discussing/debating information other than what is sanctioned by the so-called approved organisations and institutions. To put it another way, content or information is exempt under the misinformation/disinformation bill if it comes from governments, 'professional' media, accredited educational institutions or fits under the definition of entertainment or parody, which means any other information falls afoul of the proposed legislation. This is breathtakingly absurd on every conceivable level.

## Theories and models

We've already established that there is often dispute about truths we hold as being absolute, even with an abundance of data and evidence. But what about theories and models? Is the theory of relativity true for all circumstances? There are many highly qualified and brilliant scientists who refute this and have done so since Albert Einstein first floated his theory.<sup>12</sup>

*"Einstein's Relativity work is a magnificent mathematical garb, which fascinates, dazzles and makes people blind to the underlying errors. The theory is like a beggar in purple whom ignorant*

---

<sup>11</sup> James Delingpole. "Experts as ideologues." In Moran A. (eds.) *Climate Change: The facts*. Institute of Public Affairs. Melbourne, Victoria. p. 142.

<sup>12</sup> Marc J. Seifer. [Taking On Einstein](#). Nikola Tesla Articles. *Tesla Universe*. April 2005.



*people take for king...its exponents are brilliant men, but they are meta-physicists rather than scientists.” (Nicola Tesla)*

The same goes for the ‘settled science’ taught in just about every school and tertiary institution about many other theorems, for example the theory of gravity:<sup>13</sup>

*“Gravity still remains one of the biggest mysteries of physics and the biggest obstacle to a universal theory that describes the functions of every interaction in the universe accurately. If we could fully understand the mechanics behind it, new opportunities in aeronautics and other fields would appear.”*

What about germs or viruses? Do they actually exist? An increasing number of scientists are moving toward the claim that medical schools in all western countries are teaching new doctors a monstrous lie. This lie, it is claimed, is basis of modern medicine and is commonly known as ‘germ theory.’ Its origins are from Louis Pasteur who is lionised by the medical profession for making the most important discoveries of all time, yet when the evidence is forensically examined, he was merely an incompetent plagiarist and fraud. At the end of his life, Pasteur recanted his theories of germs, microbes, and viruses in favour of importance of the medium in which they exist (environment). In other words, viruses only exist by deduction. A contemporary of Pasteur, Robert Koch (1843-1910), proposed four postulates which is still considered a valid endorsement of the true scientific method:

1. *The pathogenic microbe can be observed in the body fluids of a host suffering from the disease. This pathogenic organism is not present in a healthy host. In other words, a microbe suspected of causing a certain disease must be found in every case of that disease.*
2. *The pathogenic microbe must be isolated and grown in the laboratory, outside of the diseased host.*
3. *When this suspected pathogen is introduced to a healthy, susceptible host, that host must develop the disease.*
4. *That same pathogen must then again be obtained and reisolated from that experimentally infected host.*

Using Koch’s four postulates, since some scientists claim no virus has actually ever been isolated, observed or photographed (including the SARS-CoV-2 virus) with the most advanced microscopes ever developed, let alone replicated, do they actually exist? An increasing number of scientists and academics say not. This would also include the existence of bacteria for which only the first two postulates conform to the evidence gathered. What is referred to as a virus then, is simply an RNA sequence observed under electron microscopes; a by-product of cells themselves or cell debris which cannot be broken down. This observable phenomenon has given rise to ‘terrain theory’ which proposes that the environment of the body determines how it reacts to external stimuli (such as poisons), versus germ theory which has its roots in the pharmaceutical complex to combat ‘viruses’ causing ailments and diseases. More on this will be explored in the section below in the discussion of SARS-CoV-2.

Are such theories (for example, terrain theory versus germ theory) not worthy of scholarly debate, particularly given the chaos of the mismanagement of the so-called SARS-CoV-2 pandemic over the last three years? Instead of censoring terrain theory and banning a

---

<sup>13</sup> Nancy Atkinson. [Where Does Gravity Come From?](#) *Universe Today*. 5 December 2013.

discussion about it, why not examine the merits of both theories using an agreed strategy under the rigour of the scientific method? The fact that terrain theory is treated with derision by academia and the mainstream media and deemed unacceptable in scientific discourse about viruses by government sources, for example, means it will come under the misinformation/disinformation bill's purview. By extension, this will likely result in negative consequences (not limited to fines and imprisonment) for any person or representative/s from digital platforms that post terrain theory information because it goes against the state-sanctioned and pharmaceutical industrial complex-sponsored germ theory.

Sadly, in an effort to impose adherence to a single source of truth about (insert whatever topic), the proposed legislation deliberately but deceptively misses the point. Debating different perspectives is not promoting misinformation or disinformation; it is science in action, mathematics, medical or psychological expert against expert, vying for their theories to be proven either way by sharing and then debating evidence. Irrespective of the subject matter, which could include matters involving national security, is it not beneficial that debates continue to rage, for example, in the scientific and medical community about many theories and models taken for granted? As discussed above, history shows that rigour in scientific endeavour, and therefore human knowledge have progressed because its very foundations are intellectually debated from time to time. Is not debate the sign of an advanced sophisticated civilised society where all opinions matter in the market place of ideas, and the outcomes that eventually dominate combine the best parts of the two (or more) arguments?

Apparently not according to the proposed misinformation/disinformation bill which deliberately 'excludes content for misinformation purposes' providing it comes from government sources, 'professional news' outlets, and/or 'accredited' educational institutions. Therefore, what the information/disinformation bill is attempting to achieve is active censorship of any opinions, views, beliefs that are inconsistent with that from these sanctioned sources. This means that only one version of 'the truth' on a subject matter is permitted, which really is a euphemism for authoritarian tyranny and a war on freedom of speech. No debates, no other opinions, just edicts or policy positions on controversial topics that must be followed and never discussed, at least on digital platforms. Compliance with the 'approved' official positions will be enforced with severe penalties for breaches such as imprisonment or hefty fines for corporations (up to almost \$7 million plus percentages of annual turnover) and individuals (up to \$1.375 million). In the end, politicians and governments, institutions and corporations for that matter, have a civic duty to take their scientific advice from the very best evidence available, evidence that has been tested with rigour, precision and the hypotheses presented debated among the best and most qualified experts in their respective fields. For governments to be promoting obviously wrong and harmful positions on a whole range of issues demonstrates that this is not happening.

## **Two prime examples: climate change and SARS-CoV-2**

While on the matter of theories, let's take a closer look at two of the more controversial matters where the discourse is highly censored, government agendas pushed by a compliant media, where trillions of dollars are involved, and wealthy international organisations, foundations and think tanks dictate what information is acceptable. While there are many

potential candidates, the two chosen for purposes of this submission are anthropogenic climate change, and (mis) management of the so-called SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.

### Climate change

There is no escape from the ubiquitous human-caused climate change theory which has its doomsday merchants relentlessly peddling so-called facts and predictions that later turn out not to be true. The cult of so-called climate change is causing billions of people to be worse off or dead. Trillions of dollars have been moved in the largest wealth transfer in human history to elites; famines being caused not by changes to the climate but by third world governments being “persuaded” to adopt climate policies (such as banning nitrogen-based fertilizers)<sup>14 15</sup> that cause crops to fail, reducing rice growing in populated countries,<sup>16 17</sup> increasingly unaffordable electricity for many people the world over resulting in lower standards of living, making it difficult for people to be mobile because of the prohibitive cost of fuel and push for electric vehicles, and it goes on.

*Globally, 1.3 billion people don't have access to electricity and 2.7 billion people rely on wood, twigs, leaves and dung for cooking and heating which causes harmful indoor air pollution and death. Without cheap electricity, production cannot be increased, goods can't get to market, vaccines cannot be refrigerated and hundreds of millions of young people cannot study after the Sun goes down to escape poverty via education.<sup>18</sup>*

In 2001, the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) predicted a huge and rapid rise in global surface air temperatures thanks to human emissions. “Projections using these scenarios in a range of climate models result in an increase in globally averaged temperatures of 1.4 to 5.8 degrees Celsius over the period 1990-2100,” they declared. Respect the science, 97 per cent of scientists agree, do NOT argue, they scolded. This was the cue for journalists, academics, politicians and all manner of hucksters and grifters to jump aboard. The catastrophising by climate change alarmists has barely paused to take breath for the last 30 or more years. We've all witnessed this in many forms of propaganda from visions of belching smoke stacks, plastic-injected Hollywood types talking about life on earth ending in apocalyptic storms or floods or volcanic eruptions while taking their private jets to Cannes, the woe of never-ending droughts, empty cities, flooded islands, famines heard nightly on the six o'clock news. A few clues along the way pointed to this fraud, including the leaked Climategate emails which showed growing alarm at the pause in global warming by the climate scientists most responsible for the fear mongering. In 2005, Dr Phil Jones, director of the Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia, privately confessed,

---

<sup>14</sup> Uditha Jayasinghe and Devjyot Ghoshal. [Fertiliser ban decimates Sri Lankan crops as government popularity ebbs](#). Reuters. 3 March 2022.

<sup>15</sup> Kanika Gupta. [Sri Lanka aims for food security after ill-fated fertilizer ban](#). Nikkei Asia. 24 October 2022.

<sup>16</sup> Sean Fleming. [This is how rice is hurting the planet](#). World Economic Forum. 18 June 2019.

<sup>17</sup> Damian Carrington. [Meat, dairy and rice production will bust 1.5C climate target, shows study](#). The Guardian. 7 March 2023.

<sup>18</sup> Plimer I. Green Murder. Connor Court Publishing PL. 2021. p. 23.

*The scientific community would come down on me in no uncertain terms if I said that the world had cooled from 1998. Okay it has but it is only seven years of data and it isn't statistically significant..."*<sup>19</sup>

But far from retiring in shame, now Professor Jones doubled down insisting that a film<sup>20</sup> be made about his victimisation at the hands of those truth seekers, which caused him and his wife terrible embarrassment. *The Trick* tells of the persecution of Phil Jones and the fight for the ultimate exoneration of himself and the science. *The Trick* looks at the potentially devastating consequences to humanity from climate change denial – how a media storm undermined public confidence in the science and how the concept of ‘truth’ took a back seat causing us to lose a decade of action. However, its critics<sup>21</sup> accuse it of being a simple puff piece that tells us nothing new, and hides information by propagandising the climate change narrative. What does this have to do with submitting an objection to the misinformation/disinformation bill? It goes toward public perception and confidence, the use of propaganda and silencing the truth. Mainstream media will not criticise such obviously bogus content because it would damage the reputation of “acclaimed” climate scientists who still peddle their inaccurate predictions against the backdrop of a planet that refuses to warm to the levels of their catastrophist modelling.

The point here is that we do not shut down or censor global warming alarmists whose prediction for catastrophic temperature rises, or ocean rises, or polar bear numbers, or disappearing polar ice caps, or permanent droughts, or increasing cyclones turn out to be false. Why is this so? Why is it important that humankind from all corners of the globe must adhere to a narrative that is based on falsehoods? There must be some very powerful well-orchestrated forces at play to ensure that any deviation from the official narrative that the world is in catastrophic peril from climate change is censored, silenced or punished. Climate emergency, boiling earth, melting ice caps! Year after year the false predictions fall like autumn leaves yet these climate change (formerly global warming) alarmists become even more famous, wealthy, and influential. Any criticism of this all-prevailing narrative is proclaimed guilty of spreading misinformation and disinformation. What? When explanations and logic fail to explain what is clearly a false dichotomy, always follow the money. More about this will be discussed in the final sections of this submission.

Why not indulge the topic of climate change in more detail as it is very relevant to the topic of misinformation and disinformation. Wasn't it the 2007 Australian of the Year recipient Tim Flannery appointed as Chief Climate Commissioner who around that time predicted cities such as Brisbane would never again have dam-filling rains, as global warming had caused "a 20 per cent decrease in rainfall in some areas" and made the soil too hot, "so even the rain that falls isn't actually going to fill our dams and river systems ..."?<sup>22</sup> <sup>23</sup> Since then, Brisbane had a one in 100-year flood event and its main dam (Wivenhoe) swelled

---

<sup>19</sup> Mark Morano. [Quotable warming hiatus quotes Phil Jones 7<sup>th</sup> May 2009](#). Climate Depot. Accessed 10 August 2023.

<sup>20</sup> [The Trick](#). Directed by Phil Broughton. Performances by Jason Watkins, Victoria Hamilton and Anwyn Sheers. Television Film BBC One. 18 October 2021.

<sup>21</sup> Tony Thomas. [Climategate, the Movie: Boffins Turning Tricks](#). Quadrant Online. 8 November 2022.

<sup>22</sup> Andrew Bolt. [Tim Flannery's Latest Prediction Blown Away](#). *The Herald Sun*. 18 September 2018.

<sup>23</sup> Sally Sara. [Interview with Professor Tim Flannery](#). *ABC Landline*. 11 February 2017.

beyond capacity because it was kept over 190% full,<sup>24</sup> <sup>25</sup> arguably because the dam's managers believed Tim Flannery's predictions, and the city flooded causing billions of dollars' worth of damage (misinformation?).

The Brisbane floods which occurred in early 2011, killed 33 people, damaged 28,000 homes and cost more than \$100 billion in damages with impacts to 2.5 million people. Previous floods have been higher six times since 1832. Clearly this rules out climate change as being the cause of the 2011 Brisbane floods, particularly since the Wivenhoe Dam was constructed as flood mitigation measure after a major flood in 1974. When water was finally released from the dam it flooded the Lockyer, Brisbane and Bremer Valleys which led to a class action against the Queensland government, Sunwater and the State-owned dam operator Seqwater for \$880 million which was initially successful for half that amount, but later overturned by the High Court.<sup>26</sup> Therefore, there are significant and deadly consequences for adhering to climate change catastrophism that is not based in fact. For example, the water operators could easily have checked the historical records of previous floods so that decisions to release the water from the dam earlier could have occurred.

Moving on, in 2009, the company Geodynamics in which Tim Flannery was a shareholder persuaded the Rudd government to part with a \$90 million government grant to get it up and running,<sup>27</sup> <sup>28</sup> but by 2016 it was all over.<sup>29</sup> In Tim Flannery's own words:<sup>30</sup>

*There are hot rocks in South Australia that potentially have enough embedded energy in them to run Australia's economy for the best part of a century. They are not being fully exploited yet but the technology to extract that energy and turn it into electricity is relatively straightforward....*

*But we've totally ignored the technologies that really, I think, have a lot of potential to do the job very cost effectively such as geothermal and solar thermal....*

It is worth adding further Tim Flannery quotes since he is lauded especially by the national broadcaster, our ABC, feted by political types of all persuasions, and held one of the most senior and influential positions in the country in relation to environment and climate matters. Excerpts from an article entitled "Tim Flannery: a prophet of doom on climate" in [The Australian](#):<sup>31</sup>

*In 2007 Flannery told the Sydney Morning Herald "Sometime in the next 30 years, we face significant destabilisation." In what sense, he was asked. "Rapidly rising sea*

---

<sup>24</sup> Tony Moore. [What a difference a decade makes: Wivenhoe Dam then and now](#). *Brisbane Times*. 13 January 2021.

<sup>25</sup> Marissa Calligeros. [Wivenhoe Dam release caused Brisbane flood: report](#). *The Sydney Morning Herald*. 11 March 2011.

<sup>26</sup> AAP Editors. [Victims of 2011 Queensland floods lose fight for \\$440m in compensation](#). *The Guardian*. 12 April 2022.

<sup>27</sup> [Geodynamics wins \\$90m in govt funding](#). *The Sydney Morning Herald*. 6 November 2009.

<sup>28</sup> Tim Flannery. [There's power in those hot rocks . . .](#) *Australian Financial Review*. 9 February 2007.

<sup>29</sup> Tom Fedorowytch. [Geothermal power project closes in SA as technology deemed not financially viable](#). ABC News. 30 August 2016.

<sup>30</sup> Andrew Bolt. [Another Flannery fail: geothermal project scrapped](#). Andrew Bolt Blog. *The Herald Sun*.

<sup>31</sup> [The Mocker: Tim Flannery is a profit of doom on climate scaremongering](#). *The Australian*. 25 March 2021.

*levels, maybe up to six metres," he explained. "And hundreds of millions of refugees, because there are whole cities going under."*

*The actual trajectory we've seen in the Arctic over the last two years, if you follow that, that implies that the Arctic ice cap will be gone in the next five to 15 years. This is an ice cap that's been around for the last three million years."*

*In 2008 Flannery proposed changing the colour of the sky to combat climate change, a crackpot scheme which would have involved adding sulphur to jet fuel to disperse it in the atmosphere. "We need to be ready to start doing it in perhaps five years time if we fail to achieve what we're trying to achieve," he said.*

*Put Flannery's remarks to him and you are likely to be met with his standard reply of "I didn't say that", or "I was misrepresented," but the reality is this bloke is all over the shop. In 2006, he called for Australia to replace coal fired power plants with nuclear technology. "We would then have a power infrastructure like that of France, and in doing so we would have done something great for the world," he wrote in *The Age*.*

*But less than a year later, he dismissed the case for nuclear power.*

*The answer is so resoundingly 'no' it is embarrassing," he smugly informed a Sydney business audience. "We are, potentially, the new Saudi Arabia of renewable energy ... it is massive, unimaginable amounts of energy and we have some fantastic technology in Australia to harness that."*

*He did not explain his massive turnaround. If there is one thing Flannery is consistent about, it is his refusal to explain his inconsistencies.*

It is also widely reported that over \$13 billion worth of mothballed desalination plants that cost upwards of \$130 million per year to operate, can largely be attributed to Tim Flannery's doomsday climate change fear mongering.<sup>32</sup> That is \$12 billion worth of tax payer money, not to mention the \$90 million, and who knows what other hair-brained schemes he has received money for, together with the \$180,000 salary at the time he was the Chief Climate Commissioner.

Just to hammer the point home, while Chief Climate Commissioner, Flannery warned Australian families that their beach holiday would no longer be possible.<sup>33</sup>

*"It's hardly surprising that beaches are going to disappear with climate change," he told reporters outside the National Climate Change Forum in Adelaide.*

*"We've seen single climate events destroy beaches. So this is no surprise, it's simply part of an ongoing trend."*

*Professor Flannery said that, while it was impossible to predict the future, scientists were able to construct models to consider the impacts of climate change.*

*"Beaches like Bells Beach and Bondi are vulnerable according to those models to the sort of changes that would be set in place as our climate shifts," he said...*

---

<sup>32</sup> Norimitsu Onishi. [Arid Australia Sips Seawater, but at a Cost](#). *The New York Times*. 10 July 2010.

<sup>33</sup> [Act now or Bondi beach at risk: Flannery](#). *The Sydney Morning Herald*. 19 February 2010.

If it couldn't get any worse, channelling the other doomsday carpet bagger, Al Gore who will be discussed below, Professor Flannery cannot seem to fathom that short range predictions can be embarrassing as well as costly:<sup>34</sup>

*Just imagine yourself in a world five years from now, when there is no more ice over the Arctic, when we stand under threat of a rapidly warming Arctic Ocean, when we're starting to see the first destabilisation of the Greenland ice cap, and all of those things happening because we don't have a solution, because if things advance that rapidly we simply will not have a solution, in terms of reducing emissions. Then you've got to start pulling in your last-ditch efforts.*

Where is Professor Tim Flannery now? He is lecturing at the Melbourne Sustainable Society Institute, The University of Melbourne.<sup>35</sup>

*Professor Tim Flannery is one of Australia's leading writers on climate change. An internationally acclaimed scientist, explorer and conservationist, Professor Flannery was named Australian of the Year in 2007.*

*Professor Flannery has held various academic positions including Professor at the University of Adelaide, director of the South Australian Museum in Adelaide, Principal Research Scientist at the Australian Museum and Visiting Chair in Australian Studies at Harvard University in the Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology.*

*He is Chief Councillor of the Climate Council, and a well known presenter on ABC Radio, NPR and the BBC for more than a decade, he has also written and presented several series on the Documentary Channel...*

You cannot make thus up. One of the world's most prolific climate change fearmongers, proven to openly peddle misinformation and disinformation for decades, doubling down on predicting future catastrophes that will not happen to hapless students. No doubt there will be many models involved and ample funding to support him in this endeavours. On every conceivable level, and on every definition provided, much of what Tim Flannery has uttered in terms of climate change is untrue, incorrect, false, wrong, fake, and would therefore clearly fit within the meaning of both misinformation and disinformation. While it is still available, it is very easy to find that Professor Flannery's catastrophising predictions are debunked and mocked all over the Internet. Given that we have incontrovertible proof, as outlined above, the question must be asked: can we therefore expect Professor Tim Flannery to be investigated, censored, cancelled, named, shamed, prosecuted and fined under the proposed misinformation/disinformation bill?

But Tim Flannery is not the only one whose version of truths bend reality. What about the predictions from Al Gore's 2006 movie, *An Inconvenient Truth*, which bemoans how rising ocean levels will dramatically alter our planet's coastlines. As Greenland's ice sheets collapse, Gore predicted that our shores will be flooded, and sea and low-lying islands will sink beneath the water leaving millions homeless. His narration tells the audience that, due to global warming, melting ice could release enough water to cause at 20-foot rise in sea

---

<sup>34</sup> [Business leaders discuss climate](#). ABC Radio National. Transcript. Presenter: Robyn Williams. Featuring Tim Flannery and six other guests, including the Prime Minister at the time, Kevin Rudd. 7 June 2008.

<sup>35</sup> University of Melbourne. Climate Energy College. [Profiles: Prof. Tim Flannery](#). Accessed 15 August 2023.

level “in the near future.” Shortly after the film was released, it was widely reported on the nine<sup>36</sup> <sup>37</sup> (there are many more) items that a British High Court deemed to be false claims in *An Inconvenient Truth*. Mr Gore has never been held to account over the errors, nor has he corrected them. These are the “nine fundamental errors of fact” that the court decided the film contained:<sup>38</sup>

1. *Gore incorrectly claimed that low-lying Pacific atolls “are being inundated because of anthropogenic global warming” (They are not, they are increasing in size).*
2. *That the Gulf Stream was shutting down (It is not, it changes for a great diversity of reasons).*
3. *That there was an exact fit between the rise in temperature over 650,000 years and the rise in carbon dioxide (It is exactly the opposite. Furthermore, some 650 to 1,600 years after each natural warming event atmospheric carbon dioxide increases showing that warming is not driven by carbon dioxide).*
4. *The disappearance of snow on Mt Kilimanjaro was due to human-induced climate change (Land clearing has reduced precipitation giving less snow and less ice).*
5. *The drying of Lake Chad was an example of climate change (It is an example of the locals taking too much water for crops).*
6. *Hurricane Katrina was due to global warming (The number of hurricanes hitting the US has decreased for 100 years and is unrelated to temperature cycles).*
7. *Polar bears had drowned because of swimming long distances to find ice (Like all animals, polar bears die, they swim hundreds of kilometres out to sea and their population is increasing).*
8. *Coral reefs all over the world were bleaching because of global warming (Coral bleaching events have been happening for millions of years and are unrelated to humans).*
9. *A sea level rise of up to six metres would be caused by melting of either west Antarctica and Greenland in the near future. (The Antarctic and Greenland ice sheets grow and sink, polar ice is a rare in the history of the planet and over 150 hot spots and volcanoes have been identified under the Antarctic ice which melt ice).*

These fundamental errors were known by those managing the Australian education system, but still in 2010 Al Gore’s film was included in the curriculum of Australian Schools. Further, in the film we were told that “unless we take drastic measures the world would reach a point of no return within ten years.” It is beyond belief that this misinformation and disinformation is still frightening our impressionable youngsters, yet now the inimitable and perennial Mr Al Gore, making many millions from his carbon credit schemes,<sup>39</sup> <sup>40</sup> is doubling down, inserting himself into the hysteria (and money-making racket) of the so-called climate crisis imminently ending the world. While he should feel ashamed that all the predictions in his movie and elsewhere have proven false, the media, the global organisations, celebrities, politicians, corporations, big tech, and governments heed his empty warnings and genuflect him on the world stage.

In January 2023 during remarks made at the World Economic Forum summit<sup>41</sup> <sup>42</sup> in Davos, Switzerland, Mr Gore warned that continued carbon emissions into the atmosphere would

---

<sup>36</sup> David Adam. [Gore's climate film has scientific errors – judge](#). *The Guardian*. 12 October 2007.

<sup>37</sup> [Gore climate film's nine 'errors'](#). BBC News. 11 October 2007.

<sup>38</sup> Ian Plimer. *Green Murder*. Connor Court Publishing. 2021. Pp. 221-222.

<sup>39</sup> Dana Hanson. [How Al Gore Achieved a Net Worth of \\$330 Million](#). MoneyInc. 27 April 2023.

<sup>40</sup> Larry Bell. [Blood And Gore: Making A Killing On Anti-Carbon Investment Hype](#). *Forbes*. 3 November 2013.

<sup>41</sup> Thomas Catenacci. [Eco group slams Davos summit as global elites arrive in private jets to talk climate policy](#). Fox News. 16 January 2023.

<sup>42</sup> Hope Sloop. [Former VP Al Gore gives 'unhinged' rant about environmental threats including 'rain bombs' and 'boiling oceans' during speech at World Economic Forum](#). Daily Mail. 19 January 2023.



destroy the planet and lead to widespread calamities. "We're still putting 162 million tons [of greenhouse gas] into it every single day and the accumulated amount is now trapping as much extra heat as would be released by 600,000 Hiroshima-class atomic bombs exploding every single day on the earth," Gore said. "That's what's boiling the oceans, creating these atmospheric rivers, and the rain bombs, and sucking the moisture out of the land, and creating the droughts, and melting the ice and raising the sea level, and causing these waves of climate refugees." Since 2007, Mr Gore travels the world conveniently in private jets, hawking the lies in his highly discredited movie which are lapped up by fawning acolytes of the human caused climate change fraud.

For context, Mr or is it now Professor, Al Gore made a fortune from mining royalties on his Tennessee farm, gives speeches on the talk circuit for \$300k plus which he attends in his private jets. He sold his media interests in Al Jazeera to Qatar which is awash with so-called fossil fuels. Like Tim Flannery, Barack Obama and Bill Gates, Mr Gore does not seem to be concerned about rising sea levels as he lives in a Californian waterfront mansion on which he spent \$9 million. To fund his lifestyle, Mr Gore founded a carbon trading company which has made hundreds of millions of dollars peddling the so-called climate change emergency. Why wouldn't he catastrophise local weather into global climate? If in doubt about motives, always follow the money. Mr Gore sits on the board of Apple and lobbies for climate policies that limit the consumption of meat yet one of his companies has invested \$200 million in a meat substitute company Beyond Meat. In 2018, Mr Al Gore claimed that the climate crisis is the biggest existential challenge that humanity has ever faced. Where have we heard these words before? <sup>43</sup>

Why is this important? Why should any of us care if the clever Mr Gore makes many millions from a scam that is reigning us all in and controlling the narrative with its hyperventilating breathless rhetoric. What does it have to do with a submission objecting to proposed misinformation and disinformation laws in Australia? Because, for example in 2017, Mr Al Gore was the guest speaker at a climate change taxpayer-funded soiree,<sup>44</sup> hosted by the Queensland government for which he charged \$320,000, with taxpayers footing the bill. Shortly after, Queensland's premier pledged that they would embrace renewables to produce zero emissions by 2050.<sup>45</sup> All this against a backdrop where every one of Mr Gore's apocalyptic scenarios failed to materialise.<sup>46</sup> <sup>47</sup> Unless we pay (lots of) homage to Mr Gore the "world will descend into political disruption and chaos and diseases, stronger storms and even more destructive floods" will be the norm. So, tax payers funded an billionaire discredited huckster and our elected government based future environmental policy decisions on his hysterical claims. And it is not just Mr Gore, of course, there are many failed predictions about the climate.<sup>48</sup> Will the misinformation/disinformation bill cover the grand

---

<sup>43</sup> Ian Plimer. *Green Murder*. Connor Court Publishing. 2021. Pp. 222-223.

<sup>44</sup> Alyson Horn. [Al Gore speaks in Brisbane but avoids an inconvenient elephant in the room](#). ABC News. 7 June 2019.

<sup>45</sup> Queensland Government. [Palaszczuk Government announces Climate Week Queensland](#). The Queensland Cabinet and Ministerial Directory Media Statement. 1 April 2019.

<sup>46</sup> Ian Plimer. *Green Murder*. Connor Court Publishing. 2021. Pp. 220-225.

<sup>47</sup> Thomas Catenacci. [Al Gore has history of climate predictions, statements proven false](#). Fox News. 22 January 2023.

<sup>48</sup> Mark J Perry. [50 Years of Failed Doomsday, Eco-pocalyptic Predictions; the So-called 'experts' Are 0-50. American Enterprise Institute](#). 23 September 2019.

profligacy as a result of Mr Gore's lies that will likely cost Australians billions of dollars and lower standards of living as their energy and food prices surge to eye-popping levels.

### **The cost of doing everything**

According to Professor Ian Plimer who has written extensively on the capture of science used to tout grand climate change schemes, the so-called green initiatives to tackle the problem are costing billions if not trillions of dollars. Bjorn Lomborg agrees:<sup>49</sup>

*The science shows us that fears of a climate apocalypse are unfounded. Global warming is real, but it is not the end of the world. It is a manageable problem. Yet, we now live in a world where almost half the population believes climate change will extinguish humanity.*

*This has profoundly altered the political reality. It makes us double down on poor climate policies. It makes us increasingly ignore all other challenges, from pandemics and food shortages to political strife and conflicts or subsume them under the banner of climate change.*

*This singular obsession with climate change means that we are now going from wasting billions of dollars on ineffective policies to wasting trillions. At the same time, we're ignoring ever more of the world's more urgent and much more tractable challenges. And we're scaring kids and adults witless, which is not just factually wrong but morally reprehensible.*

As discussed above, the claims by so-called climate catastrophists have been discredited for decades as time after time, their predictions and models are proven wrong. The so-called science behind the predictions and models many times has been exaggerated, fraudulent and just plain wrong. Even the peer reviewed literature cannot be trusted as many academic publications have been compromised by conflicts of interests. As Professor Plimer puts it, the climate "crisis" is a matter of national sovereignty rather than an environmental, scientific, or political problem. He cites Ottmar Edenhofer who claimed in Forbes magazine in 2010 that, "...one has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. Instead, climate change policy is about how we redistribute de facto the world's wealth..."<sup>50</sup>

Just to prove that there is not consensus on the matter of anthropogenic climate change, on the same day that Greta Thunberg made her impassioned speech to the United Nations about her fears of a climate emergency (yes the "how dare you" one), a group of 500 prominent scientists and professionals, led by the CLINTEL (Global Climate Intelligence Group) co-founder Professor Guus Berkhout, sent a letter to the United Nations Secretary-General stating that there is no climate emergency and climate policies should be designed to benefit the lives of people. There were 500 signatures to the 2019 letter. The Climate Declaration highlights the following:<sup>51</sup>

*Climate science should be less political, while climate policies should be more scientific. In particular, scientists should emphasize that their modeling output is not the result of magic: computer models are human-made. What comes out is fully dependent on what theoreticians and programmers have put in: hypotheses, assumptions, relationships, parameterizations,*

---

<sup>49</sup> Bjorn Lomborg. 2020. False Alarm How Climate Change Panic Costs Us Trillions, Hurts The Poor, And Fails To Fix The Planet. Basic Books. NY.

<sup>50</sup> Larry Bell. [In Their Own Words: Climate Alarmists Debunk Their 'Science'](#). Forbes. 5 February 2013.

<sup>51</sup> [World Climate Declaration](#). CLINTEL Foundation. Undated. Accessed 15 August 2023.

*stability constraints, etc. Unfortunately, in mainstream climate science most of this input is undeclared.*

*To believe the outcome of a climate model is to believe what the model makers have put in. This is precisely the problem of today's climate discussion to which climate models are central. Climate science has degenerated into a discussion based on beliefs, not on sound self-critical science. Should not we free ourselves from the naive belief in immature climate models?*

More recently, CLINTEL provided a follow up letter<sup>52</sup> to the UN Secretary-General attaching more than 1,600 signatories to the declaration that there is no climate emergency.<sup>53</sup> Incidentally, the 2022 Nobel Prize winner Dr. John F. Clauser has recently signed the Climate Declaration. Clauser is the second Nobel Laureate to sign the declaration, Dr. Ivar Giaever was the first. Clauser has publicly distanced himself from climate alarmism and this year he also joined the Board of Directors of the CO<sub>2</sub> Coalition. In the announcement by the CO<sub>2</sub> Coalition, Dr Clauser was quoted in the following way: <sup>54</sup>

*The popular narrative about climate change reflects a dangerous corruption of science that threatens the world's economy and the well-being of billions of people. Misguided climate science has metastasized into massive shock-journalistic pseudoscience. In turn, the pseudoscience has become a scapegoat for a wide variety of other unrelated ills. It has been promoted and extended by similarly misguided business marketing agents, politicians, journalists, government agencies, and environmentalists. In my opinion, there is no real climate crisis. There is, however, a very real problem with providing a decent standard of living to the world's large population and an associated energy crisis. The latter is being unnecessarily exacerbated by what, in my opinion, is incorrect climate science.*

There are also an increasing number of academic papers and reports refuting the human caused climate change hypothesis:<sup>55</sup>

*Two prominent climate scientists have taken on new rules from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on cutting carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions in electricity generation, arguing in testimony that the regulations "will be disastrous for the country, for no scientifically justifiable reason."*

*Citing extensive data (pdf)<sup>56</sup> to support their case, William Happer, professor emeritus in physics at Princeton University, and Richard Lindzen, professor emeritus of atmospheric science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), argued that the claims used by the EPA to justify the new regulations aren't based on scientific facts but rather political opinions and speculative models that have consistently proven to be wrong.*

*"The unscientific method of analysis, relying on consensus, peer review, government opinion, models that do not work, cherry-picking data and omitting voluminous contradictory data, is commonly employed in these studies and by the EPA in the Proposed Rule," Mr. Happer and Mr.*

---

<sup>52</sup> Professor A.J. (Guus) Berkhout. [Open Letter from Clintel to the UN Secretary-General António Guterres](#). CLINTEL Foundation. 23 June 2023.

<sup>53</sup> [World Climate Declaration: There is no climate emergency](#). Global Climate Intelligence Group (CLINTEL.org). 18 February 2023.

<sup>54</sup> [Nobel Prize winner Dr. John F. Clauser signs the Clintel World Climate Declaration](#). CLINTEL Foundation. 12 August 2023.

<sup>55</sup> Kevin Stocklin. [Princeton, MIT Scientists Say EPA Climate Regulations Based on a 'Hoax'](#). *The Epoch Times*. 15 August 2023.

<sup>56</sup> William Happer, Richard Lindzen. [Letter to the US Environmental Protection Agency](#). July 19, 2023

*Lindzen wrote. "None of the studies provides scientific knowledge, and thus none provides any scientific support for the Proposed Rule.*

*"All of the models that predict catastrophic global warming fail the key test of the scientific method: they grossly overpredict the warming versus actual data. The scientific method proves there is no risk that fossil fuels and carbon dioxide will cause catastrophic warming and extreme weather."*

*Climate models such as the ones that the EPA is using have been consistently wrong for decades in predicting actual outcomes, Mr. Happer told The Epoch Times.*

Generally, over the last three decades or more it has been very difficult for the most experienced and credentialed scientists writing about anthropogenic climate change to not only get their material published, but also keep their tenures, pay their mortgages and manage their public reputations in the onslaught of the official narrative (promoted by governments, mainstream media, and academic institutions) all supported by a well-funded fact checking industry worth many billions of dollars. See how this works?

The shaming and deplatforming of Professor Peter Ridd represents a recent and connected example. Professor Ridd dared to use his expertise and evidence through 30 years studying the Great Barrier Reef to allay fears that the Reef is not dying from coral bleaching as suggested by the catastrophists, but in fact coral bleaching is an age-old natural phenomenon. Professor Ridd had more than 100 published scientific papers under his belt but fell foul of his employer, James Cook University in north Queensland, which terminated his contract because he refused to acquiesce to the official narrative.<sup>57</sup> The matter was heard in the High Court which unanimously decided against Professor Ridd's claim of unfair dismissal. There are no winners with this decision. Professor Ridd was left with legal debts and collecting the shards of his once brilliant career, and science was dealt a death blow, in particular James Cook University itself.

Once Professor Ridd was legally out the way, the official narrative that the Great Barrier Reef is dying because of climate change, can continue with impunity. Thanks to celebrities<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Morgan Begg (ed). *Peter Ridd and the case for academic freedom*. Institute of Public Affairs. 2023.

<sup>58</sup> Wright C and Nyberg D. [The Roles of Celebrities in Public Disputes: Climate Change and the Great Barrier Reef](#). *Journal of Management Studies*. 59:7 November 2022.

<sup>59</sup> like David Attenborough<sup>60</sup> and Barack Obama,<sup>61</sup> the mainstream media<sup>62 63 64 65 66 67</sup> and the usual gallery of hand wringers like UNESCO,<sup>68</sup> the Nature Conservancy,<sup>69</sup> the Great Barrier Reef Foundation,<sup>70</sup> the World Wildlife Fund,<sup>71</sup> the Climate Council,<sup>72</sup> the partly government-funded Australian Academy of Science<sup>73</sup> (an organisation with an annual revenues of around \$20 million)<sup>74</sup> which bemoans that between 50 and percent of the hard corals of the Great Barrier Reef are now dead), and of course Greenpeace<sup>75</sup> which promotes this trope, international tourists were convinced not to spend their tourist dollars coming to visit one of the most spectacular wonders of the natural world.<sup>76</sup> Let us pause examine the Great Barrier Reef Foundation for a moment. This is the very foundation which received a “captain’s call” grant in 2018 from former Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull to the tune of \$443 million dollars.<sup>77</sup> When in doubt about motives, remember always to follow the money. With the vast volume of material in support of the official narrative of a dying reef because of climate change stacked against him, Professor Peter Ridd never had a hope of winning that case. Just in case there is any curiosity about how the \$443 million is being spent, a 113-page report from the Great Barrier Reef Foundation, radically proposes the use of a “surface film” is among a number of radical solutions proposed into protect the reef.<sup>78</sup> Other innovative strategies to arrest the largest living organism from the ravages of climate

---

<sup>59</sup> Reuters. [Leo DiCaprio on the Great Barrier Reef: 'I've witnessed environmental devastation firsthand' – video](#). *The Guardian*. 18 June 2014.

<sup>60</sup> Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and Tyrone Ridgway. [David Attenborough says the Great Barrier Reef is in 'grave danger' – it's time to step up](#). *The Conversation*. 24 April 2016.

<sup>61</sup> [Remarks by President Obama at the University of Queensland](#). The White House. Office of the Press Secretary. 15 November 2014.

<sup>62</sup> [The Great Barrier Reef is dying](#). Editors, *The Washington Post*. 19 March 2017.

<sup>63</sup> Andrew Griffin. [Great Barrier Reef: Half of natural wonder is 'dead or dying' and it is on the brink of extinction, scientists say](#). *The Independent*. 20 April 2016.

<sup>64</sup> Peter Thomson and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg. [The Great Barrier Reef is a victim of climate change – but it could be part of the solution](#). *The Guardian*. 26 July 2021.

<sup>65</sup> [Great Barrier Reef has lost half of its corals since 1995](#). *BBC News*. 14 October 2020.

<sup>66</sup> [Climate change is killing the Great Barrier Reef](#). PBS Hour. Transcript: Judy Woodruff interviews David Wachenfeld director for reef recovery at the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and others. 22 March 2017.

<sup>67</sup> Johanna Marie. [IPCC scientists' climate change report says rising seas will see Great Barrier Reef islands disappear](#). *ABC News (Wide Bay)*. 11 August 2021.

<sup>68</sup> [United Nations Educational, Scientific And Cultural Organization Convention Concerning The Protection Of The World Cultural And Natural Heritage World Heritage Committee Extended Forty-Fourth Session](#) Fuzhou (China) / Online Meeting 16-31 July 2021. Pp 83-85.

<sup>69</sup> [Which rivers are polluting the Great Barrier Reef?](#) *The Nature Conservancy Australia*. 26 May 2019.

<sup>70</sup> [Climate change is the single biggest threat facing the Reef](#). *Great Barrier Reef Foundation*. Undated. Accessed 12 August 2023.

<sup>71</sup> [Ocean Conservationists And Celebs Join Global Campaign To Protect Great Barrier Reef](#). *World Wildlife Fund (Australia)*. 2018.

<sup>72</sup> Lesley Hughes et al. [Lethal Consequences: Climate Change Impacts On The Great Barrier Reef](#). *Climate Council*. 5 July 2018.

<sup>73</sup> [Position statement – The Great Barrier Reef](#). *The Australian Academy of Science*. 11 October 2018.

<sup>74</sup> [Australian Academy of Science Financial Report 2021–22](#).

<sup>75</sup> John Hocevar. [What's Killing Coral Reefs? And How Can We Stop It?](#) *Greenpeace USA*. 4 April 2016.

<sup>76</sup> Dean Miller. [How climate change impacts the Great Barrier Reef tourism industry](#). *Greenpeace* in conjunction with *The New Scientist*. 9 October 2020.

<sup>77</sup> Scout Wallen. [Remember that record \\$443m of funding for the Great Barrier Reef? This is what happened to it](#). *ABC News*. 22 April 2023.

<sup>78</sup> [Surface film and fake clouds in \\$444m plan to save Great Barrier Reef](#). *News.com.au*. 12 July 2019.

change are cloud brightening,<sup>79</sup> artificially altered clouds,<sup>80</sup> and some form of shade cloth. What could possibly go wrong?

As discussed earlier, the fundamental principle at the heart of science is the search for the truth through robust debate, that there are no absolutes, and any hypothesis is subject to change when new or different information is presented. The tradition of academic excellence relies on intellectual freedom; for scholars to perform research, make conclusions and test their hypotheses in the public arena. The very foundations of scholarship are inexorably connected to freedom of speech on digital platforms, and unfortunately we are witness to its death throes.

### Peer review: an echo chamber

There are many thousands of “peer-reviewed” published scientific papers that peddle the global warming/climate change hysteria. Why wouldn't there be when the amount of funding and accolade received by the authors enables them to flaunt their catastrophic hypotheses virtually unchallenged on the world stage. Just for a moment, let us look at the nature of “peer review.” Peer review is said to be at the very heart of all scientific advances, and it is the method by which substantial grants are allocated, new facts decided upon and published, academics promoted, Nobel prizes awarded, and public accolades through mainstream media are bestowed. It is meant to validate research and evidence, yet there is no agreed peer review process and instead what we find is extremely variable and undefined.

Significantly, peer review is also extremely susceptible to fraudulent activities, of which there are numerous examples over the last number of decades. Nevertheless, peer review is also a victim of the prevailing narrative depending upon whether it confirms or denies supporting evidence for a particular agenda which will be heavily promoted, criticised, or ignored. Of course, there have been recent and not so recent scandals in scientific and academic publishing to so-called highly reputable journals. The Sokal Affair comes to mind.<sup>81</sup>In 1996, Alan Sokal a physics professor at New York University and University College London, submitted an article to *Social Text*, an academic journal of postmodern cultural studies. The article used popular jargon to suggest that a scientific theory about the effects of quantum mechanics on gravitation was socially constructed. The submission was an experiment to test the journal's intellectual rigor. Only after the article was published did Sokal admit it was a hoax. After they get over their embarrassment, it still sends the academic community into uproar. There are many more examples of published articles failing the test of the scientific method, peer review, and conflict of interest.<sup>82 83 84 85 86</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Kerry Brent, Jeffrey McGee, Jan McDonald, Manon Simon. [Putting the Great Barrier Reef marine cloud brightening experiment into context](#). Carnegie Climate Governance Initiative (C2G). 13 May 2020.

<sup>80</sup> Jeff Tollefson. [Can artificially altered clouds save the Great Barrier Reef?](#) Nature. 25 August 2021.

<sup>81</sup> [The Sokal Affair](#). Wikipedia. Accessed 12 August 2023.

<sup>82</sup> Ioannidis JPA. [Why Most Published Research Findings Are False](#). *PLOS Medicine*. 30 August 2005.

<sup>83</sup> Smith R. [Peer review: a flawed process at the heart of science and journals](#). *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*. J R Soc Med 2006 Apr; 99(4): 178–182.

<sup>84</sup> Tom Feilden. [Most scientists 'can't replicate studies by their peers.'](#) BBC News. 22 February 2017.

<sup>85</sup> David Colquhoun. [Publish-or-perish: Peer review and the corruption of science](#). The Guardian. 5 September 2011.

<sup>86</sup> Geoffrey Kabat. [The Crisis Of Peer Review](#). *Forbes Magazine*. 23 November 2015.

Further evidence and discussion of peer review and the “crisis of replication” will appear in the SARS-CoV-2 section of this submission.

### **Climate change: connections to a bigger agenda?**

It is not the purpose of this submission to prove or disprove the validity of climate change science, that is for experts qualified in the various fields. The topic of climate change is discussed to illustrate that there is a myriad of perspectives within the field and, despite claims to the contrary, there certainly is a lack of consensus with the so-called science, as discussed above. Matters relating to climate change are characterised by an infinite number of influencers and a bottomless pit of money. Not just any influencers, but only those who can forcefully tout the official narrative that a climate emergency exists and put strategies in place to milk the life from it. The machine behind the climate change agenda is incredibly sophisticated, and it is so because of the funding behind it; trillions of dollars collectively funnelled into the cause by well-known household named organisations, foundations, governments, and elite benefactors.

The burning question is, why is the matter of anthropogenic climate change pushed so relentlessly by so many of the world’s largest organisations (International Monetary Fund, United Nations, World Health Organization, Bank of International Settlements, World Economic Forum, and so on), the world’s leaders, mega corporations, big tech (Google, Apple, Microsoft, X, Facebook/Meta, YouTube etc), mainstream media, academia, the military industrial complex, the medical industrial complex, to name a few? To criticise the prevailing climate change narrative and call it a hoax based on fraudulent science is to risk being deplatformed, cancelled, censored and banned from social media or other discussion platforms. Any scientific academic expert who dares to question the so-called science is ridiculed, fact checked, shamed and risks loss of tenure, as discussed earlier with Professor Ridd. No person could deny the concept of climate change as it has been happening for millions of years, but anyone who denounces the climate “emergency” or “crisis” is, according to the sanctioned narrative, advocating misinformation and disinformation. Such people are scorned and labelled “climate skeptics” or “climate change deniers.” Only a handful of politicians have dared to raise the issue that adopting climate change policies to, adopt net zero emissions for example, is sheer lunacy and writes an “economic suicide note” for Australia.

Just a few words on how the totalitarian censorship works. An example is the Australian chapter of *The Conversation*, a website cited in this submission. *The Conversation* was founded with taxpayer funding as well as funding from some banks, a trove of universities, and other taxpayer-funded institutions such as the CSIRO, Victorian Government.<sup>87</sup> No dissenting views other than the official narrative is permitted on *The Conversation*:<sup>88</sup>

*At The Conversation Australia we’ve recently vowed to improve our climate change coverage, and part of that means moderating comments with a similar degree of rigour. Once upon a time, we might have viewed climate sceptics as merely frustrating. We relied on other commenters and authors to rebut sceptics and deniers, which often lead to endless back and forth.*

---

<sup>87</sup> [The Conversation: Partners and Funders](#). *The Conversation*. Accessed 12 August 2023.

<sup>88</sup> Misha Ketchell. [Climate change deniers are dangerous - they don't deserve a place on our site](#). *The Conversation*. 17 September 2019.

*But it's 2019, and now we know better. Climate change deniers, and those shamelessly peddling pseudoscience and misinformation, are perpetuating ideas that will ultimately destroy the planet. As a publisher, giving them a voice on our site contributes to a stalled public discourse.*

*That's why the editorial team in Australia is implementing a zero-tolerance approach to moderating climate change deniers, and sceptics. Not only will we be removing their comments, we'll be locking their accounts.*

*We believe conversations are integral to sharing knowledge, but those who are fixated on dodgy ideas in the face of decades of peer-reviewed science are nothing but dangerous.*

*It is counter productive to present the evidence and then immediately undermine it by giving space to trolls. The hopeless debates between those with evidence and those who fabricate simply stalls action.*

*As a reader, author or commenter, we need your help. If you see something that is misinformation, please don't engage, simply report it. Do this by clicking the report button below a comment.*

*We know you want to have constructive positive discussions, so please don't engage with the climate change deniers. Dob them in and help us create a space where they don't derail the conversation.*

This was worth quoting in full to demonstrate how debate is being shut down on just one, albeit influential, website and “managed” to ensure there are no dissenting views. Science in action, from our most prestigious academic institutions, right? No dissenting views other than the official climate change mantra is permitted to be discussed. This totalitarian approach stifles debate and has Orwellian overtones. No conversation and no freedom of speech because it is “dangerous.” Unfortunately, this approach is replicated across multiple platforms as the Al Gores and Tim Flannerys of the world ply their craft and reap their rewards by peddling their untruths, pushing their lies, and hawking their dud predictions.<sup>89</sup> <sup>90</sup> <sup>91</sup> <sup>92</sup> But that's ok on *The Conversation*, and you can even “dob them in.” See how this works? All the pieces are already in place as the stage is being set to usher in further totalitarian controls for the misinformation/disinformation bill.

As already stated, the climate is always changing and tends to follow cycles. Temperatures change with the seasons because of the Earth's tilt relative to the Sun's orbit. Temperature changes, therefore, are driven by the Earth's position and distance from the Sun which in turn has its own measurable and predictable cycles. Yet we are told that a trace gas has a more significant effect on temperatures than the Sun.<sup>93</sup> As Ian Plimer puts it:<sup>94</sup>

*The message communicated is not about the scientific complexities of cycles but about frightening the public witless as a mechanism for controlling their lives and wallets and bullying*

---

<sup>89</sup> David Vetter. [YouTube Is Serving Up Climate Misinformation. This Top Scientist Says Google Should Ban It.](#) *Forbes Magazine*. 7 December 2021.

<sup>90</sup> Rob Bluey. [LinkedIn Bans Geologist for Climate Change Posts: 'This Type of Content Is Not Allowed'.](#) *The Daily Signal*. 4 October 2021.

<sup>91</sup> Naomi Nix. [Twitter bans climate change propaganda ads as deniers target platforms.](#) *The Washington Post*. 22 April 2022.

<sup>92</sup> Mariana Spring. [Google, YouTube ban ads on climate misinformation.](#) *BBC News*. 8 October 2021.

<sup>93</sup> Ian Plimer. *Green Murder*. Conor Court Publishing. 2021. p. 518.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.* p. 520.



*and berating the public about lifestyle and all the energy systems that support the modern world...*

*The media have a huge emotional investment in a beaten-up climate change crisis. Propaganda is made so much easier when the education system has been dumbed down for decades and many people now don't have the general knowledge and critical and analytical skills to dissect what is nonsense...*

*The language of fear and panic repeated ad nauseum, as noted by George Orwell more than 70 years ago, it is used as one of the main instruments of political control. There is no climate crisis or emergency. Linguistic language manipulation has not given us repeatable validated measurements that show unprecedented global warming. The use of weasel words to deliberately replace repeatable facts is used to bamboozle the community and to push the green activist agenda.*

*Don't believe a word of what you read, hear, or watch. This is what the media will not tell you. Green schemes are un-costed, subsidised and are championed by those bathed in self-interest. These folk have no practical experience and willing to spend other people's' money. Wind- and solar-generated electricity are horrendously expensive and increase human emissions of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere. They are unreliable. To try to increase reliability using giant hazardous batteries filled with renewable energy or to try to manufacture, transport, store, and burn hydrogen as a stop-gap measure creates expensive and unreliable giant incendiary bombs...*

*EVs are subsidised and are designed to run on subsidised electricity. This is financial madness. EVs, renewable energy, batteries and hydrogen take more energy and carbon dioxide to produce than they save and are kept operational by fossil fuel-generated electricity. Mobile incendiary bombs called EVs have very limited use by wealthy hypocritical green activist show-offs for hunting and gathering their lattes from one café to the next. They are owned and driven by those who support child slavery and destruction of the environment. Why is this not reported by the media?*

*All green solutions to the alleged problem of human emissions warming the planet such as Net Zero are expensive, unreliable, subsidised, explosive, and achieve the opposite of the desired ideal. All green solutions championed by green activists produce a wealthy class who impoverish workers even more. The free market created the most efficient and reliable methods of electricity production and transport and brought the poor out of poverty. Get rid of subsidies and mandates and let the market do what it does.*

If the official narrative of science is fraudulent and plain wrong about anthropogenic climate change, this still leaves us with our burning question about why it is peddled so forcefully and no one can speak out about it, much less debate it. If we wish to dig deeper, and there are mountains of evidence, the motives to promote the climate catastrophe have an ominous and sinister history, many centuries in the making. If we examine the current situation, nations are grasping on to the last shards of their sovereignty while the entire world comes under directions from elite global organisations like those mentioned above and foundations like the Rand Corporation, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Aspen Institute, The Club of Rome, Brookings Institute, the Grattan Institute, Tavistock Institute, Imperial College University of London, and hundreds more. Some of these organisations have been fine-tuning their sustainable development goals to use against populations for many

decades. For example, a report by the Club of Rome published in 1991, highlights this agenda:<sup>95</sup>

*The Common Enemy of Humanity Is Man*

*In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill. In their totality and in their interactions these phenomena do constitute a common threat which demands the solidarity of all peoples. But in designating them as the enemy, we fall into the trap about which we have already warned, namely mistaking symptoms for causes. All these dangers are caused by human intervention and it is only through changed attitudes and behaviour that they can be overcome. The real enemy, then, is humanity itself.*

The climate change hoax has a long and distinguished pedigree dating at least back to the very early 1900s. Despite many of the claims of global warming and human caused climate change being debunked by inconvenient evidence, the narrative around climate “crisis” and “emergency” continues to be peddled by the largest globalist organisations, corporations, think tanks, mainstream media, and governments across the world. For those not the least bit curious or not paying attention, this would seem baffling. At least one of the tentacles for this collusion dates back to the bequest from the estate of Cecil Rhodes to set up the Round Table Movement in 1902. The purpose of this movement was to form a network of policy think tanks whose membership had the means and opportunity to “influence the lives of millions across borders on a regular basis.” The notion of Chatham House Rules comes from this movement which was later renamed The Royal Institute of International Affairs and it extolled the virtues of discipline through a secrecy and concealment of its membership and discussions. Remember that secret societies are nothing new, and many of the attendees to these meetings would have likely belonged to other secretive clubs, orders, or groups, such as the Freemasons or Yale’s Skull and Bones.

Nevertheless, these early gatherings enabled a network of global power brokers who could engage the Chatham House Rule to discuss matters of national security, international trade, and global treaties and agreements. These original groups gave rise to the Council of Foreign Relations, the Trilateral Commission, the Club of Rome, and later the United Nations, World Health Organisation, International Monetary Fund, Bank of International Settlements, World Economic Forum and many other influential policy making groups. Cross membership of these groups include, but is not limited to, the following: Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Open Society Foundation, the Bilderberg Group, The Royal Society, AstraZeneca, Gilead, Bloomberg, The City of London, The European Commission, the European Union, BAE systems, Lockheed Martin, Goldman Sachs, the Bank of England, HM Treasury, the Bank of Japan, the Bank of Italy, Morgan Stanley, De Beers, BlackRock, Vanguard, China International Capital Corporation, KPMG, Moody’s, King’s College London, Imperial College London, the Royal College of Defence Studies, the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office the Ministry of Defence, the Department for Digital, Culture Media and Sport, the Department of Health and Social Care, the British Army and all foreign embassies.

---

<sup>95</sup> Alexander King, Bertrand Schneider. [\*The First Global Revolution A Report By The Council Of The Club Of Rome\*](#). Random House, Inc. Pantheon Books. 1991. p. 115.

This also includes membership from equivalent offices in the US, Canada, New Zealand and Australia to name a few.<sup>96</sup>

Behind closed doors and away from public scrutiny members of these groups have produced libraries of white papers, green papers, discussion papers and complex reports from every discipline imaginable. It would be foolish indeed to dismiss the aspirations and intentions of such documents as charitable time-wasting altruism by elites with nothing better to do. In other words, they do not meet to exchange mansion decorating ideas or horse racing tips for Royal Ascot. As an example, the *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*<sup>97</sup> (often referred to as the Brundtland Report) as presented to the United Nations General Assembly in 1987 is 374 pages long and proposes a raft of complex actions for member nations, such as Australia, to follow. Reading the report in detail will find many of the proposals already well under way. Details in the Brundtland Report are concerning as it strongly advocates the eugenicist principles of population control, calling for the creation of a 'new charter,' to set 'new norms' to guide the transition to sustainable development. The Brundtland Report was presented at the UN sponsored Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 and in 1997 spawned the *Earth Charter*, "formally endorsed by thousands of organizations, including UNESCO and the IUCN (World Conservation Union)" which through the cloyingly aspirational language, also masks eugenics-inspired population control, technocracy, biosecurity, communitarian austerity and global governance.<sup>98</sup> This illustrates that documents produced by these elite think tanks behind closed doors often result in global policy change.

Another door stopper document is the Global Diversity Assessment published in 1995, an innocuous name for a sophisticated and complex report by the United Nations Environment Program is 1,125 pages long.<sup>99</sup> The Global Biodiversity Assessment was commissioned by the United Nations Environment Programme and funded by the Global Environment Facility.<sup>100</sup>

*The World Bank Group is proud to have been a founding member of the GEF. Since the GEF's inception, the World Bank Group has implemented 836 projects in 146 countries, supported by US\$5.8 billion in GEF funding. This funding has catalyzed additional investment of US\$42.4 billion from other sources (a 1:8 ratio) and remains instrumental in helping countries better manage their natural resources and enable cleaner and greener economic growth.*

Just to prove there are plenty of dollars to push the official climate change narrative, always follow the money. This of course has generated the latest offerings by governments around the world, including our own efforts to arrive at a *Net Zero 2050 Plan*.<sup>101</sup> The UK government's 2021 publication *Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener*<sup>102</sup> and the UK FIRES

---

<sup>96</sup> John Coleman. *Conspirators' Hierarchy: The story of the committee of 300*. Bridger House Publishers Inc. 1992.

<sup>97</sup> United Nations General Assembly. [Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development](#). 4 August 1987.

<sup>98</sup> [The Earth Charter](#). Earth Charter Organisation. Undated. Accessed 12 August 2023.

<sup>99</sup> United Nations Environment Programme. [Global Biodiversity Assessment](#). United Nations. 1995.

<sup>100</sup> [World Bank Group and the Global Environment Facility](#). The World Bank. 11 August 2023.

<sup>101</sup> Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water. *Net Zero*. The Australian Government.

<sup>102</sup> UK Government. [Net Zero Strategy: Build Back Greener](#). 2021.

document *Absolute Zero Report*,<sup>103</sup> will no doubt serve as foundational documents for Australia's plan when it finally comes out. UK FIRES stands for placing Resource Efficiency at the heart of the UK's Future Industrial Strategy. UK Fires is a collaboration between the universities of Cambridge, Oxford, Nottingham, Bath, and Imperial College London. It's a case of fall into line for all countries which have signed up to the net zero mantra:<sup>104</sup>

*World leaders have been warned by the United Nations' chief climate change scientist to "stick to" the shift from petrol and diesel to electric cars, and that opening new oil reserves was storing up "very difficult choices" for future governments.*

*In an exclusive interview with the Standard, Professor Jim Skea said that political leaders had a "particular responsibility" as the "ringmasters or ringmistresses" to lead the battle against global warming, which he warned may be happening faster than expected.*

*He also emphasised that they would be judged as global leaders, or not, on tackling climate change by whether "net zero pledges are backed up by credible actions".*

Why are such details included in a submission objecting to government overreach of freedoms, namely freedom of speech, in the proposed misinformation and disinformation bill? It is because the language and conditioning by these globalist organisations through their reports uses clever psychological control methods to force populations to willingly give up their freedoms and accept lower standards of living in order to combat the false threat of climate change. The global banks and other financial institutions need to be seen doing the 'right thing' by setting up green finance initiatives. An example of this is the UK's Centre for Greening Finance and Investment,<sup>105</sup> which uses computer modelling to predict climate change risks and advise banks, lenders, investors, and insurers where to invest by creating new products to combat climate change. When in doubt, always follow the money. A keen observer would be aware that banks hover around when there is money to be made.

The greening of international finance will require eye-wateringly vast sums of investment which is a euphemism for wealth transfer from ordinary people to elites. With the US, China and France leading the world in issuing green bonds, the bond market is set to achieve a value of \$2.63 trillion by 2023. In a speech given by the UK's Chancellor of the Exchequer said,<sup>106</sup> "But if we are collectively to meet our global climate goals, we will need to mobilise \$90 trillion by 2030." Say what? And, this is just the UK! The climate change gravy train is set to reap many more trillions of dollars worldwide, and it is difficult to get total costs for this epic plundering. It will not be possible for businesses to operate unless they adhere to the sustainable development goals (SDG) that are already set up in all corners of the globe.

This is big business and ordinary people will bear the losses as their lifestyle gives way to grinding poverty all to achieve climate change policies imposed upon them by the masters of the universe. This will result in the behaviour change being sought under the SDGs. Recall

---

<sup>103</sup> Resource Efficiency at the heart of the UK's Future Industrial Strategy (UK FIRES). [Absolute Zero Report](#). 2021.

<sup>104</sup> Nicholas Cecil. ['Politicians will be judged on delivery of net zero strategy,' UN climate chief tells world leaders](#). *Evening Standard*. 8 August 2023.

<sup>105</sup> [UK Centre for Greening Finance and Investment](#). Smith School Of Enterprise And The Environment. Undated. Accessed 12 August 2023.

<sup>106</sup> UK Government. [Green Finance Institute and Financial Services Skills Taskforce unveiled](#). News Story. 22 June 2018.

the Bruntland Report? This is far more than a bunch of elite billionaires swanning around at Davos talking about climate change and sustainable development. These sophisticated well-thought-out plans take years to come to fruition and there are deep agendas. There is no way around their reach since our successive governments have signed us up to it, and unfortunately the misinformation/disinformation bill is part of this agenda along with those pushing it. Climate change is all about energy; energy is needed by people to survive and thrive. This gives governments and those that control them an asymmetrical power relationship over populations. People who understand this already know that questioning of the approved narrative around climate change will be dealt with harshly. The misinformation/disinformation bill simply brings Australia into lockstep and formalises the detail.

## The SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic

Before we discuss how, when, what, why and whether there even was a “pandemic,” the responses and reaction to the World Health Organization-declared “SARS-CoV-2 pandemic” was not only carried out with deliberate haste, but was also profoundly misguided, destructive, and deadly. Few would disagree that this ongoing catastrophe, no matter from which angle, has caused the biggest global crisis since World War II. Worse, the so-called SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has eroded the very nature of trust; trust in science, trust in the medical system, trust in governments, trust in authority, trust in the media, trust in our education system, trust in our tertiary institutions, trust in big corporations, trust in each other, and trust in the prevailing truth narrative. Actions as a result of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has divided families, polarised positions on many long-held views about health and well-being, crushed friendships, alienated communities, and made many of us suspicious of one thing or another. As we get into the detail, bear in mind that the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has played its part in the biggest wealth transfer in human history.

How could this have possibly happened, and right under our noses? Where did it come from like a thief in the night to take away rights and freedoms, our livelihoods, and worse, the lives of some people known and others unknown to us? Did anyone see this coming? Well, at least the main players did, but unless part of the elite inner circle, or exceptionally observant, most had no clue as the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic ravaged humanity caught flat footed, with such intensity and ferocity that it will never recover, or at least life will never be the same. Our ability to think rationally about the unbelievably brutal actions by the collective governments’ response to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic vaporised as our emotions took over when we were all at our most vulnerable. When emotions take over, our ability to suspend disbelief occurs; logic goes out the window, to be replaced with irrational beliefs. Irrational beliefs create an emotional vacuum where people seek out answers to fill the void, and at that point will believe just about anything. And believe we did. Ripe for the takedown one may say. So, how were our emotions so comprehensively captured and how did we fall for this deadly psychological operation (or psyop)? The answer: very easily as it turns out, as we were constantly plied with misinformation and disinformation from what many regarded as “trusted” sources i.e. state government health departments, AMA, TGA, universities, medical publications such as *The Lancet*, *Nature* etc.

Fear propaganda played an important part in how successfully the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic was rolled out. Not just ordinary fear, but fear accompanied by overwhelming changes to everything around us compared to everything that had gone on before. Technology in the form of social media, instant news, and digital global reach helped, of course. Right from the start, there was nothing in modern times to compare to what we were all experiencing with the 24-hour SARS-CoV-2 case and death numbers in bright red crawlers swarming across our television screens. Breaking news delivered hourly about the latest SARS-CoV-2 cases, death counts, hospitalisations, and overwhelmed health services. Global panic set in as the latest sensational detail was announced by sombre but breathless news readers and roving reporters about national and international body counts. We were all stunned and at the same time mesmerised with the overwhelming message that imminent death to any one of us by SARS-CoV-2 was highly likely. Messages from the harbingers of doom were as pervasive as they were persuasive. This was soon accompanied by mandates for everything imaginable - lockdowns, mask wearing, reporting of symptoms, travel restrictions, gathering

in groups, walking in the park, sunbathing on the beach, exercising, home visits, and SARS-CoV-2 phone apps. Very few have living memories of such an horrendous overreach of government powers on a scale not seen, at least in Western countries, for almost a century.

No one was spared – “Your papers, please!” Permissions of varying severity were needed to enter or leave each state, churches, hospitals, schools, aged care facilities, child care centres, soon followed by shopping centres, public transport, restaurants, service stations, shops and anywhere people were likely to encounter other people.<sup>107</sup> Babies died without proper care since the borders were slammed shut,<sup>108 109</sup> families could not attend funerals of their loved ones,<sup>110</sup> ANZAC ceremonies respecting the fallen were cancelled, the elderly died in aged care without their loved ones being present,<sup>111 112</sup> the sick and injured left to the mercy of the apparently overwhelmed hospital system,<sup>113</sup> elective surgeries were cancelled,<sup>114</sup> as people fell ill and were dying from something they named SARS-CoV-2 shortened to SARS-CoV-2.

### **The official narrative: SARS-CoV-2 was a deadly pandemic**

The preceding paragraphs are to jolt the memory and set the scene as the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic response unfolded. Memory cannot always be relied upon; sometimes memories are exceedingly sharp about some things, but blunt about others, particularly if they are unpleasant memories. As part of this objection to the misinformation/disinformation bill, and as much as this is distasteful, it is important to revisit how cleverly we were all hoodwinked into believing the official narrative, when it is now becoming crystal clear that what we were fed was deception about every conceivable aspect of SARS-CoV-2.

“Unprecedented” they called it, deadly they said, a war they cried, an “invisible killer” they warned, does not discriminate they wailed, we are all at risk they moaned, you will kill Granny they scolded, and it went on and on. Just to ram the point home, there were constant reminders of the peril we were facing with the declared “pandemic” by ramping up the fear to a crescendo with 24/7 TV coverage, announcements, signs, posters, phone apps, masked faces, government warnings, lockdowns, shut borders, shut movie theatres, schools, bans on camping, hiking, surfing, swimming, moon watching, and it went on. A poll conducted in early 2021 saw Australians overestimating their fear of dying from SARS-CoV-2 to be 38% - many times over the 0.05% infection rate for the vast majority of people.<sup>115</sup> In

---

<sup>107</sup> Stephanie Zillman. [Queensland Premier 'will not hesitate to slam border shut' amid growing fears of NSW coronavirus outbreak](#). *ABC News*. 22 July 2020.

<sup>108</sup> [Unborn twin baby dies in NSW after Queensland border confusion](#). *SBS News*. 28 August 2020.

<sup>109</sup> ['My heart bleeds': Unborn twin dies after border closure delays mum's surgery](#). *AAP News through Yahoo News*. 28 August 2020.

<sup>110</sup> Freya Noble, Rebeka Powell. [Woman forced into full PPE for final lonely goodbye to dad](#). *Nine News*. 11 September 2020.

<sup>111</sup> Melissa Davey. ['Yelling out for help': the atrocious conditions inside Australia's aged care homes](#). *The Guardian*. 5 February 2022.

<sup>112</sup> Suzy Khimm. [The hidden Covid-19 health crisis: Elderly people are dying from isolation](#). *NBC News*. 28 October 2020.

<sup>113</sup> Melissa Davey. [Emergency overload: how Covid exposed Australia's straining hospital system](#). *The Guardian*. 15 May 2022.

<sup>114</sup><sup>114</sup> Lexie Hamilton-Smith. [Coronavirus restrictions on surgery leaves thousands on burgeoning wait lists — often living in agony](#). *ABC News*. 2 August 2020.

<sup>115</sup> Sky News Australia. ['Fear factor' over COVID is 'out of hand'](#). YouTube. 1 July 2021.

fact, as we now know, the vast majority of the people who died from SARS-CoV-2 were already at high risk of dying from other causes. Risk factors included the same risk factors as for every other medical condition; namely age, obesity, hypertension, dementia, diabetes, auto-immune diseases, cancers etc. As it also turned out, the highest risk factors were being admitted to hospital and being a resident in aged care. Three years later, we are still being plied with new variants with scary names, urged to get SARS-CoV-2 injections, get tested and mask up if you show a positive result. Unless living under a rock for the last three years it is impossible to deny the official narrative that SARS-CoV-2 was a deadly pandemic. As we continue, bear this in mind as the misinformation and disinformation about SARS-CoV-2 is exposed at every level.

### **The evidence: SARS-CoV-2 was not a pandemic**

The evidence is overwhelming at every conceivable level and would need a library to list the litany of the crimes waged against humanity because of the declaration of SARS-CoV-2 as a worldwide pandemic. Despite the frequent images of [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Strangely, most of the most harrowing footage was coming out of China but no other countries. Whether this was all theatre and China was using the “lame duck” strategy to persuade Western countries to lockdown is still a matter for speculation.

The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic is no ordinary fraud. It is fraud on a gargantuan scale and involves many levels of millions of players around the world who are either fully complicit or totally ignorant. The choreography of the SARS-CoV-2 hoax was orchestrated by a small number of key individuals and groups involving multinational corporations, government agencies, global health authorities, elite foundations, international organisations and enterprises using a top down, highly compartmentalised authoritarian structure. An operation on such a vast scale requires money, lots of it, endless streams of it in fact. This authoritarian compartmentalisation technique enabled the so-called pandemic to remain largely undetected for many months by most people. Armies of fact checkers were hired, social media was commandeered, academics were bought off, mainstream media required to only peddle the “official narrative,” governments fell in lockstep, corporations followed orders, and any dissenting voices silenced, cancelled and deplatformed. Military-style campaigns reminiscent of war time headed up by real generals were deployed to badger the people into following orders to “keep you safe and protect the community.”<sup>116</sup> Dropping the not-so-subtle hint that we would have to vaccinate our way out of the crisis. Is it little wonder how the world was deceived into believing there was a genuine pandemic that threatened their lives? Is it little wonder why most rolled up their sleeves and took the SARS-CoV-2 shots?

Since we can prove there was no pandemic by the numbers who died from SARS-CoV-2 alone, it leaves no room for doubt that pandemic was orchestrated as a psychological operation (psy op) to control the world by fear. But why? To know everything about the coronavirus they termed SARS-CoV-2 would require expertise in epidemiology, virology, immunology, infectious diseases, statistical analysis, causal mortality, mathematics, biology, chemistry, and physics which not many of us do. But let us begin at the beginning, so to

---

<sup>116</sup> Australian Government. [Op COVID SHIELD National COVID Vaccine Campaign Plan](#). 3 August 2012.



speak. What is almost universally agreed is that the official narrative claimed a so-called virus named SARS-CoV-2 emerged in late 2019 in the city of Wuhan China and began to quickly spread around the world. The so-called virus caused acute respiratory symptoms in many people, particularly the elderly and immune compromised. Some people experienced mild or no symptoms. Deaths occurred mainly in hospitals and only later did we find that the survival rate is widely reported to be 99.7 per cent.

And here we are coming up to four years later and the world as we knew it prior to the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 has transformed lives to be almost unrecognisable from times prior to the declared pandemic. The introduction of this misinformation/disinformation bill is such an example of the exploitation of a contrived crisis created for the sole purpose of control. Not just ordinary control, like you have control over what you wear each day, but nefarious pathological control that has at its very core, eugenics and depopulation. To conceive of such despicable evil is to many people anathema and simply cannot be comprehended. This is the chief reason why so many people complied and acquiesced under such tyranny and continue to do so as their freedoms are seized one by one without them even being aware of it.

Again, this scene-setting is relevant to this submission opposing the misinformation/disinformation bill as it is integral to the narrative around what is considered the official narrative about all aspects of SARS-CoV-2. Why this detail is included is to demonstrate that both misinformation and disinformation are constantly being pushed by the very institutions in the bill that are meant to be trustworthy, namely our governments, credentialed educational institutions, and official media sources. To rub further salt into the wounds, these same institutions are exempt under the misinformation/disinformation bill which makes no secret that it intends to badger us all into submission, to silence us, to censor us, to deplatform us, to investigate us, to prosecute us, and to even ruin us for speaking an alternative view of the truth.

How do we know SARS-CoV-2 was a hoax of epic proportions? How can we prove this? It is quite simple, really. Now that there are three years of numbers to crunch, SARS-CoV-2 hardly registered a blimp on the hospital activity and mortality charts, particularly during the first twelve months when the fear campaign was at its most frenzied. These numbers have been deliberately obfuscated and difficult to obtain, but there are determined truth seekers who have remained steadfast in their quest to find indisputable evidence that just about every aspect of SARS-CoV-2 is fraudulent. Termed crackpot conspiracy theorists, such courageous doctors, academics, scientists, psychologists, journalists, lawyers, and even a small number of politicians and celebrities are calling out these lies.

So, to the numbers. All-cause mortality, that is the actual number of deaths is agreed by many experts to be the most accurate measurement of the severity of an illness:<sup>117</sup>

*All-cause mortality by time (day, week, month, year, period), by jurisdiction (country, state, province, county), and by individual characteristics of the deceased (age, sex, race, living accommodations) is the most reliable data for detecting and epidemiologically characterizing*

---

<sup>117</sup> Dennis Rancourt. [There was no pandemic](#). Denis's Substack. 3 July 2023.

*events causing death, and for gauging the population-level impact of any surge or collapse in deaths from any cause.*

*Such data is not susceptible to reporting bias or to any bias in attributing causes of death.*

The global death rate for the main year of the so-called SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, 2020, was 0.76%. That is 7.612 people died per 1,000. Turning to the global death rates (depending upon which website is used, there are very minor variations) over the past five years, we find the following:<sup>118</sup>

2022	7.678
2021	7.645
2020	7.612
2019	7.579
2018	7.546

Taking a quick look at 1950 on the same website,<sup>119</sup> for example we find the global death rate a substantial 20.15 people per 1,000 died, (and there was no deadly pandemic in 1950). The point here is that for the past five years there has barely been any change in the global death rate, during which time SARS-CoV-2 was said to be raging across the planet. Is this not evidence that there never was a global pandemic of such catastrophic proportions? What it is, is evidence that a fraudulent pandemic was created that required the most draconian measures to keep populations from finding out the truth and keeping them fearful and under control. Part of this control is censoring information and views other than the official narrative that SARS-CoV-2 is a deadly pandemic.

Another way to tell if there was a deadly pandemic is to look at mortality figures. If we regard 2020 as the seminal year for SARS-CoV-2, then looking at deaths in Australia, we expect there to be a considerable increase in the number of deaths in that year if indeed SARS-CoV-2 is a deadly pandemic. In the table below, figures are provided for total deaths and some causes of death in the years 2015 to 2022. Note that the causes of death selected to not add up to the total and are provided for illustration purposes only. The baseline to compare current figures are regarded as deaths from the years 2015-2019. If we examine the table, we can easily note that there is only a difference of 1,836 deaths comparing the baseline to the year 2020 when SARS-CoV-2 struck. However, the narrative from our trusted government departments, main stream media and academic institutions did portray a deadly pandemic. Surly a massive case of misinformation/disinformation?

Attributing deaths to SARS-CoV-2 is controversial and fraught with error, as many people were seen to die with the virus, than from the virus. This is because most people who died had significant comorbidities and were of advanced age. Nevertheless, this is another topic around which there is so much misinformation and disinformation coming from our health

---

<sup>118</sup> [World Death Rate 1950-2023](#). Macrotrends website. Accessed 12 August 2023.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid.

authorities and governments. Death numbers rose quite sharply following roll out of the SARS-CoV-2 vaccinations. More on this will be discussed below in the topic of vaccinations.

DOCTOR CERTIFIED DEATHS	2015-2019 (Average)	2020	2021	2022
Total deaths	140,647	142,483	150,935	167,657
COVID		855	1,224	9,735
Total respiratory diseases	14,125	11,885	12,970	14,392
Cancer	46,224	48,294	49,609	50,371
Ischaemic heart diseases	15,158	13,696	14,082	14,955
Other heart diseases	8,877	8,640	9,601	10,279
Cerebrovascular diseases	9,801	9,114	9,316	9,302
Dementia	14,169	15,302	16,456	17,618

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics. Provisional Mortality Statistics, Jan 2023. Released at 11.30am (Canberra time) 28 April 2023 Table 4.3 Doctor certified deaths, Number of deaths, selected causes, 2015-22 monthly data by date of occurrence.

### Planning for the pandemic

How do we know SARS-CoV-2 was planned? When we look at the level of preparedness for pandemics that has been carried out, it simply is inconceivable that a bat cosied up to a pangolin at a wet market and spawned a deadly virus. All by accident, of course. For the average person, not checking the detail of these things, they would be unaware that sophisticated planning for pandemics is nothing new. Wargaming the release of pathogens to “one-up” the enemy in case they do it first has been occurring for many decades, some of the more bizarre including operations “Corn Terrorism” (where corn is clandestinely sprayed with corn blight by China) and “Lousy Wine,” (involving grape lice hidden in pâté by disgruntled French wine growers) both of which involved scenarios to attack the US agricultural industry. Scenario participants are challenged with a raft of communication dilemmas that stem from each unique storyline. Action items cover such items as risk communications, rumour control, interagency message coordination and consistency, issue management, proactive and reactive media relations, cultural competency, and ethical concerns. Scenarios, drills, and planning exercises involving multiple players most notably the military and security agencies, have also involved a range of more deadly pathogens, including anthrax, smallpox, ebola, strains of influenza, and of course coronavirus. While there are many more, the five public, and most relevant to SARS-CoV-2 are:

1. Lockstep Simulation 2010
2. Event 201
3. SPARS 2017
4. CLADE X 2018
5. Crimson Contagion

#### *Lockstep Simulation 2010*

In 2009 and 2010, both the Obama administration and World Health Organization prioritised biosecurity as the key to managing global risks.<sup>120</sup> A scenario report entitled

<sup>120</sup> Robert F Kennedy Jr. *The Real Anthony Fauci*. Children’s Health Defense. Skyhorse Publishing. 2021. p. 407.

“Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development” was published by the Rockefeller Foundation.<sup>121</sup> Four scenario narratives are described in the document, the first “Lockstep” has a by-line which describes “a world of tighter top-down government control and more authoritarian leadership, with limited innovation and growing citizen pushback.” The Lockstep Scenario describes a world a couple of years in the future:<sup>122</sup>

*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...*

*During the pandemic, national leaders around the world flexed their authority and imposed airtight rules and restrictions, from the mandatory wearing of face masks to body-temperature checks at the entries to communal spaces like train stations and supermarkets. Even after the pandemic faded, this more authoritarian control and oversight of citizens and their activities stuck and even intensified. In order to protect themselves from the spread of increasingly global problems — from pandemics and transnational terrorism to environmental crises and rising poverty — leaders around the world took a firmer grip on power.*

It is noteworthy that the actual author of the document, Peter Schwartz, a Hollywood consultant on a number of sci-fi films, has significant connections to the intelligence community as well as global organisations such as the World Economic Forum.<sup>123</sup> Identified as one of the early drivers of the transhumanist agenda, Schwartz “currently markets a “vaccine management” software platform that allows governments to track, trace, monetize, and enforce vaccine compliance among global populations.” According to Kennedy, a decade after Schwartz authored the Lockstep document, he took a position as Salesforce’s Senior Vice President of Strategic Planning and Chief Futures Officer. A video of Peter Schwartz is still available on the Salesforce.com website as he guides clients in preparing “...for the latest factors impacting our ability to move out of multiple, pandemic-driven global crises. Featuring updated scenarios based on new virus strains, vaccines, global economic forces, and social trends, this video outlines what to monitor so you can anticipate shifts and accelerate growth—despite today’s uncertainty.”<sup>124</sup>

### Event 201

The website of the Centre for Health Security described the gathering:<sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> [Scenarios For The Future Of Technology And International Development](#). The Rockefeller Foundation. May 2010.

<sup>122</sup> Ibid.

<sup>123</sup> Robert F Kennedy Jr. *The Real Anthony Fauci*. Children’s Health Defense. Skyhorse Publishing. 2021. pp. 407-411.

<sup>124</sup> Salesforce Scenarios Team. [Winter 2021 COVID-19 Scenarios to Inform Your Business Decisions](#). Salesforce. Accessed 13 August 2023.

<sup>125</sup> Centre for Health Security. [Table Top Exercise: Event 201](#). Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. Accessed 13 August 2023.

*The Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security in partnership with the World Economic Forum and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation hosted Event 201, a high-level pandemic exercise on October 18, 2019, in New York, NY. The exercise illustrated areas where public/private partnerships will be necessary during the response to a severe pandemic in order to diminish large-scale economic and societal consequences.*

This “table top exercise” that simulated a meeting of world leaders was held only a couple of months before SARS-CoV-2 officially struck. Some experts put the timeline for the first cases of SARS-CoV-2 many months before.<sup>126</sup> Nevertheless Event 201 was meant to simulate the responses to a worldwide coronavirus pandemic, complete with mock news reports and panel discussions on how to impose measures such as travel restrictions, business shutdowns, and internet censorship. The Event 201 scenario went down like this:

*Event 201 simulates an outbreak of a novel zoonotic coronavirus transmitted from bats to pigs to people that eventually becomes efficiently transmissible from person to person, leading to a severe pandemic. The pathogen and the disease it causes are modeled largely on SARS, but it is more transmissible in the community setting by people with mild symptoms.*

Participants included representatives from the World Bank, Marriott International, the Australian ANZ Bank, Johnson & Johnson, NBC Universal Media, Lufthansa Group Airlines, and many other influential leaders. Such exercises are held to ensure that national leaders and corporations will cooperate in the event of a global emergency. Under the direction of global leaders, national decision-makers coordinate their responses in advance, so that when a crisis occurs, they can quickly implement agreed plans ahead of time. This is the ubiquitous public/private partnership referred to in the introduction to the exercise, and strangely is one of the key characteristics of fascist regimes. The notion of public/private partnerships is relatively new concept. In the past, sovereign governments were elected by citizens to govern them in domestic matters and represent them on the international stage. However, in the last few decades, another new concept of global stakeholders has evolved. These are large international corporations, private forums, think tanks and wealthy foundations. Examples of “global business leaders” mentioned on the Event 201 website are Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the World Economic Forum, Google and Facebook. Is it a coincidence that these unelected stakeholders played a pivotal role during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic?

One of the main topics for discussion by the participants of Event 201 was how to deal with misinformation and disinformation. There were discussions of lockdowns and rapid development of new vaccines, and strategies to keep messaging on target. The fictional coronavirus in the exercise killed 65 million people within 18 months. And is it not remarkable that the messaging and strategies cooked up at Event 201 were all ready to roll, and used, during the actual SARS-CoV-2 pandemic declared a few months later? If this seems incredulous, check the details in the linked document.

### *SPARS 2017*

To discuss SPARS 2017, we need to briefly take a step back a couple of months to early 2017. In May 2017, preparation began for a simulation to a contagion called MARS (Mountain Associated Respiratory Virus) which was a joint exercise scenario for health

---

126

ministries at a G20 event to be held in Berlin. The two events are linked, and in the documents described:<sup>127</sup>

*German governmental institutions collaborated to produce the simulation with the Gates Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the World Bank, the World Health Organization, and the Robert Koch Institution...*

*The exercises' two moderators also worked closely with the Gates Foundation; David Heymann served simultaneously as chair of the UK's Centre on Global Health Security and an epidemiologist with the Gates-funded London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. Heymann also sits with Moderna CEO Stéphane Bancel on the Mériem Foundation USA Board. BioMérieux is the French company that built the Wuhan lab. Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, Heymann has chaired the World Health Organization's Scientific Technical Advisory Group for Infectious Hazards. The other moderator of the 2017 simulation was Professor Ilona Kickbusch, a member of Gates's Global Preparedness Monitoring Board.*

*Over two days, the global health ministry officials and other "guest countries and international representatives" bore witness to a "timeline of the unfolding pandemic," known as MARS, a novel respiratory virus, spread from busy markets in a mountainous border region of an unnamed but China-like country – to nations around the globe. Only draconian clampdowns by neighboring governments and heroic WHO technocrats orchestrating a tightly choreographed centralized global response wave humanity from a chaotic dystopian apocalypse.*

In October 2017, another table top pandemic exercise was held at the Johns Hopkins Centre for Health Security, the global biosecurity command centre, the Gates Foundation, together with the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and the National Institutes of Health, both of which are major funders of the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. The SPARS 2017 document describes in its disclaimer:<sup>128</sup>

*This is a hypothetical scenario designed to illustrate the public health risk communication challenges that could potentially emerge during a naturally occurring infectious disease outbreak requiring development and distribution of novel and/or investigational drugs, vaccines, therapeutics, or other medical countermeasures. The infectious pathogen, medical countermeasures, characters, news media excerpts, social media posts, and government agency responses described herein are entirely fictional.*

The SPARS Scenario features an outbreak of the novel SPARS coronavirus first identified in a major US city in 2025. Over a three-year period, the virus spreads to every US state and more than 40 countries, where case fatality rates vary depending on the capabilities of local health systems. In the US, an existing drug is repurposed to treat SPARS symptoms while federal regulators work with a pharmaceutical company to fast-track the production of a SPARS vaccine. The response differs among nations. What follows is a nationwide vaccination effort and lingering strains on the US healthcare sector from a steady stream of patients seeking treatment for serious post-SPARS complications. Again, an eerily familiar scenario to what happened with the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic three years later.

---

<sup>127</sup> Robert F Kennedy Jr. *The Real Anthony Fauci*. Children's Health Defense. Skyhorse Publishing. 2021. pp. 412-413.

<sup>128</sup> Schoch-Spana, M., Brunson, E., Shearer, M., et al. The SPARS Pandemic 2025-2028 A Futuristic Scenario for Public Health Risk Communicators.

## CLADE X 2018

Another table top exercise conducted on 15 May 2018 hosted by The Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, as we know is partly funded by the Gates Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. The purpose of the exercise was to illustrate high-level strategic decisions and policies that the United States and the world will need to pursue in order to prevent a pandemic or diminish its consequences should prevention fail. Clade X was a day-long pandemic tabletop exercise that simulated a series of National Security Council–convened meetings of 10 US government leaders, played by individuals prominent in the fields of national security or epidemic response.<sup>129</sup>

The difference between CLADE X 2018 and SARS-CoV-2 is that CLADE X 2018 involved a “simulated response to a fictitious bioengineered pathogen for which there is no vaccine.” In this exercise, the pathogen was released in Europe by a doomsday cult and made its way to the US, killing 100 million along the way. In the meantime, crashing the stock market, healthcare systems, and creating global panic. It was picked up by the mainstream media which honed right in on the lack of preparedness for a global pandemic.<sup>130 131</sup> Clade X 2018 emphasised the need for militarised pandemic responses and explored strategies for controlling the media and social media. Essentially it was a training drill to prepare military, political, bureaucratic, and intelligence officials to support the coup d’état that would likely follow. Again, the simulation ends with the same affirmations as the other exercises, which is heavy-handed military control mechanisms, such as lockdowns, travel bans, censorship, isolating the healthy, in conjunction with mRNA vaccinations against the pathogen in which Bill Gates and Antony Fauci had already invested billions of dollars.

Other accounts of the exercise by fawning in situ journalists extolled the virtues of Bill Gates for helping to prepare the US and the world for a deadly pathogen which could escape at any minute.<sup>132</sup>

*This is the third major pandemic exercise that the Center for Health Security has run. The first, called Dark Winter, was held in 2001 and simulated a smallpox attack on Oklahoma. Its timing, just a few months before 9/11, made its terrifying outcome—the near-complete breakdown of government and civil society—deeply resonant. Dark Winter is credited, in part, with spurring George W. Bush to pass Directive 51, a largely classified plan to insure the continuity of government in the event of a “catastrophic emergency.”*

*“I would say there has been enormous progress in our preparedness since then,” Tom Inglesby, the center’s director, who played the national-security adviser in Clade X, told me. These advances include new preparedness programs and offices at the C.D.C. and the Department of Health and Human Services; national stockpiling of vaccines and medications; and, at the international level, investments in emergency financing and infectious-disease infrastructure. According to an article that appeared last year in the British Medical Journal, however, the world remains “grossly underprepared.” Philanthropist-in-chief Bill Gates drew on models developed by*

---

<sup>129</sup> Centre for Health Security. [Table Top Exercise: CLADE X 2018](#). Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. Accessed 13 August 2023.

<sup>130</sup> Tom Inglesby and Eric Toner. [Our lack of pandemic preparedness could prove deadly](#). *The Washington Post*. 19 September 2018.

<sup>131</sup> Lena H Sun. [This mock pandemic killed 150 million people. Next time it might not be a drill](#). *The Washington Post*. 30 May 2015.

<sup>132</sup> By Nicola Twilley. [The Terrifying Lessons of a Pandemic Simulation](#). *The New Yorker*. 1 June 2018.

*the Institute for Disease Modeling, a venture founded by his former Microsoft colleague Nathan Myhrvold, to warn that, at our current state of readiness, roughly thirty-three million people would die within the first six months of a global pandemic similar to the 1918 flu.*

The objective for CLADE X 2018 was the repetition of the message that a global pandemic was inevitable, that only vaccines could avert catastrophe, and all human freedoms were on the block. The participants swallowed it, the media swallowed it, and the public swallowed it, and the fix was in:<sup>133</sup>

*In September 2019, the Gates-funded Johns Hopkins Centre for Health Security followed up on its CLADE X 2018 even by issuing an eighty-four-page report, "Preparedness for a High-Impact Respiratory Pathogen Epidemic."<sup>134</sup> The report focused on the only end point that seemed to really concern Gates – the Gates/Fauci mRNA vaccine project. If there was any doubt that pushing mRNA vaccine was the entire purpose of the exercise, the white paper cleared that up. The CLADE X 2018 summary called for making the top priority of all governments, media, and biosecurity players the coordinated drive for:*

*...R&D aimed at rapid vaccine development for novel threats and distributed surge manufacturing ... Nucleic acid (RNA and DNA)-based vaccines are widely seen as highly promising and potentially rapid vaccine development pathways, though they have not yet broken through with licensed products.*

Through this sponsored exercise and subsequent report, Gates is promoting the need for a rapid mass vaccination strategy should the world have the misfortune to have a pandemic. All the while, his partner Anthony Fauci through the various agencies under his control, was funding gain of function research into coronaviruses in Wuhan, and other laboratories. The joke is on all of us, as it is certain at the time the report was released that SARS-CoV-2 was already circulating around the globe.

### *Crimson Contagion*

According to Robert F Kennedy, in June 2019, about six months before the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic was declared, Dr Michael Ryan, executive director of the World Health Organization's health emergencies program, summarised the conclusions of the "Preparedness for a High-Impact Respiratory Pathogen Epidemic" report, warning that "we are entering a new phase of high impact epidemics" that would constitute "a new normal" where governments worldwide would strengthen control and restrict the mobility of citizens."<sup>135</sup>

Enter Crimson Contagion. In August 2019, another exercise to be held over four days was launched. It was led by Robert Kadlec then President Trump's disaster response leader, with support from Anthony Fauci representing the National Institutes of Health, Dr Robert Redfield of the Centres for Disease Control and Health and Human Services secretary, Alex Azar. As Robert Kennedy explains:<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>133</sup> Robert F Kennedy Jr. *The Real Anthony Fauci*. Children's Health Defense. Skyhorse Publishing. 2021. p. 421

<sup>134</sup> [Preparedness for a High-Impact Respiratory Pathogen Pandemic](#). Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security. 10 September 2019.

<sup>135</sup> James Gallagher. [Large Ebola outbreaks new normal, says WHO](#). BBC News. 7 June 2019.

<sup>136</sup> Robert F Kennedy Jr. *The Real Anthony Fauci*. Children's Health Defense. Skyhorse Publishing. 2021. p. 423.



*So now Kadlec – who had, for twenty years, had been writing scripts for using a pandemic to overthrow democracy and curtail constitutional rights – was in the perfect position to do just that. With this virus simulation, he included all the key players who would manage what was to become a de facto coup d'état sixty days hence.*

*While earlier simulations functioned as training drills for high-level political, military, press, intelligence agency, and regulatory commissars, the 2019 Crimson Contagion simulation functioned as a nationwide crusade to evangelize state-level health bureaucracies, municipal officials, hospital and law enforcement agencies across America with the messages developed in the preceding simulations.*

*Under a veil of enforced secrecy, organizers staged the Crimson Contagion exercise nationwide at over 100 centers. "Participation included 19 federal departments and agencies, 12 key states, 15 tribal nations and pueblos, 74 local health department and coalition regions, 87 hospitals, and over 100 healthcare and public health private sector partners." The simulation scenario envisioned a "novel influenza" pandemic originating in China labeled H7N9. As with COVID-19, air travelers rapidly spread the deadly respiratory illness across the globe...The multistate, multiregional exercise that took place just months before the real-world COVID-19 pandemic focused on "critical infrastructure protection; economic impact; social distancing; scarce resource allocation; prioritization of vaccines and other countermeasures..."*

The draft report from the Crimson Contagion exercise only surfaced following a freedom of information request. The report dated 19 October 2019 was marked "not to be disclosed,"<sup>137</sup> but after another FOI request, finally found its way into the public arena as a *New York Times* headline on 20 March 2020, well after SARS-CoV-2 had taken hold.<sup>138</sup>

A detailed reading of the draft report holds interesting clues as to what was to come, from mask shortages to using specific death numbers, the Crimson Contagion's planners had prepared for every conceivable contingency many months before SARS-CoV-2 was even identified as a threat. Just another coincidence, no?

### **The official narrative: SARS-CoV-2 is naturally derived**

Broadly speaking, there are four main theories about the origins of SARS-CoV-2:

1. a zoonotic virus that naturally mutated from bats to humans
2. accidental release from the Wuhan Institute of Virology
3. deliberately released from the Wuhan Institute of Virology by China itself or by unknown actors
4. SARS-CoV-2 is a hoax as viruses do not exist.

It comes as no surprise that the first theory is the only accepted narrative, that is SARS-CoV-2 has its origins in nature as a mutated virus that jumped from species to humans. The second and third theories get some coverage in mainstream media but are largely dismissed as conspiracy theories. Any person claiming the fourth theory is the explanation for the

---

<sup>137</sup> [After-Action Report and internal Final Report for the Crimson Contagion exercise, 2019](#). U.S. Department Of Health And Human Services Office Of The Assistant Secretary For Preparedness And Response. January 2020.

<sup>138</sup> David E. Sanger, Eric Lipton, Eileen Sullivan and Michael Crowley. [Before Virus Outbreak, a Cascade of Warnings Went Unheeded](#). *The New York Times*. 19 March 2020. Updated 4 September 2021.

origins of SARS-CoV-2 will be shut down, censored and removed. No debate, no opinion about anything but the first theory is allowed. If this seems difficult to believe, examine the permitted narrative sources which are current to this day. Of course, these groups/institutions are those that the misinformation/disinformation bill would have us trust and believe in. Here are a few quick examples:

#### Wikipedia<sup>139</sup>

*Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, there have been efforts by scientists, governments, and others to determine the origin of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Most scientists agree that, as with many other pandemics in human history, the virus is likely derived from a bat-borne virus transmitted to humans via another animal in nature or during wildlife trade such as that in food markets. Many other explanations, including several conspiracy theories, have been proposed. Some scientists and politicians have speculated that SARS-CoV-2 was accidentally released from a laboratory. This theory is not supported by evidence.*

#### New England Journal of Medicine<sup>140</sup>

*The two major hypotheses are a natural zoonotic spillover, most likely occurring at the Huanan Seafood Wholesale Market, and a laboratory leak from the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV)...*

*The joint WHO–China technical report published in March 2021 rated a zoonotic spillover as a “likely to very likely” source of the virus, cold food–chain products as “possible,” and a laboratory incident as “extremely unlikely....”*

*Of the three possibilities — natural, accidental, or deliberate — the most scientific evidence yet identified supports natural emergence. More than half of the earliest Covid-19 cases were connected to the Huanan market, and epidemiologic mapping revealed that the concentration of cases was centered there. In January 2020, Chinese officials cleared the market without testing live animals, but positive environmental samples, including those from an animal cage and a hair-and-feather–removal machine, indicated the presence of both SARS-CoV-2 and Covid-susceptible animals...*

#### World Health Organisation<sup>141</sup>

*In summary, the joint team considered the following ranking of potential introduction pathways, from very likely to extremely unlikely: (1) through an intermediate host; (2) direct zoonotic introduction; (3) introduction through cold/ food chain; and (4) introduction resulting from a laboratory incident.*

#### American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene<sup>142</sup>

*SARS-CoV-2 emerged essentially as predicted: a natural event associated with either direct transmission of a bat coronavirus to humans or indirect transmission to humans via an*

---

<sup>139</sup> Wikipedia. [Origin of Covid-19](#). Accessed 09 August 2023.

<sup>140</sup> Gostin, LO and Gronvall, GK. [The Origins of Covid-19 — Why It Matters \(and Why It Doesn't\)](#). June 22, 2023 N Engl J Med 2023; 388:2305-2308.

<sup>141</sup> World Health Organization. [WHO-convened global study of origins of SARS-CoV-2: China Part. Joint WHO-China Study Team report](#). 14 January-10 February 2021

<sup>142</sup> Morens DM, et al. [The Origin of COVID-19 and Why It Matters](#). Am J Trop Med Hyg. 2020 Sep;103(3):955-959.

*intermediate host such as a Malaysian pangolin (Manis javanica) or another, yet-to-be-identified mammal...*

*We have entered a new pandemic era, one in which epidemic and pandemic emergences are becoming commonplace; some are likely to be highly pathogenic. In 2020, our science is sufficiently robust to have a good chance of controlling pandemic viral emergences within 2–3 years, but dramatically insufficient to prevent and control their emergences in the first place.*

*We should begin developing broadly protective vaccines and broadly therapeutic antiviral/antimicrobial agents against pathogens within taxonomic groups likely to emerge in the future, including coronaviruses, henipaviruses, and filoviruses, among others. Organizations like the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations,<sup>143</sup> among others, should be extended and strengthened, emphasizing, in addition to vaccine development, therapeutics as well as prevention tools. Pandemic prevention should be a global effort on a par with chemical and nuclear weapon prevention.*

### Australian government<sup>144</sup>

#### PAUL KELLY:

*So, the question of the origin of the virus has been one I haven't been asked for a while, but it certainly was early on something that was of great interest. I must say, I'm much more focused now on what's happening in Victoria, and what's happening around the world in relation to this virus. It continues to be a global pandemic of massive proportions. Thousands and thousands of people every day being affected, hundreds and hundreds of people around the world dying from this virus. So, right now, I'm more interested in what we can learn about controlling the virus and particularly developments of vaccines and effective treatments, rather than where it came from. But you're right, the Australian Government is very interested and as a scientist I'm very interested in the origins of this particular virus and what we can learn for the next time if it happens again, another what is most likely a zoonotic infection, having crossed from one species-another species to humans.*

*Let's look at the facts. We know that the first cases that were reported were in Wuhan. Whether it came from Wuhan or not will be a matter for the internationally agreed WHO-led team that will be investigating this when that comes to happen. Australia has been very much at the forefront of asking for that particular independent look at the origin of the virus, and I'm sure we will learn a lot at that time.*

### Associated Press<sup>145</sup>

*International scientists who examined previously unavailable genetic data from samples collected at a market close to where the first human cases of COVID-19 were detected in China said they found suggestions the pandemic originated from animals, not a lab...*

*International scientists who examined previously unavailable genetic data from samples collected at a market close to where the first human cases of COVID-19 were detected in China said they found suggestions the pandemic originated from animals, not a lab.*

---

<sup>143</sup> Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and Wellcome Pledge US\\$300 Million to CEPI for COVID-19 Pandemic Response and to Accelerate Epidemic Preparedness](#). 18 January 2022.

<sup>144</sup> Australian Government. [Acting Chief Medical Officer press conference about COVID-19 on 26 August 2020](#) Read the transcript of Acting Chief Medical Officer, Professor Paul Kelly, about COVID-19.

<sup>145</sup> [New COVID origins data suggests pandemic linked to animals](#). *The Associated Press*. 17 March 2023.

The official story of the SARS-CoV-2 “pandemic” is a staggering concoction of unscientific nonsense and outright lies.<sup>146</sup> This started with the tales about the allegedly natural origin of the virus. Anyone, from ordinary people to high profile journalists, doctors, public officials, celebrities, scientists, academics, who dared question the official narrative of SARS-CoV-2 being of natural origin was immediately denounced as a dangerous “conspiracy theorist.” While it is much more complex than this, the official story at the time went along the lines of SARS-CoV-2 being a distant relative of the less infectious wild bat-derived SARS-CoV virus that infected 8,000 people in 2002-2004 (this is why it was officially termed SARS-CoV-2). This wild bat virus then somehow mutated, reordering its genetic code to incorporate the DNA of a pangolin making it more infectious and more virulent. Yet curiously there is no biological, genomic, or epidemiological trace of the virus’s evolutionary history. Nevertheless, the official story was that the SARS-CoV-2 virus rapidly mutated yet again and gained the ability to infect humans causing a global pandemic. We were urged to believe that the first act of this tragic drama occurred sometime at the end of 2019 at a wet market (the Huanan Seafood Wholesale Market) in Wuhan China where meat and other products from wild animals are sold.

The natural origins story of SARS-CoV-2 was regurgitated so many times by international global organisations, the mainstream media, governments, the medical establishment, and the super technology organisations that it was difficult to find any other explanation.<sup>147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155</sup> Those who did question, of course, were summarily ridiculed, berated and dismissed as dangerous conspiracy theorists, censored and/or banned on social media platforms, or even from Parliament.<sup>156</sup> The list of dangerous wrong thinkers included scientists, medical professionals and other world-renowned experts who dared to raise the weight of evidence and express concerns about the official story. Many others simply expressed curiosity at the preponderance of switching stories, incredulous “facts” coming from health authorities and media sources, much of it without any proper scientific or medical evidence. Once the restrictions kicked in, freedoms once taken for granted were removed often with violent enforcement of mandates, led some people to feel that things just did not add up. Little did we know earlier on that what we were experiencing was just not in our own back yards. The same messaging often word for word, the same actions, the same responses, the same restrictions, the same reports, the same advice were in complete lockstep in many countries across the world.

---

<sup>146</sup> Palmer M et al. 2023. [mRNA Vaccine Toxicity](#). Doctors for Covid Ethics. Pp. 1-2.

<sup>147</sup> Peros CS et al. 2021. [Bushmeat, wet markets, and the risks of pandemics: Exploring the nexus through systematic review of scientific disclosures](#). *Environmental Science & Policy*. Vol 124. Pp 1-11.

<sup>148</sup> Bing Lin AB et al. 2021. [A better classification of wet markets is key to safeguarding human health and biodiversity](#). *The Lancet (Planetary Health)*. Vol 5, Issue 6, E386-E394, JUNE 2021.

<sup>149</sup> United Nations. Health News. [WHO and partners urge countries to halt sales of wild mammals at food markets](#). 13 April 2021.

<sup>150</sup> Ian Lloyd Neubauer. [COVID or not, ‘the desire to eat wildlife’ continues in Asia](#). Al Jazeera. 13 July 2021.

<sup>151</sup> Bill Birtles. [VIDEO: Calls for bats to be banned from Indonesian wet markets](#). ABC Australia. 1 August 2023.

<sup>152</sup> Jackie Northam. [Calls Grow To Ban Wet Markets Amid Concerns Over Disease Spread](#). NPR. 16 April 2020.

<sup>153</sup> Helen Briggs. [Coronavirus: WHO developing guidance on wet markets](#). BBC. 21 April 2020.

<sup>154</sup> The Economist. [Will wet markets be hung out to dry after the pandemic?](#) 26 May 2020.

<sup>155</sup> National Geographic. [Wet Markets launched the coronavirus. Here’s what you need to know](#). (paywall)

<sup>156</sup> Jade Macmillan. [Scott Morrison criticises ‘crazy’ COVID-19 conspiracy theories, George Christensen defends comments on restrictions](#). ABC News. 11 August 2021.

## The evidence: SARS-CoV-2 was NOT naturally derived

Right from the start we were fed misinformation and disinformation by our collective governments, the medical establishment, the mainstream media, and health authorities about the source of SARS-CoV-2.<sup>157 158 159</sup> This was no wild bat virus, and we now know this from multiple documented sources.<sup>160 161 162 163</sup> Even the FBI Director floated the lab-leak theory when it suited his political purposes,<sup>164</sup> as did the US Department of Energy of all sources.<sup>165</sup> Curiously, back in August 2021, the House Foreign Affairs Committee Minority Staff had announced that the pandemic came from the Wuhan lab.<sup>166</sup> The addendum to their report states:

*It is the opinion of Committee Minority Staff, based on the preponderance of available information; the documented efforts to obfuscate, hide, and destroy evidence; and the lack of physical evidence to the contrary; that SARS-CoV-2 was accidentally released from a Wuhan Institute of Virology laboratory sometime prior to September 12, 2019.*

Voices are being bravely raised in some mainstream media outlets to propose an alternative narrative. Journalist Sharri Markson has detailed how Dr Anthony Fauci had deliberately played down suspicions of a Wuhan lab leak to protect his reputation and deflect from NIH-funded coronavirus research at the lab. In an exclusive interview with *The Australian*, Dr Robert Kaldec, a senior US health official and Fauci's former boss, said that he, Fauci and NIH director Francis Collins had privately discussed how to "turn down the temperature" on accusations against China.<sup>167</sup> Gain of function, no gain of function. These people in charge of critical research with deadly pathogens conveniently cannot seem to get their stories straight.

Because the misinformation and disinformation about the origins of SARS-CoV-2 continues to rage, it is fortunate to have of whistleblowers who were actually involved in the development and management of what came to be known as the gain of function research at the Wuhan Institute of Virology and are prepared to talk. Dr Andrew G Huff, former

---

<sup>157</sup> Christopher Brito. [Dr. Fauci again dismisses Wuhan lab as source of coronavirus](#). CBS News. 5 May 2020.

<sup>158</sup> Alex Gutentag, Leighton Woodhouse, Michael Shellenberger, And Matt Taibbi. [Top Scientists Misled Congress About Covid Origins, Newly Released Emails And Messages Show](#). Public. Substack. 19 July 2023.

<sup>159</sup> Erika P. [Coronavirus is 'Perfectly Adapted' to Infect Humans Raising Suspicions that it's Either Man-Made or A Complete Nuke of Nature: Australian Scientists](#). Science Times. 27 May 2020.

<sup>160</sup> [On the Origin of SARS Coronavirus 2](#). Swiss Policy Research. March 2022.

<sup>161</sup> Deigin Y, Segreto R. [SARS-CoV-2's claimed natural origin is undermined by issues with genome sequences of its relative strains](#). Bio Essays. 27 May 2021.

<sup>162</sup> Dr Robert Malone. [Puppet Masters of the Pandemic. Part 1: What Did The CIA Do in Wuhan?!](#). SubStack. 4 August 2023.

<sup>163</sup> Alex Gutentag, Leighton Woodhouse, Michael Shellenberger, And Matt Taibbi. [Top Scientists Misled Congress About Covid Origins, Newly Released Emails And Messages Show](#). SubStack. 19 July 2023.

<sup>164</sup> Lois Beckett. [FBI director endorses theory Covid-19 virus may have leaked from Chinese lab](#). *The Guardian*. 1 March 2023.

<sup>165</sup> Jeremy Herb and Natasha Bertrand. [US Energy Department assesses Covid-19 likely resulted from lab leak, furthering US intel divide over virus origin](#). CNN Politics. 27 February 2023.

<sup>166</sup> [The Origins of Covid-19, an Investigation of the Wuhan Institute of Virology](#). Committee Minority Staff. The House Foreign Affairs Committee. August 2021.

<sup>167</sup> Sharri Markson. [Covid cover-up: how the science was silenced](#). *The Australian*. 28 July 2023.

Senior Scientist and Vice President at EcoHealth Alliance, and expert in the fields of bioterrorism and biowarfare, writes: <sup>168</sup>

*This is the first truth about Wuhan: there is no evidence that SARS-CoV-2 naturally emerged. None...*

*The cover-up of SARS-CoV-2 began with the Chinese in September 2019, and this fact should not be surprising...*

*In January 2020, Dr Kristian Andersen of the Scripps Research had been examining the genetic characteristics of SARS-CoV-2. While I worked at EchoHealth, Dr Andersen and I had been looking for ways to collaborate. In an email exchange with Anthony Fauci and Jeremy Farrar, (Wellcome Trust), Andersen stated:*

*The problem is that our phylogenetic analyses aren't able to answer whether the sequences are unusual at individual residues, except if they are completely off. The unusual features of the virus make up a really small part of the genome (<0.1%) so one has to look really closely at all the sequences to see that some of the features (potentially) look engineered...all find the genome inconsistent with expectations from evolutionary theory ... there are still further analysis to be done, so those opinions could change.*

*Just four days later, Andersen gave feedback in advance to a National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine letter that was referenced in the prestigious *The Lancet* medical journal to argue against the idea had been engineered and brand it a conspiracy theory.*

Dr Huff then goes on to say that shortly after Dr Andersen's public reversal of position, the funding from the NIH and NIAID tripled. Of particular note is Andersen's et al paper which proposed a natural zoonotic pathway and speculated about how the leap to humans might have occurred. <sup>169</sup> The authors elaborate on a potential conduit in intermediate animals, likely pangolins. For example, "The presence in pangolins of an RBD [Receptor Binding Domain] very similar to that of SARS-CoV-2 means that we can infer that this was probably in the virus that jumped to humans. This leaves the insertion of [a] polybasic cleavage site to occur during human-to-human transmission." This viral evolution occurred in "Malayan pangolins illegally imported into Guangdong province". Even with these speculations there are major logic and scientific gaps in this theory. For example, why is the virus so well adapted to humans? Why Wuhan (in Hubei province), which is 1,000 Km from Guangdong? Criticisms of Andersen's et al paper emerged across many scientific disciplines, <sup>170</sup> but as we have already established, the prevailing narrative of zoonotic transmission outflanked the lab-leak theory. Fact checkers were then sent out to hunt down the dissenting views. At the time of writing their paper, Latham's and Wilson's note that:

*Thus, while countless scientific publications on the pandemic assert in their introductions that a zoonotic origin for SARS-CoV-2 is a matter of fact or near-certainty (and Andersen et al has 860 citations as of July 14th), there is still not one published scientific paper asserting that a lab escape is even a credible hypothesis that deserves investigation.*

---

<sup>168</sup> Huff AG. 2022. *The Truth About Wuhan: How I Uncovered the Biggest Lie in History*. Skyhorse Publishing.

<sup>169</sup> Andersen, K.G., Rambaut, A., Lipkin, W.I. et al. [The proximal origin of SARS-CoV-2](#). *Nat Med* 26, 450–452 (2020).

<sup>170</sup> Latham J and Wilson A. [A Proposed Origin for SARS-CoV-2 and the COVID-19 Pandemic](#). *Independent Science News*. 15 July 2020.

According to many experts, the virus was the product of collaborative US/Chinese gain of function research which deliberately set out to make viruses and other pathogens more deadly. The origin of SARS-CoV-2 is easily traced and documented in multiple scientific publications,<sup>171</sup> most of them funded at least in part by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and Dr Anthony Fauci's National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID). According to Andrew Huff, the creation of SARS-CoV-2 and the accompanying vaccines date back to at least 1987. This was following experiments conducted by Dr Robert Malone who mixed strands of messenger RNA with droplets of fat to create a molecular soup which enabled mRNA vaccines possible. Dr Huff details what actually went on behind the scenes while he was employed at EchoHealth Alliance. Of particular note is a paper co-written by Dr Ralph Baric, in which the authors describe in detail how they used, designed and constructed full-length chimeric viruses to determine if they would replicate in human airway cultures.<sup>172</sup> The following long excerpt from Andrew Huff's book about this particular article is worth restating:

*This specific paper is relevant because it compares and documents the effectiveness of different variations of coronavirus spike proteins at infecting human cells specifically by binding to ACE2 receptor, which was a critical and necessary step to design and engineer the SARS-CoV-2 virus. While employed at EchoHealth Alliance, I met both Dr Shi Zhengli and Dr Ralph Baric, when they presented their work on the design and engineering of SARS-CoV-2 (coronavirus gain of function research), and the use of highly specialized humanized mice models, which were necessary to successfully build SARS-CoV-2.*

*These facts are supported by numerous recorded presentations by Dr Peter Daszak and Dr Ralph Baric from 2015-2019, some of which I personally attended while employed at EchoHealth Alliance. Additionally, the specific gain of function work described in this paper was presented by Dr Peter Daszak to In-Q-Tel, a DoD and CIA venture capital firm. In the slides presented to In-Q-Tel, which I personally helped create at EchoHealth, the use of USAID-EPT-PREDICT funding to collect coronavirus samples from bats globally is described, where they are then analyzed to identify their most dangerous features to humans and recombined to make new coronaviruses like SARS-CoV-2. Then, these viruses are tested on mice to validate lethality and transmissibility. EchoHealth Alliance then used Dr Baric's work for testing experimental vaccines, treatments, and therapeutics against the newly-engineered SARS-CoV-2 strain to determine which countermeasures would be the most effective at mitigating the disease in humanized mice.<sup>173</sup>*

SARS-CoV-2 was deliberately released from the Wuhan Institute of Virology, actually when this occurred is a matter for speculation, but highly likely to be around early to mid 2019. Dr Peter Breggin and Ginger Ross Breggin, authors of the book, *COVID-19 and the Global Predators: We Are Their Prey*<sup>174</sup> have put together a well-referenced and comprehensive timeline of more than 80 pages detailing pertinent events leading up to the "SARS-CoV-2 pandemic" dating back to the 1920s.<sup>175</sup> Ever since SARS-CoV-1 emerged in southern China in

---

<sup>171</sup> Breggin PR and Breggin GR. 2020. [COVID-19 Treachery Against the US and the World How Dr. Anthony Fauci Enabled China to Make SARS-CoV-2 and to Stockpile Biological Weapons.](#)

<sup>172</sup> Menachery VD et al. [SARS-like WIV1-CoV poised for human emergence.](#) Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2016 Mar 15;113(11):3048-53.

<sup>173</sup> Huff AG. 2022. *The Truth About Wuhan: How I Uncovered the Biggest Lie in History.* Skyhorse Publishing. P. 185.

<sup>174</sup> Breggin PR and Breggin GR. 2021. *COVID-19 and the Global Predators: We Are Their Prey.* Lake Edge Press. NY.

<sup>175</sup> [Chronology and Overview of COVID-19 Events](#) from the book *COVID-19 and the Global Predators: We Are the Prey* by Peter R. Breggin MD and Ginger R. Breggin. Updated.

2002-2004, an enormous effort has been made to find a SARS-CoV in nature. No SARS-CoV emergence among humans has ever been traced to nature, but at least seven have been traced to laboratories. A lengthy scientific paper which used Bayesian Analysis concluded that the chance of SARS-CoV-2 being of zoonotic origin is 0.2%.<sup>176</sup> A Swiss Policy Research paper on the origins of SARS-CoV-2 also concluded that evidence available supported a lab-related origin of the novel coronavirus.<sup>177</sup> Scientists have warned about the potential for zoonotic transmission of viruses through gain of function research for some time.<sup>178</sup>

Almost four years since the pandemic was declared, the fallout keeps on turning up evidence to support the deliberate leak of something. While it is difficult to conceive of the cosy relationship between China and the US through the NIH, NIAID, other agencies, including the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), Centres for Disease Control (CDC), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the end result is that bioengineered pathogens were released on the world's population. Two questions go begging here: who would possibly believe that the Chinese government would let the US engineer potential bioweapons in its own country — without having complete control of the process? And who could believe humankind would "benefit" from the genetic enhancement of animal viruses to cause a deadly pandemic in human populations? But funding for such diabolical projects was and is still ongoing.

The "SARS-CoV-2 pandemic" was, and still is, the most incredibly coordinated complex war on humanity in world history and involves an array of multiple players from a diverse network including major worldwide corporations, globalist organisations such as the World Health Organisation, International Monetary Fund and the United Nations, banking and finance, public health, universities, wealthy foundations, what is termed "big tech" companies such as Google, Apple, Microsoft, Twitter – X, and Facebook. Anyone who believes the "SARS-CoV-2 pandemic" just happened when a bat met a pangolin is not paying attention and has much research to catch up on. Where we all find ourselves today as a result of the draconian actions from our collective governments is decades, if not hundreds of years, in the making. The people of the world are being primed for mass depopulation event. SARS-CoV-2 is just the beginning.

In November 2019, before the novel coronavirus become publicly known, Peter Daszak openly stated<sup>179</sup> that EcoHealth Alliance and the Wuhan Institute of Virology were doing the type of research that could create viruses like SARS-CoV-2. The US military is the largest sponsor of EcoHealth Alliance.<sup>180</sup> In fact, EcoHealth Alliance may be described as a US military contractor or front organization.<sup>181</sup> A leaked 2018 US DARPA grant application by EcoHealth and the Wuhan Institute of Virology describes the planning of high-risk coronavirus experiments, including the introduction of "human-specific cleavage sites" to

---

<sup>176</sup> Steven Carl Quay. [A Bayesian analysis concludes beyond a reasonable doubt that SARS-CoV-2 is not a natural zoonosis but instead is laboratory derived](#). Zenodo. 29 March 2021.

<sup>177</sup> [On the Origin of SARS Coronavirus 2. Swiss Policy Research](#). Updated March 2022.

<sup>178</sup> Butler, D. [Engineered bat virus stirs debate over risky research](#). *Nature*. 2015.

<sup>179</sup> Peter Daszak Twitter account. 21 November 2019 [Tweet](#).

<sup>180</sup> Sam Hussein. [Peter Daszak's EcoHealth Alliance Has Hidden Almost \\$40 Million In Pentagon Funding And Militarized Pandemic Science](#). Biotechnology, Health, News. Independent Science News. 16 December 2020.

<sup>181</sup> Sainath Suryanarayanan. [EcoHealth Alliance Orchestrated Key Scientists' Statement on "natural origin" of SARS-CoV-2](#). Independent Science News. 19 November 2020.



bat coronaviruses and the “release of skin-penetrating nanoparticles and aerosols containing ‘novel chimeric spike proteins’ of bat coronaviruses into cave bats in Yunnan, China.” The idea appears to have been to “immunize” bats against coronaviruses that could jump to humans (Project DEFUSE).

### **SARS-CoV-2 hinged on PCR Tests**

The public was erroneously told that the PCR tests were infallible and could measure the quantity of virus present in the sample. Throughout the entire SARS-CoV-2 “pandemic” it is difficult to know the biggest lie told to the people, in other words what misinformation and disinformation about so many aspects did the worst damage. It is a race to the bottom, but one of the front contenders is surely the PCR test. Without the PCR test, the so-called SARS-CoV-2 pandemic would largely have gone unnoticed. It hardly needs pointing out that the entire SARS-CoV-2 pandemic is contingent upon the positive results using the most popular testing method, the PCR testing procedure. Without the desperate calls to “test, test, test” by all lead organisations such as the World Health Organization, testing for SARS-CoV-2 would likely have been through more standard methods, such as that used for influenza. PCR tests were never designed to test live viruses and the amplification rendered them utterly useless. The PCR test was used to criminally install the fear into populations with the most outrageous fear campaign. Almost four years later, most people are not aware how much misinformation and disinformation surrounded the PCR test. To establish the context for these lies, an historical perspective is needed.

It is beyond question that the main method of testing (others being viral and antibody/serology) for SARS-CoV-2, the PCR test, is seriously flawed and the reviews have failed. This is the reason why it was recalled and recommended not to be used after 31 December 2021. The CDC’s own calculations showed that the PCR tests that detect live viruses in samples that have gone above 33 cycle thresholds are unreliable. Furthermore, research published in April 2020 concluded patients with positive PCR tests that had a cycle threshold above 33 were not contagious and could safely be discharged from the hospital or home isolation.

A small but important digression is needed for perspective. The number of so-called positive SARS-CoV-2 cases in Australia and around the world, including the mortality rates, are not consistent with a deadly pandemic, such as the Black Plague in the Middle Ages which killed one third of Europe, and the and the Spanish Influenza Pandemic in two years between 1918-1920. We now know that If if someone is tested by PCR as positive at a threshold of 35 cycles or higher, the probability that person is actually infected is less than 3%. In other words, the probability that the person will have a false positive result is 97%. The Review Report concludes that the maximum reasonably reliable cycle threshold value is 30 cycles. Above a cycle threshold of 35 cycles, rapidly increasing numbers of false positives must be expected. Therefore, PCR data evaluated as positive after a cycle threshold value of 35 cycles are completely unreliable.<sup>182</sup>

*Between 30 and 35 there is a grey area, where a positive test cannot be established with certainty. This area should be excluded. Of course, one could perform 45 PCR cycles, as recommended in the Corman-Drosten WHO-protocol (Figure 4), but then you also have to*

---

<sup>182</sup> Borger, P. et al. Review report Corman-Drosten et al. Eurosurveillance 2020. International Consortium of Scientists in Life Sciences (ICSLS) [Oct 2020 – Jan 2021] <https://cormandrostenreview.com/>

*define a reasonable Ct-value (which should not exceed 30). But an analytical result with a Ct value of 45 is scientifically and diagnostically absolutely meaningless (a reasonable Ct-value should not exceed 30). All this should be communicated very clearly. It is a significant mistake that the Corman-Drosten paper does not mention the maximum Ct value at which a sample can be unambiguously considered as a positive or a negative test-result. This important cycle threshold limit is also not specified in any follow-up submissions to date.*

Dr Michael Yeadon is a specialist virologist and former VP and Chief Scientist of Pfizer Global R &D, who in an article from September 2020 on the PCR test, writes:<sup>183</sup>

*I was frankly astonished to realise they're sometimes used in population screening for diseases – astonished because it is a very exacting technique, prone to invisible errors and it's quite a tall order to get reliable information out of it, especially because of the prodigious amounts of amplification involved in attempting to pick up a strand of viral genetic code. The test cannot distinguish between a living virus and a short strand of RNA from a virus which broke into pieces weeks or months ago.*

Dr Yeadon followed this article up in December 2020 with a lengthy article on the failure of the PCR test and called for it to be removed as a valid test for SARS-CoV-2:<sup>184</sup>

*The entire 'second wave' is supported solely on the back of a flawed mass PCR test, which at industrialized scale was never, in my view and the views of others skilled in PCR, capable of delivering trustworthy results. I have detailed the evidence supporting the claim that the autumn PCR test results are not reliably detecting COVID-19 infection. It may seem a leap to damn the PCR test and claim that there isn't an epidemic but a pseudo-epidemic. But even in the hands of skilled and careful people, the strange phenomenon of the PCR false positive pseudo-epidemic has occurred several times before. In large, industrialised labs, it is very likely that significant and unmeasured cross-contamination related false positive rates are occurring.*

*The key sign of a PCR false positive pseudo-epidemic is the relative paucity of excess deaths equal to the deaths claimed to be occurring as a result of the lethal infective agent. This key sign is present.*

*The unprecedented "'second wave' conundrum is solved. It's of course not happening, but why a 'second wave' was talked up, months before unreliable PCR testing data was brought into service, demands deeper investigation. It's not a science matter: not unless the team predicting the wave can produce the scientific literature upon which the prediction and modelling was based."*

Finally, Kary Mullis inventor of the PCR test stated it is "incapable of diagnosing disease" as it cannot distinguish between inactive and reproductive viruses. Kary Mullis spoke about the meaningful interpretation of results using PCR tests and its capacity to be misused. There are many millions of views of this linked conversation on multiple platforms, including YouTube. The linked video was taken in 1993 and the discussion was around the HIV-AIDS virus. Internet fact checking websites discredit this discussion as it doesn't specifically refer to SARS-CoV-2.<sup>185</sup> However, as a general principle the PCR test, because of its high levels of magnification, is incapable of diagnosing infectious disease or levels of infectivity in a

---

<sup>183</sup> Dr Michael Yeadon. [Lies, Damned Lies and Health Statistics – the Deadly Danger of False Positives](#). The Daily Sceptic. 20 September 2020.

<sup>184</sup> Dr Michael Yeadon. [The PCR False Positive Pseudo-Epidemic](#). The Daily Sceptic. 25 December 2020

<sup>185</sup> [Kary Mullis Speaks To Misuse Of PCR \(1993\)](#). Internet Archive. Accessed 14 August 2023.

meaningful or reliable way. (<https://archive.org/details/kary-mullis-speaks-to-misuse-of-pcr-1993>)

A TED talk by Nobel Laureate Kary Mullis in 2013 also on YouTube, explains his scientific philosophy.<sup>186</sup> Kary Mullis and Anthony Fauci (former director of the U.S. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases) often had public disagreements around the use of PCR tests and the science behind the process. A link to an interview with Kary Mullis viewed by many millions on YouTube, has long since disappeared from mainstream media, so the original source can't be found. Unfortunately, Kary Mullis is unable to comment on the current use of PCR tests, as his death occurred on 7 August 2019, right before the outbreak of SARS-CoV-2.

### **Masks as protection from SARS-CoV-2**

There are many complex issues associated with the response to the so-called SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, but one that is fraught with conflicting advice and “flip-flopping” from so-called medical experts is the issue of mandated mask wearing in the community. In the end this was misinformation and disinformation for the people of the world. Even now, mask wearing is not uncommon, and this demonstrates that people are not aware of the dangers and have listened to the misinformation coming from our governments and health authorities. This will be having deleterious impacts on their health, but because they listen to the trusted authorities, they are none the wiser.

### **What was the prevailing narrative about masks?**

The authors of the article “Masking evidence with politics,”<sup>187</sup> maintain that despite two decades of pandemic preparedness, there is considerable uncertainty as to the value of wearing masks. Further, the authors point out that there WAS evidence of high rates of infection with cloth masks and discussion of benefits of medical masks in the appropriate setting. Since the advent of SARS-CoV-2 the evidence base for mask wearing has reduced to such an extent that the numerous systematic reviews that have been recently published unsurprisingly broadly reach the same conclusions. The authors point out that even with lower quality evidence, recent reviews found masks to be effective, while at the same time recommending robust randomised trials to inform the evidence for these interventions.

### **Evidence that mask-wearing is not only useless, but harmful**

Before we look at the official narrative about mask wearing and the medical evidence that went along to support it, it will be necessary to cover how the actual evidence is now being manipulated and controlled. This is because the evidence cannot be examined in isolation of the current climate of control by giant corporate entities and big government. This would be akin to dissecting an ant to understand how an ant colony works. So, with that in mind, let us briefly examine the politicisation of evidence within the carefully crafted behavioural science framework that is now controlling every aspect of our lives since the emergence of SARS-CoV-2. If this draconian misinformation/disinformation bill is passed, evidence such as this would not be permitted to be accessed as it would not fit the official narrative about masks wearing.

---

<sup>186</sup> [Sons of Sputnik: Kary Mullis at TEDxOrangeCoast](#). Ted Talks. YouTube. Accessed 14 August 2023.

<sup>187</sup> Jefferson T, Heneghan C. [Masking lack of evidence with politics](#). The Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine. July 23, 2020.

Following the money is always a good place to start. Whether this is large multinational corporate conglomerates, or international cabals with shadowy funding arrangements, mega banks, or giant social media, or global mainstream media outlets when you start to dig, there are wheels within wheels, cogs within cogs, and more questions than answers. Nevertheless, it is difficult to ignore when researching evidence for the efficacy of mask wearing, as overt censorship of this subject is becoming more obvious as this paper will reveal. So pervasive is this problem that it would be very easy for the censorship and politicisation of science issues to dominate the discussion. However, for the purpose of providing context, a brief treatment of these matters will be helpful. In usual times, pre-SARS-CoV-2, arguably this extra step would not have been necessary. The following highlights some examples of organisations which seek to ensure the world and indeed it's government outposts, agencies and thinktanks are in lockstep with SARS-CoV-2 messaging (which, of course, includes mask wearing):

- 1) The Rockefeller Foundation is a good starting point. After all, one of the key documents from this foundation, published in 2010, provides scenario planning for a future pandemic.<sup>188</sup> Apart from the statues at the front of the Rockefeller Centre wearing masks,<sup>189</sup> we find many publications from the Rockefeller Foundation about SARS-CoV-2 promoting mask wearing.<sup>190</sup> <sup>191</sup> A Rockefeller Foundation sponsored Report by another globalist body, the Rand Corporation found that 74% or more of unsure parents want classroom ventilation, mandatory masking, regular COVID-19 testing of staff and students, and a minimum of three feet between people at school to feel safe.<sup>192</sup> To ensure any dissenting voices are silenced, we see the Rockefeller Foundation funding a censorship campaign to combat “misinformation.”<sup>193</sup>

*“Science alone is not sufficient to drive action: the best data analysis in the world will not stop an outbreak if people at risk are not aware of the problem, do not think it is a real threat, do not trust the messenger, or do not know what actions to take to protect themselves and their loved ones,” said Estelle Willie, Director of Health Policy and Communications at The Rockefeller Foundation. “The Rockefeller Foundation’s \$13.5 million commitment is a direct acknowledgement that effective public health begins with effective communication that cuts through the noise and confusion stemming from mis- and disinformation.”*

- 2) Global organisations like the Council for Foreign Relations also weighs in:<sup>194</sup>

*Months into the pandemic, countries around the world are seeking to tighten public health policies to contain the spread of the new coronavirus disease, COVID-19, until there is an effective vaccine. With growing evidence that face coverings limit the*

---

<sup>188</sup> Rockefeller Foundation and Global Business Network. [Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development](#). May 2010.

<sup>189</sup> Tamar Rapin. [The iconic Rockefeller Center statues are wearing masks too](#). New York Post. 20 June 2020.

<sup>190</sup> Rockefeller Foundation. [Message Handbook. COVID-19 Testing and Tracing](#). September 2020.

<sup>191</sup> Rockefeller Foundation. [Vaccine Confidence Message Brief](#). March 2021.

<sup>192</sup> Schwartz HL, Diliberti MK, Grant D. Will Students Come Back? School Hesitancy Among Parents and Their Preferences for COVID-19 Safety Practices in School. RAND Education & Labor. Rand Corporation. June 2021.

<sup>193</sup> Rockefeller Foundation. [The Rockefeller Foundation Commits \\$13.5 Million in Funding to Strengthen Public Health Response Efforts](#). Press Release. 15 July 2021.

<sup>194</sup> Council for Foreign Relations. [Which Countries Are Requiring Face Masks?](#) 4 August 2020.

*virus's transmission, more than one hundred countries have issued nationwide mask mandates.*

- 3) Not to be outdone, the World Economic Forum, whose Executive Chairman penned a book on the opportunities to be leveraged from SARS-CoV-2,<sup>195</sup> and also promotes the lockstep approach in support of its Great Reset.<sup>196 197</sup>

*Early in the pandemic, the general public was told not to wear masks. This was driven by the longstanding recognition that standard surgical masks (also called medical masks) are insufficient to protect the wearer from many respiratory pathogens, as well as the concern about diverting limited supplies from healthcare settings.*

*Science is the pursuit of knowledge and understanding, and it inevitably changes the way we see the world. Thanks to the tireless efforts of scientists everywhere, we have compressed years of research on the COVID-19 virus into months. This has led to a rapid evolution of policies and recommendations, and not surprisingly some skepticism about the advice of experts...*

*Our hope is that by creating a week where community, government, business, sports and entertainment leaders send the same message about this critical new behavior, everyone will understand the urgency of changing their behaviour and start wearing a mask, this week and every week.*

- 4) The International Monetary Fund (IMF), gatekeeper to much of the third world's debt, also promotes mask wearing, since we're all in this together.<sup>198</sup> It is not surprising that in a recent IMF report, *Mask Mandates Save Lives*, the first footnote is attributed to a study from the *British Medical Journal* (discussed in more detail below), which recommends to abandon science, since SARS-CoV-2 is so deadly, and adopt the precautionary principle instead: "it is time to act without waiting for randomised controlled trial evidence."<sup>199</sup> Really?

After contorted mathematics, simple scatter plots, prevaricating language, tables that show barely perceptible differences between mask mandated states and those who relaxed mask mandates, and after declaring that this is the first paper to look at mask mandates and attitudes, the IMF paper breathlessly concludes:<sup>200</sup>

*Our estimates imply that mask mandates saved 87,000 lives and could have potentially saved 58,000 additional lives up to December 19, 2020.10 Lives saved are calculated comparing the actual mask mandates in place after April 18, 2020. We find that the effects of mask mandates crucially depend on the local attitudes...Hence, mask mandates are likely to remain an important policy in the*

---

<sup>195</sup> Schwab K, Malleret T. COVID-19: The Great Reset. Forum Publishing. 2020.

<sup>196</sup> World Economic Forum. [Why wearing a mask is the most important thing we can do to stop the spread of COVID-19](#). 12 August 2020.

<sup>197</sup> World Economic Forum. [The Great Reset](#). Website.

<sup>198</sup> Hansen NJH, Mano RC. [Mask Mandates Save Lives](#). International Monetary Fund. 6 August 2021.

<sup>199</sup> Greenhalgh T, Schmid MB, Czypionka T, Bassler D, Gruer L. [Face masks for the public during the covid-19 crisis](#). BMJ. 2020 Apr 9;369:m1435. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m1435. PMID: 32273267.

<sup>200</sup> Hansen NJH, Mano RC. [Mask Mandates Save Lives](#). International Monetary Fund. Working paper series. 6 August 2021.

*toolkit against COVID-19. Moreover, masks are likely to be a pivotal tool in fighting any future pandemics as well.*

Figures such as this based on junk science, theory and supposition can only best be described as nonsensical. Vast numbers thrown around as if they represent science and truth, based on shaky evidence, simply defies rational thought. Will this be the type of information that passes for official information if this misinformation/disinformation bill passes?

- 5) Finally, there will be no surprises what the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, which funds a spider's web of global health related initiatives, in particular vaccine programs, adds to mask wearing during the era of SARS-CoV-2. In a September 2020 interview on CNBC, Bill Gates believed that more could have been done to push mask wearing:<sup>201</sup>

*"The number of things that in retrospect, could have been done better on this pandemic is very, very large," the Microsoft co-founder said last week while discussing the latest release of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's annual Goalkeepers Report, which measures progress made toward the U.N.'s Sustainable Development Goals...*

*"Even the medical community are understanding of the importance of masks. You know, it took us several months — most respiratory diseases are coughing diseases. They're not talking or singing diseases. And so we got that one wrong. We underestimated the value of masks..."*

The former CEO of Microsoft turned philanthropist, Bill Gates has achieved a hero-like status during the pandemic. The *Washington Post* has called him a "champion of science-backed solutions,"<sup>202</sup> while the *New York Times* recently hailed him as "the most interesting man in the world."<sup>203</sup> Gates is also the star of a hit Netflix docu-series, "Pandemic: How to Prevent an Outbreak,"<sup>204</sup> released just weeks before coronavirus hit the U.S., and was produced by a *New York Times* correspondent, Sheri Fink, who previously worked at three Gates-funded organisations (Pro Publica, the New America Foundation, and the International Medical Corps).

Another mechanism the Gates Foundation employs to influence the WHO and leading government agencies is the UK government's Strategic Advisory Group of Experts (SAGE), the principal advisory group to the WHO for vaccines. SAGE<sup>205</sup> is a board of 15 people, legally required to disclose any possible conflicts of interest. The Group also advises governments on SARS-CoV-2 planning and strategy.

During a recent virtual meeting, half of the board's members listed the Gates Foundation connections as possible conflicts of interests.<sup>206</sup> The Gates Foundation's influence in the international health arena goes well beyond the WHO. A 2017

---

<sup>201</sup> Natasha Turak. [Bill Gates: 'We underestimated the value of masks'](#) CNBC. 16 September 2020.

<sup>202</sup> Jay Green. [The billionaire who cried pandemic](#). Washington Post. 20 May 2020.

<sup>203</sup> [Bill Gates Is the Most Interesting Man in the World](#). New York Times. 22 May 2020.

<sup>204</sup> Netflix. [Pandemic: How to Prevent an Outbreak](#). 2020.

<sup>205</sup> World Health Organization. [SAGE Immunization](#). Website.

<sup>206</sup> World Health Organization. [Declaration of Interest](#). Virtual Meeting of Strategic Advisory Group of Experts (SAGE) on Immunization. 31 March-1 April 2020.

analysis of 23 global health partnerships<sup>207</sup> revealed that seven relied entirely on Gates Foundation funding and another nine listed the foundation as its top donor. Just on that particular connection, the Imperial College, London, the former home of “discredited modeller” Professor Neil Ferguson, also received significant funding (at least US\$80 million over the last decade) from the Gates Foundation.<sup>208</sup> Professor Ferguson’s models predicted up to 2.2 million dead in the US and 500,000 dead in the UK if the government took no action.<sup>209</sup> He also called for lockdowns that would last 12-18 months. An article in the National Review highlights Professor Ferguson’s modelling record:<sup>210</sup>

*2001 - [Imperial College epidemiologist Neil] Ferguson was behind the disputed research that sparked the mass culling of eleven million sheep and cattle during the 2001 outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease. He also predicted that up to 150,000 people could die. There were fewer than 200 deaths.*

*2002 - Ferguson predicted that up to 50,000 people would likely die from exposure to BSE (mad cow disease) in beef. Four million cows were slaughtered because of a model. In the U.K., there were only 177 deaths from BSE.*

*2005 - Ferguson predicted that up to 150 million people could be killed from bird flu. In the end, only 282 people died worldwide from the disease between 2003 and 2009.*

*2009 - a government estimate, based on Ferguson’s advice, said a “reasonable worst-case scenario” was that the swine flu had fatality rate of 0.3-1.5% and would lead to 65,000 deaths. In the end, swine flu killed 457 people in the U.K.*

*2020 – in March, Ferguson admitted that his Imperial College model of SARS-CoV-2 was based on undocumented, 13-year-old computer code that was intended to be used for a feared influenza pandemic, rather than a coronavirus. Ferguson declined to release his original code so other scientists could check his results*

Other articles about Professor Ferguson’s record are also instructive in the debate about how much weight public health policies should be placing on predictive models is acceptable, especially given the epidemiology models are starting to come under much-needed scholarly scrutiny.<sup>211 212 213 214 215</sup> Yet, if scrutiny counts for anything, Professor Ferguson is still peddling hyperbolic case numbers based on his

---

<sup>207</sup> Buse K, Harmer AM. Seven habits of highly effective global public-private health partnerships: practice and potential. Soc Sci Med. 2007 Jan;64(2):259-71. doi: [10.1016/j.socscimed.2006.09.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2006.09.001). Epub 2006 Oct 20. PMID: 17055633.

<sup>208</sup> Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. [Committed Grants](#). Database of grants. (Downloadable Excel file).

<sup>209</sup> Ferguson N et al. [Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions \(NPIs\) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand](#). Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team. 16 March 2020.

<sup>210</sup> John Fund. [Professor Lockdown’ Modeler Resigns in Disgrace](#). National Review. 6 May 2020.

<sup>211</sup> Phillip Magness. [How Wrong Were the Models and Why?](#) American Institute for Economic Research. 23 April 2020.

<sup>212</sup> Steerpike. [Six questions that Neil Ferguson should be asked](#). The Spectator. 16 April 2020.

<sup>213</sup> Aaron Ames. [Experts Damned by Their Own Research](#). Quadrant Online. 7 May 2020.

<sup>214</sup> Avery C. et al. [Policy Implications of Models of the Spread of Coronavirus: Perspectives and Opportunities for Economists](#). National Bureau of Economic Research. Working Paper No. 27007. April 2020.

<sup>215</sup> Miltimore J. [Modelers Were ‘Astronomically Wrong’ in COVID-19 Predictions, Says Leading Epidemiologist—and the World Is Paying the Price](#). Foundation for Economic Education. 2 July 2020.

modelling.<sup>216</sup> Just watch as the world must listen and act these pronouncements.<sup>217</sup> These hucksters and carpet bagging braggarts are the very so called experts that the prevailing narrative promotes. Recall the lies and deceit of Al Gore and Tim Flannery from the previous section, yet their content will be forced upon us as official information and if the proposed legislation passes, it will be impossible for them to be questioned.

As previously discussed, in October 2019, the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security hosted “Event 201” in partnership with the World Economic Forum and the Gates Foundation.<sup>218</sup> Event 201 was an exercise simulating the outbreak of a novel coronavirus. It included representatives from the U.S. National Security Council, as well as corporate leadership from pharmaceutical companies such as Johnson & Johnson. While similarities between the mock outbreak and the real outbreak have prompted theories about Bill Gates “predicting” SARS-CoV-2, it is undeniable that the policy proposals that emerged out of the exercise are being implemented today.

The Gates Foundation together with the George Soros’s Open Society Foundations also wholly, jointly, or partly funds many so-called fact-checker websites to pounce on dissenting voices. Although obtaining accurate funding sources is challenging, as it is generally accepted that The Poynter Institute for Media Studies,<sup>219</sup> Snopes and Politifact are well-known examples of fact checking organisations being funded by the Gates Foundation and foundations belonging to George Soros, but there are hundreds more in many countries. A simple search can usually follow the money trails which also reveals Facebook and Google donates to FactCheck.org.<sup>220</sup>

The misinformation/disinformation bill will presumably still need an army of fact checkers and AI bots to trawl the digital platforms searching for any information that goes against the official narrative. The deplatforming has long since begun, and the proposed legislation simply formalises the process. This is how it works - a topical example of one of the victims of an aggressive fact checking campaign followed the publishing of a popular and often cited article about mask wearing.<sup>221</sup> The paper was authored by a Stanford University cardiologist Dr. Baruch Vainshelboim and ceremoniously retracted a few months later in July 2021. What mistake did the good professor make? Hint: he published a peer reviewed paper questioning the efficacy of mask wearing:

*The existing scientific evidences challenge the safety and efficacy of wearing facemask as preventive intervention for COVID-19. The data suggest that both medical and non-medical facemasks are ineffective to block human-to-human*

---

<sup>216</sup> Stephen McIlkenny. [Covid infections will “almost certainly” reach 100,000 daily cases warns expert.](#) Scotland Herald. 18 July 2021.

<sup>217</sup> Stephen Mathews, Emily Craig. ['Professor Lockdown' Neil Ferguson once warned 200MILLION people globally could die during bird flu crisis \(and even Government contingency plans are prepared for over 700,000 in UK - three times more than Covid\).](#) Daily Mail Australia. 25 February 2023.

<sup>218</sup> The Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security. [Event 201. A global pandemic exercise.](#) 18 October 2019.

<sup>219</sup> Poynter website. [Largest Funders of Poynter.](#)

<sup>220</sup> FactCheck.org website. [Our funding.](#) Accessed 9 August 2021.

<sup>221</sup> Vainshelboim B. Facemasks in the COVID-19 era: A health hypothesis. Medical Hypotheses. Vol. 146, January 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2020.110411>



*transmission of viral and infectious disease such SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19, supporting against the usage of facemasks.*

*Wearing facemasks has been demonstrated to have substantial adverse physiological and psychological effects. These include hypoxia, hypercapnia, shortness of breath, increased acidity and toxicity, activation of fear and stress response, rise in stress hormones, immunosuppression, fatigue, headaches, decline in cognitive performance, predisposition for viral and infectious illnesses, chronic stress, anxiety and depression.*

*Long-term consequences of wearing facemask can cause health deterioration, developing and progression of chronic diseases and premature death. Governments, policy makers and health organizations should utilize proper and scientific evidence-based approach with respect to wearing facemasks, when the latter is considered as preventive intervention for public health.*

What role will fact checking play in how this proposed misinformation/disinformation bill. How will the information gathered by the fact checking industry be used as evidence to discredit, deplatform, investigate, or censor? Who will control the fact checkers or will they be co-opted? In this case, PolitiFact used the logical fallacy argument from the standpoint of authority to discredit the article, attacking the scientific credibility of the author and the journal *Medical Hypotheses*. Even though the author's claims are based on numerous peer-reviewed studies cited in his paper, PolitiFact attempts to discredit *Medical Hypotheses* as "a journal that says its purpose is to publish 'interesting theoretical papers.'" A good paper down the memory hole, and a career besmirched. It is worth repeating the reasons in the retraction notice by the publishing company.<sup>222</sup>

*The Editorial Committee concluded that the author's hypothesis is misleading on the following basis:*

- 1. A broader review of existing scientific evidence clearly shows that approved masks with correct certification, and worn in compliance with guidelines, are an effective prevention of COVID-19 transmission.*
- 2. The manuscript misquotes and selectively cites published papers. References #16, 17, 25 and 26 are all misquoted.*
- 3. Table 1. Physiological and Psychological Effects of Wearing Facemask and Their Potential Health Consequences, generated by the author. All data in the table is unverified, and there are several speculative statements.*
- 4. The author submitted that he is currently affiliated to Stanford University, and VA Palo Alto Health Care System. However, both institutions have confirmed that Dr Vainshelboim ended his connection with them in 2016.*

This is the underbelly of how it all works. Sometimes detail is needed to show the strategies employed and the outcomes of what happens when someone is deplatformed. This censorship industrial complex, which will be formalised in law if this misinformation/disinformation bill passes, goes to the very heart of freedom of speech. Censorship by mega social media technology corporations like Twitter, Facebook, Instagram and YouTube use algorithms and bot technology to cancel successful channels with millions

---

<sup>222</sup> Elsevier. [Retraction Notice. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2021.110601](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2021.110601). July 2021.

of followers to seal the fate of professors, scientists, doctors, experts, mathematicians, educators, statisticians, and any others who dare to publish against the accepted narrative. The term “fake news” is conjured to denigrate what is rejected by the mainstream juggernaut media companies, all in lockstep with the main players, of course. There is evidence for this in a myriad of places, and much of it is open-source knowledge. The trove of emails revealed under a right to information inquiry by the *New York Post* provides anyone who is curious, a starting point for looking at the linkages, particularly involving Dr Fauci. An email exchange between Dr Fauci and Mark Zuckerberg, CEO of Facebook, unearthed by this FOI request provides an example.<sup>223</sup> Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg collaborated directly with Dr. Anthony Fauci, offering “resources” for COVID-19 vaccine development and a redacted offer Fauci described as “very exciting.”

In one message from February 2020, Zuckerberg wrote to Dr. Fauci offering help to facilitate development of coronavirus vaccines. “I was glad to hear your statement that the covid-19 vaccine will be ready for human trials in six weeks. Are there any resources our foundation can help provide to potentially accelerate this or at least make sure it stays on track?” the Facebook CEO asked.

*“If we start in April (~6-7 weeks from now) with a phase 1 trial of 45 subjects, it will take another 3-4 months to determine safety and some immunogenicity,” Fauci responded. “We may need help with resources for the phase 2 trial if we do not get our requested budget supplement. If this goes off track, I will contact you. Many thanks for the offer.”*

On 18 December 2020 a press release was issued by Facebook:<sup>224</sup>

*...given the recent news that COVID-19 vaccines will soon be rolling out around the world, over the coming weeks we will start removing false claims about these vaccines that have been debunked by public health experts on Facebook and Instagram. This is another way that we are applying our policy to remove misinformation about the virus that could lead to imminent physical harm.*

The “public health experts” are not named, but many millions of dollars are now thrown at rooting out disinformation. However, the website where the press release was published also contains a video of Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg interviewing Dr. Fauci, thus indicating who might be considered the authority on “false claims” about vaccines.<sup>225</sup>

The last word on this goes to Dr. Peter Hotez, a professor of paediatrics and molecular virology at Baylor College of Medicine who recently called for federal hate-crime protections to be extended to cover criticism of Dr. Fauci and other scientists. The frequent MSNBC and CNN guest wants Congress to expand hate crimes to “scientists currently targeted by far-right extremism in the United States.” The July 2021 paper charges:<sup>226</sup>

*“There is a troubling new expansion of antiscience aggression in the United States. It’s arising from far-right extremism, including some elected members of the US Congress and conservative news outlets that target prominent biological scientists fighting the COVID-19 pandemic.”*

---

<sup>223</sup> Document cloud website. [FOI emails regarding Dr Fauci](#). Esp. see p. 243. The document is searchable on names.

<sup>224</sup> Kang-Xing Jin, Head of Health. Facebook. [Keeping People Safe and Informed About the Coronavirus](#). 18 December 2020.

<sup>225</sup> Reuters. [Dr. Fauci and Mark Zuckerberg discuss COVID-19](#). 17 July 2020.

<sup>226</sup> Hotez PJ. Mounting antiscience aggression in the United States. *PLOS Biology*. 28 July 2021

For an irony alert of epic proportions, Hotez concludes:

*For researchers working in the pandemic response to continue to do so effectively, we seek help in halting the aggression. This is essential not only for our personal safety or national security, but also the reality that attacking science and scientists will both promote illness and cause loss of life. For example, currently more than 99% of the COVID-19 deaths now occur among unvaccinated people, and almost as many hospitalizations. To begin, the following steps must be considered:*

- 1) The President of the United States, together with science leaders at the federal agencies, should prepare and deliver a robust, public, and highly visible statement of support. The statement would reaffirm the contribution of scientists across United States history.*
- 2) We should look at expanded protection mechanisms for scientists currently targeted by far-right extremism in the United States. Rep. Paul Tonko (D-NY) has introduced a bill known as the Scientific Integrity Act of 2021 (H.R. 849) to protect US Government scientists from political interference, but this needs to be extended for scientists at private research universities and institutes. Still another possibility is to extend federal hate-crime protections.*

Much more could have been written on this veritable rabbit hole where politicising science by abandoning the scientific method and silencing dissenters irrespective of evidence, is gaining momentum. While it is important to the context in which scholarly papers are now published, to pursue this matter any further could be seen as a distraction to the discussion on the medical evidence of the efficacy of mask wearing in the rest of this paper. At least for the curious, it is beyond question that the censorship issue has a significant bearing on the “accepted” narrative being peddled by the lead agencies, governments, social media and the mainstream media. This of course, has influenced the quality and breadth of available papers to research on the efficacy of mask wearing, particularly those published in the time of SARS-CoV-2. The unfortunate fact is that censorship and evidence can no longer be separated.

That face masks were required for children under the age of 12 is not so surprising, as of course it was be in lockstep with the World Health Organisation’s advice on the use of masks for children in the community in the context of COVID-19.<sup>227 228</sup> The WHO’s guidance states that children aged 12 and over “should wear a mask under the same conditions as adults, in particular when they cannot guarantee at least a 1-metre distance from others and there is widespread transmission in the area...Children aged 5 years and under should not be required to wear masks”, and those aged between 6 and 11 are subject to six considerations, such as transmission rates in the area, access to clean masks, impact on learning and psychosocial development, adequate supervision etc. But wait, there are further conditions for those up to age 5 under a drop-down menu, “there may be local requirements for children aged 5 years and under to wear masks, or specific needs in some settings, such as being physically close to someone who is ill. In these circumstances, if the child wears a mask, a parent or other guardian should be within direct line of sight to supervise the safe use of the mask.”<sup>229</sup>

---

<sup>227</sup> World Health Organization. [Coronavirus disease \(COVID-19\): Children and masks](#). Q&A. 21 August 2020.

<sup>228</sup> World Health Organization. United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF). [Advice on the use of masks for children in the community in the context of COVID-19](#). 21 August 2020.

<sup>229</sup> World Health Organization. [Coronavirus disease \(COVID-19\): Children and masks](#). Q&A. 21 August 2020.

Any scientist or doctor or other qualified expert who tries to publish against this narrative is likely to have their papers withdrawn.<sup>230</sup> In this particular case, the authors recommended that “decision-makers weigh the hard evidence produced by these experimental measurements accordingly, which suggest that children should not be forced to wear face masks.” The article originally appeared in the *Journal of the American Medical Association – Paediatrics* on 30 June 2021 but lasted only two weeks before it was retracted as a result of aggressive “fact checking.” Has the scientific method lost all sense of inquiry and proportionality, as it strikes down those who dare to question the official narrative? Even common sense suggests that a face covering does not permit free flow of air to the lungs, but this obvious detail cannot be questioned. It will be interesting to see whether advice such as this will too be ignored and restrictive mask wearing practices will return with the next variant.

Returning to Dr Wallach’s research on the effect of carbon dioxide in mask wearing for children.<sup>231</sup> Dr Wallach found that wearing a face mask causes children to inhale dangerous levels of carbon dioxide that becomes trapped behind the mask. Further, that the air masked children inhaled contained more than six times the legal safe limit for closed rooms as set down by the German Federal Environmental Office. The safe limit is 0.2%, whereas the air the masked children inhaled contained over 1.3% carbon dioxide. The effect was worse for younger children, with one seven year-old child inhaling air with 2.5% carbon dioxide, over 12 times the safe limit.<sup>232</sup> Wouldn’t any parent anywhere want to know this information to protect their child? If the misinformation/disinformation bill becomes legislation, parents will not have access to this information, as it would not be sanctioned as the official narrative. Such studies would not be permitted or debated.

As previously mentioned, it would also seem that since the advent of SARS-CoV-2, there is a distinct difference between the conclusions and outcomes of studies before 2019 in relation to mask wearing to those being published more recently. In other words, prior to SARS-CoV-2, multiple studies concluded that mask wearing is not recommended in many circumstances, lacks evidence, and is not suitable to prevent the transmission of viruses and needs to be fit for purpose. Yet, since early 2020, the narrative about mask wearing shifted from ambivalence towards the practice being part of the duty to protect others, and in many instances, a requirement of being permitted to leave the family home, and even within the family home. Largely this change is a result of the fear driven campaign over numbers of SARS-CoV-2 cases detected using dubious testing methods.

Again, to inject some perspective, recall that there has been little change in the total death counts across the world over the last five years. By comparison, the Spanish Influenza Pandemic in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century killed up to 100 million people<sup>233</sup> over a two-year period,

---

<sup>230</sup> Walach H, Weikl R, Prentice J, et al. Experimental Assessment of Carbon Dioxide Content in Inhaled Air With or Without Face Masks in Healthy Children: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Pediatr*. Published online June 30, 2021. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.2659

<sup>231</sup> Walach H, Weikl R, Prentice J, et al. Experimental Assessment of Carbon Dioxide Content in Inhaled Air With or Without Face Masks in Healthy Children: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Pediatr*. Published online June 30, 2021. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2021.2659

<sup>232</sup> Ibid.

<sup>233</sup> Johnson NP, Mueller J. Updating the accounts: global mortality of the 1918-1920 “Spanish” influenza pandemic. *Bull Hist Med*. 2002 Spring;76(1):105-15. doi: [10.1353/bhm.2002.0022](https://doi.org/10.1353/bhm.2002.0022). PMID: 11875246.

which is many times more than have died so far from SARS-CoV-2.<sup>234</sup> Yet, many governments around the world are united in holding their populations hostage by mandating mask wearing with every variant, unless their citizens submit to the experimental and deadly vaccines.

The CDC recently updated its website to include a page entitled, “When You’ve Been Fully Vaccinated: How to Protect Yourself and Others.”<sup>235</sup> The advice is that people who are fully vaccinated can participate in many of the activities they did before the pandemic, and that mask wearing is not mandated, but recommended. On surface, this reflects the ever-changing mask wearing mandates in Australia and the rest of the world, but is much more menacing, because it is contingent upon taking an experimental vaccine. The recent Australian Government publication, National COVID Vaccine Campaign Plan, under the direction of the National Cabinet, declares:<sup>236</sup>

*“The purpose of this plan is to detail the mechanisms and arrangements that will lead achievement of vaccination targets which are set out in the National Plan to Transition Australia’s National COVID Response (i.e., ~70% fully vaccinated to move to Phase B and ≥80% fully vaccinated to move to Phase C; see Annex A).*

*These mechanisms and arrangements will ensure public confidence in the vaccine rollout and ensure as many Australians as possible are vaccinated as early as possible, within the TGA guidelines and available vaccine supply.*

Breathtaking in its scope, this so called National COVID Vaccine Campaign Plan, recognises 12-15 year olds as a priority group, in particular:

- *children with specified medical conditions that increase their risk of severe COVID-19 (including asthma, diabetes, obesity, cardiac and circulatory congenital anomalies, neuro developmental disorders, epilepsy, immuno-compromised and trisomy*
- *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children aged 12–15 years*
- *all children aged 12–15 years in remote communities, as part of broader community outreach vaccination programs that provide vaccines for all ages (≥12 years).*

No well child died as a result of SARS-CoV-2. So why inject children with an experimental substance that has not gone through the rigorous testing procedures like other vaccines? No great deduction powers are needed to predict that mandated mask wearing practices will be tied to the vaccination rates.

### **Analysis of the “evidence”**

There are hundreds, if not thousands, of published papers, reports and grey literature documents about the efficacy of mask wearing for health purposes. As previously mentioned, many are disappearing as they fall foul of the fact checking machine controlled by the mega corporations, banks, mainstream media outlets and social media giants. These same papers would also be captured under the misinformation/disinformation bill and shoved down the memory hole. As would be expected, the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic seems to have divided the scientific community about whether masks have any benefit or may

---

<sup>234</sup> Based on an estimated world population of 1.86 billion in 1920. United States Census Bureau. [Historical Estimates of World Population](#). Last Revised: July 5, 2018

<sup>235</sup> Centers for Disease Control. When You’ve Been Fully Vaccinated: How to Protect Yourself and Others. Updated 27 July 2021.

<sup>236</sup> Australian Government. [Op COVID SHIELD: National COVID Vaccine Campaign Plan](#). 3 August 2021.

actually cause harm. Leading agencies such as the World Health Organization, typically extol the virtues of mask wearing, as does the CDC and in lockstep most health departments around the world. It is curious to watch these organisations when there are changes to centralised policies, say from something Dr Fauci says on a CNN interview, invariably reword their own within a few days.

The report on mask wearing by the CDC itself shows the staggering lengths data can be manipulated to provide a narrative for the rest of the world to follow.<sup>237</sup> The report, authored by at least a dozen medical doctors, PhD researchers, and attorneys, examined how mask mandates across the US affected SARS-CoV-2 cases and death rates. According to the CDC's analysis, between 1 March and 31 December 2020, statewide mask mandates were in effect in 2,313 of the 3,142 counties in the United States. The CDC report advises that mask mandates were associated with an average 1.32% decrease in the growth rates of COVID-19 cases and deaths during the first 100 days after the mask policy was implemented. "Daily case and death growth rates before implementation of mask mandates were not statistically different from the reference period." An understatement. The CDC report concludes: "Community mitigation policies, such as state-issued mask mandates and prohibition of on-premises restaurant dining, have the potential to slow the spread of COVID-19, especially if implemented with other public health strategies." The phrase "have the potential" is disingenuous and hardly scientific or conclusive.

So, the now the science tells us that mask mandates "have the potential" to reduce Covid growth rates by just 1.32%. Not that this is faithfully reported in the media. Following the release of this CDC report, the weekend media coverage was predictable:

- 1) The *Washington Post* headline read "After state lift restrictions, CDC says mask mandates can reduce deaths".<sup>238</sup>
- 2) The *New York Times* reported that "Wearing masks, the [CDC] study reported, was linked to fewer infections with the coronavirus and Covid-19 deaths. And breathtakingly, "mask mandates were linked to statistically significant decreases in coronavirus cases and death rates within 20 days of implementation, the report's authors concluded."<sup>239</sup>
- 3) *NBC News* website called the report "strong evidence that mask mandates can slow the spread of the coronavirus. . ." Further that, "All of this is very consistent," CDC Director Dr. Rochelle Walensky said during a White House briefing on Friday. "You have decreases in cases and deaths when you wear masks, and you have increases in cases and deaths when you have in-person restaurant dining."<sup>240</sup>

Still, this is the environment we now find ourselves in, where a difference of 1.32% represents strong evidence. The newly minted studies since SARS-CoV-2 trot out all manner of statistics, case numbers and mortality rates, some without evidence, to conclude that

---

<sup>237</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. [Association of State-Issued Mask Mandates and Allowing On-Premises Restaurant Dining with County-Level COVID-19 Case and Death Growth Rates — United States, March 1–December 31, 2020](#). 21 March 2021.

<sup>238</sup> Erin Cunningham, Lateshia Beachum, and Meryl Kornfield. [After states lift restrictions, CDC says mask mandates can reduce deaths](#). *Washington Post*. 5 March 2021.

<sup>239</sup> Roni Caryn Rabin. [The C.D.C. links restaurant dining and a lack of mask mandates to the virus's spread in the U.S.](#) *New York Times*. 5 March 2021.

<sup>240</sup> CBS News. [CDC study finds mask mandates, dining out influence virus spread: The findings come as some states are lifting mask orders and restaurant limits](#). 7 March 2021.

mask wearing protects the person from getting the virus and prevents them from spreading the virus.<sup>241</sup> The authors of an article published in the *British Medical Journal* (mentioned earlier) even admit as much, “the evidence base on the efficacy and acceptability of the different types of face mask in preventing respiratory infections during epidemics is sparse and contested,” but since SARS-CoV-2 is such a deadly disease the onus of proof must take a step back and the precautionary principle now be applied – which is to prevent strain on the public health system, of course. Who cares less about science or evidence? As much as the authors try to establish the case for mask wearing based on evidence, study after study cited within this article notes that it just is not there, for example:<sup>242</sup>

*The evidence is not sufficiently strong to support widespread use of facemasks as a protective measure against COVID-19. However, there is enough evidence to support the use of facemasks for short periods of time by particularly vulnerable individuals when in transient higher risk situations.*

A further example cited by the author of an earlier study (2010), says much the same:<sup>243</sup>

*In conclusion there remains a substantial gap in the scientific literature on the effectiveness of face masks to reduce transmission of influenza virus infection. While there is some experimental evidence that masks should be able to reduce infectiousness under controlled conditions, there is less evidence on whether this translates to effectiveness in natural settings. There is little evidence to support the effectiveness of face masks to reduce the risk of infection. Current research has several limitations including underpowered samples, limited generalizability, narrow intervention targeting and inconsistent testing protocols, different laboratory methods, and case definitions.*

As previously stated, it doesn't help that the “accepted” narrative on mask wearing since the advent of SARS-CoV-2 appears to have shifted toward the beneficial aspects of mask wearing. Otherwise, the lead agencies and authorities would not be pushing their use so vigorously. A study of the incidence and breadth of this disparity would be worthwhile research into the future. While it is acknowledged there are studies supporting aspects of the use of masks during SARS-CoV-2,<sup>244</sup> there is no doubt that a growing chorus of scientists and experts from all fields of endeavour are calling for better evidence to support the claims, and caution authorities to not slavishly follow bodies like the WHO and CDC.<sup>245</sup>

For example, a 2020 University of New South Wales study aimed to assess the efficacy of face masks against respiratory transmissible viruses for the community, healthcare workers and sick patients.<sup>246</sup> The authors looked at eight clinical trials on the use of masks in the

---

<sup>241</sup> Greenhalgh T, Schmid M B, Czypionka T, Bassler D, Gruer L. Face masks for the public during the covid-19 crisis *BMJ* 2020; 369 :m1435 doi:10.1136/bmj.m1435

<sup>242</sup> Brainard J, Jones N, Lake I, Hooper L, Hunter PR. Facemasks and similar barriers to prevent respiratory illness such as COVID-19: A rapid systematic review medRxiv 2020.04.01.20049528; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.01.20049528> (not peer reviewed)

<sup>243</sup> Cowing, B. J., Zhou, Y., IP, D. K. M., Leung, G. M., & Aiello, A. E. (2010). Face masks to prevent transmission of influenza virus: a systematic review. *Epidemiology and Infection*, 138(4), 449–456. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268809991658>

<sup>244</sup> MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA. A rapid systematic review of the efficacy of face masks and respirators against coronaviruses and other respiratory transmissible viruses for the community, healthcare workers and sick patients. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2020; 108: 103629. doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2020.103629

<sup>245</sup> Lazzarino A I, Steptoe A, Hamer M, Michie S. Covid-19: Important potential side effects of wearing face masks that we should bear in mind *BMJ* 2020; 369:m2003 doi:10.1136/bmj.m2003

<sup>246</sup> MacIntyre CR, Chughtai AA. A rapid systematic review of the efficacy of face masks and respirators against coronaviruses and other respiratory transmissible viruses for the community, healthcare workers and sick patients. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2020; 108: 103629. doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2020.103629

community. While the authors found that in some studies masks seem to be effective, the evidence was conflicting, with some of the studies not measuring the effect of masks use. The variability found would obviously be related to the comparisons between different types of masks. Surgical masks, for example are required to comply to specific international standards, whereas a homemade mask or a scarf would yield different results depending on the fabric, the number of layers, and the weave thickness. (Recall that Queensland Health website advocates the use of a “reusable green shopping bag” and shoelaces as the basis to construct an “effective” mask.<sup>247</sup>) It is also noted that one of the authors was the recipient of a grant from the National Health and Medical Research Council for the study.

There are also many instances of papers about mask wearing being submitted to pre-publishing platforms like MedRxiv, but not making it through the ever-narrowing peer review process. One such example was published on that particular platform on 25 May 2021 and concluded that there is no correlation between mask mandates and slowing the spread of the coronavirus.<sup>248</sup> The paper is detailed and contains significant scientific analysis. The study was completed by biology professor Damian D. Guerra from the University of Louisiana and Biochemistry professor Daniel J. Guerra. The study, looked at the total number of cases in 50 states from March 2020 to March 2021, and focused on the efficacy of wearing masks during major and smaller surges of SARS-CoV-2. The findings were almost identical in both circumstances. The two professors found:

*Mask mandates are not predictive of smaller or slower shifts from low to high case growth ... Our main finding is that mask mandates and use are not associated with lower SARS-CoV-2 spread among US states. 80% of US states mandated masks during the COVID-19 pandemic. Mandates induced greater mask compliance but did not predict lower growth rates when community spread was low (minima) or high (maxima).*

Not only were masks found not to stop the spread of COVID, but the risks were not taken into consideration when the mandates were instituted. Citing other published papers, the risks identified by the paper included:

- a) *Prolonged use of wearing a mask (more than four hours per day) promotes facial alkalinisation and inadvertently encourages dehydration, which ... can enhance barrier breakdown and bacterial infection risk.*
- b) *Masks increase headaches and sweating and decrease cognitive precision.*
- c) *By obscuring nonverbal communication, masks interfere with social learning in children.*
- d) *Masks can distort verbal speech and remove visual cues to the detriment of individuals with hearing loss; clear face-shields improve visual integration, but there is a corresponding loss of sound quality.*

On 7 August 2021 the study was re-published on MedRxiv accessed by a link on the original paper that directs the reader to the “current version”.<sup>249</sup> The current version of the paper now has a different title and is reduced to one paragraph. Gone is the scientific evidence, gone are the graphs and detailed mathematical analysis that supported the authors’ findings. Incuriously, the paper now concludes:

---

<sup>247</sup> Australian Government. [How to make a cloth mask: Instructions for making a cloth face mask.](#)

<sup>248</sup> Guerra DD, Guerra DG. Mask mandate and use efficacy in state-level COVID-19 containment. MedRxiv. 25 May 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.18.21257385>

<sup>249</sup> Guerra DD, Guerra DG. Mask mandate and use efficacy for COVID-19 containment in US States. MedRxiv. 7 August 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.05.18.21257385>



*Conclusions: We did not observe association between mask mandates or use and reduced COVID-19 spread in US states. COVID-19 mitigation requires further research and use of existing efficacious strategies, most notably vaccination.*

### **Masking fear or fact?**

It is clear that fear not fact drives the campaign to censor, silence and subdue the population. As can be seen by the mortality rates and comparisons to other respiratory-type conditions such as influenza and pneumonia in the various age groups, the numbers refuse to stack up as evidence of a deadly pandemic. Survival rates, infection rates and existence of co-morbidities, are indicative that SARS-CoV-2 is no worse than influenza. Recall in the table above that less than 12,000 people died from respiratory-type illnesses in 2020, even higher for the previous five-year average. Of course, reporting the case numbers obtained by inaccurate, inappropriate testing methods, such as the PCR tests, is key to the stranglehold of fear that governments exercise daily over their population. Make no mistake, this is no error of judgement by bungling governments and careless health authorities with their mixed messaging, but a carefully well-scripted plan driven by controlling interests who seek to leverage SARS-CoV-2 to bring about The Great Reset. Suppression of evidence, fear-driven media campaigns, and virtue signalling by carefully chosen elites all cleverly coordinated to control the dazed populations, supported by slick publications from behavioural science think tanks, funded by multi-billionaires. A recent publication on the manufactured state of fear has examined the evidence for this:<sup>250</sup>

*In one of the most extraordinary documents ever revealed to the British public, the behavioural scientists advising the UK government recommended that we need to be frightened. SPI-B or the Independent Scientific Influenza Group on Behaviour said in their report, Options for increasing adherence to social distancing measures,<sup>251</sup> dated 20 March 2020, that a substantial number of people still do not feel sufficiently personally threatened; it could be that they are reassured by the low death rate in their demographic group, although levels of concern may be rising. As a result, they recommended that ‘the perceived level of personal threat needs to be increased among those who are complacent, using hard-hitting emotional messaging.’ In essence, the government was advised to frighten the British public to encourage adherence to the emergency lockdown regulations.” (p.2).*

The author, Laura Dodsworth, is an investigative journalist with more than 20 years’ experience, a broadcaster, writer, and documentary film maker. Her book *State of Fear* has prompted many interviews with the author,<sup>252</sup> none of which appear on mainstream media, of course. From Ms Dodsworth’s research, it would appear that the UK government in all its guises has openly been into the mind-control business for decades. In 2010, a report from the Cabinet Office declared that “influencing public behaviour is central to public policy.”<sup>253</sup> One of the authors of that publication, David Halpern who was a chief strategist in the Prime Minister’s office from 2001-2007 also wrote a book on his experiences, “inside the nudge unit.”<sup>254</sup> A review of this book by a law professor reveals that nudging “... implies a sanguine

---

<sup>250</sup> Dodsworth L. [A state of fear: How the UK government weaponised fear during the Covid-19 pandemic](#). Pinter & Martin. 2021.

<sup>251</sup> UK Government. [Options for increasing adherence to social distancing measures](#) SPI-B prepared for SAGE #18 20 March 2020.

<sup>252</sup> James Delingpole. Delingpole World. [Laura Dodsworth](#).

<sup>253</sup> UK Government. Institute for Government. [MindSPACE: influencing behaviour through public policy](#). 2010. Cabinet Office.

<sup>254</sup> Halpern D. [Inside the nudge unit](#). Random House. 2016.

acceptance of a technique of government that has manipulation and even deception as a prominent feature.”<sup>255</sup> Further, that:

*Nudging is a sort of vulgar celebration of that conception of the working of government as an elite of clever people getting the mass of not so clever people to do things that they do not realise are good for them by means they are not meant to understand...Nudging does not treat citizens as children; it treats them as mugs.*

In 2011, the House of Lords also published a paper on using behavioural psychology to prompt behaviour change.<sup>256</sup> This lengthy report looked at the issues around behaviour change tactics through policy and media strategies, in particular proportionality of interventions, intrusiveness, restrictions of freedom, transparency, ethical acceptability and public permission.

*Nudges prompt choices without getting people to consider their options consciously, and therefore do not include openly persuasive interventions such as media campaigns and the straightforward provision of information. Secondly, “nudges” themselves may be provided through regulatory means. For example, businesses may be required by regulation to provide a particular choice architecture in order to “nudge” individuals.*

So, all being in this together means behavioural change can form part of any media campaign so long as there is “proportionality.” The Lords conclude at the end of the second chapter:

*We do not believe that levels of public acceptance or “public permission” are a necessary precondition of an ethically acceptable intervention, but given the potential impact of low levels of public acceptance on the effectiveness of an intervention, this must be relevant to any policy decision.*

While this has barely touched the surface, it can be established that the UK government through its murky clutch of behavioural scientists, think tanks and spin doctors, are precisely there to ensure the public stays fearful. In other words, fear has been weaponised and barely an objection is raised, particularly by the mainstream media. Returning to the SPI-B document (*Options for increasing adherence to social distancing measures*),<sup>257</sup> recommendations included increasing the sense of personal threat and to “use hard hitting emotional messaging.”<sup>258</sup> This included taglines such as:

*“Anyone can get it. Anyone can spread it.”*

*“Don’t put your friends and family in danger.”*

*“Stay home for your family. Don’t put their lives in danger.”*

*“If you go out, you can spread it. People will die.”*

*Use of hysterical media headlines was another big part of the strategy.*

This is universal. In the US, Canada and across Europe, the think tanks embedded in all governments mercilessly use fear campaigns, lockdowns, mandatory masks and vaccine

---

<sup>255</sup> Campbell D. [Cleverer than command?](#) School of Law, Lancaster University, UK.

<sup>256</sup> UK Government. [Behaviour Change](#). House of Lords. Science and Technology Select Committee. 19 July 2011.

<sup>257</sup> UK Government. [Options for increasing adherence to social distancing measures](#) SPI-B prepared for SAGE #18 20 March 2020.

<sup>258</sup> Ibid.

passports to berate their populations into submission. It has now gone beyond subtle nudging. Cass Sunstein, a US law professor who coined the term and co-wrote a book by the same name said that, “By knowing how people think we can make it easier for them to choose what is best for them, their families and society.”<sup>259</sup> In Sunstein’s latest book, he doubles down:<sup>260</sup>

*A nudge, as we will use the term, is any aspect of the choice architecture that alters people’s behaviour in a predictable way without forbidding any options or significantly changing their economic incentives...By properly deploying both incentives and nudges, we can improve our ability to improve people’s lives, and help solve many of society’s problems. And we can do so by insisting on everyone’s freedom to choose...The bottom line is that Humans are easily nudged by other Humans. Why? One reason is that we like to conform.*

In his new book, Cass Sunstein together with Richard Thaler take us through an updated version of nudging in the time of SARS-CoV-2. It is interesting to note that throughout the book mask-wearing is cleverly normalised by combining with other practices, such as “picking up after dogs, buckling seatbelts, driving under the speed limit, saving for retirement, treating people equally, or wearing masks.” Where is Professor Sunstein now? Earlier this year, Cass Sunstein was appointed to a senior position in the Department of Homeland Security in the Biden administration.<sup>261</sup> Back in August 2020, Cass Sunstein was tapped on the shoulder to chair a World Health Organization technical advisory group.<sup>262</sup> The Technical Advisory Group on Behavioural Insights and Sciences for Health, chaired by Professor Sunstein, will be coordinating across the fields of:<sup>263</sup>

*Psychology, anthropology, health promotion, social and behavioural sciences, neurosciences, behavioural economics, social marketing, design thinking and epidemiology are some of the areas of expertise of the members that come from government agencies, academia, international organizations and civil society – and are now to provide advice to WHO on a range of topics...*

*While behavioural and social sciences have for decades studied human behaviour, decision making and social and cultural drivers, past years have seen a growing integration into policies and programmes - ultimately translating into increased efficiency and better health...*

*“Providing evidence-based advice is central to WHO’s mission, but for that advice to produce results and save lives, we need to better understand the biases and triggers that affect whether or not people act on it,” Dr Tedros said.*

The SARS-CoV-2 epidemic may prove to be the biggest campaign of fear the world has ever seen. The erosion of rights and freedoms as a result of being co-opted into mass hysteria by weaponizing fear has caused us to forget how to look at actual evidence and analyse risk. The weaponization of fear undermines democracy, liberty and humanity. And nudging through behavioural science trickery lacks fairness and is downright deceitful. Suppression of the right to be human for no good reason belongs in dictatorships or feudalism.

---

<sup>259</sup> Thaler R, Sunstein C. *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. Penguin. 2008.

<sup>260</sup> Thaler RH, Sunstein C. *Nudge: the final edition*. Penguin. 2021.

<sup>261</sup> Jennifer Epstein. [Harvard’s Sunstein Joins Biden’s DHS to Shape Immigration Rules](#). Bloomberg. 9 February 2021.

<sup>262</sup> Brett Milano. [Cass Sunstein tapped to chair WHO technical advisory group](#). Harvard Law Today. 24 August 2020.

<sup>263</sup> World Health Organization. Media Press Release. [WHO convenes expert group for behaviour change](#). 9 September 2020.

Australia is no different, all in lockstep with the lead agencies and governments terrifying their citizens with scare tactics invented by behavioural scientists, rather than allow scientific evidence. Is it ethical to make people believe they are more at risk than they are? Is it moral to keep people and children in a constant state of fear?

Since at least July 2021, emergence of variants is being used to double down on mask wearing. The World Health Organization is using the spectre of the recently-discovered variant of SARS-CoV-2 to renew its calls to keep wearing masks in public regardless of whether a person is vaccinated. "The Delta variant is a dangerous virus," said WHO's SARS-CoV-2 technical lead Maria Van Kerkhove. "It is more transmissible than the Alpha variant, which was extremely transmissible across Europe — across any country that it entered." While "our public health and social measures work, our vaccines work, our diagnostics work, our therapeutics work," she argued that those who have availed themselves of such measures should resume mask wearing anyway because "there may be a time where this virus evolves and these countermeasures don't."

### **Masks and symbolism**

Finally, masks are symbolic. They are a constant reminder that we are indeed in a "pandemic." The wearing of a mask also symbolises what "side" a person is on; either of submission, or of resistance. This has fragmented families, communities and creates suspicion about the motives of each side. According to new research from a team of sociologists UNSW Sydney, the humble face mask "has become an object of symbolic power, representing some of the biggest social, political and cultural struggles of our times:<sup>264</sup>

*"Their absence or presence on a person's face immediately broadcasts not only how much at risk they feel from the coronavirus, but how much they care about others, and even their political views... during a pandemic, even the simple act of wearing a mask can be a sign of caring for others."*

Dr Fauci agrees:<sup>265</sup>

*"I want to protect myself and protect others, and also because I want to make it be a symbol for people to see that that's the kind of thing you should be doing," Fauci, the nation's top infectious disease expert and a member of the White House's coronavirus task force, told CNN's Jim Sciutto on "Newsroom." Dr Fauci said he believes that while wearing a mask is not "100% effective," it is a valuable safeguard and shows "respect for another person."*

Yet according to David Marcus, masks have been less a protective tool and more a symbol of virtue. With tools, they can be easily discarded, but not so with symbols. Symbols become a part of us, a part of our identity that mingles with our self-worth.<sup>266</sup> The author covers the changing history of mask wearing in the time of SARS-CoV-2 from the surgeon general telling us that masks were basically useless to Dr Fauci's emails saying the virus particles were too small for masks to be effective, to wearing two masks is better, to wearing masks even if you are outside, to masks are really theatre, after all.

Masks too have become a fashion emblem, tribal in their creativity. "Our face mask or covering now tells the world who we are – they are reflective of our style and quirks; and

---

<sup>264</sup> Sherry Landow. [Put your values where your mouth is: the changing power of the face mask during COVID-19](#). University of New South Wales. 13 May 2021.

<sup>265</sup> Veronica Stracqualursi. [Fauci says he wears a mask to be a symbol of what 'you should be doing'](#). CNN. 27 May 2020.

<sup>266</sup> Marcus, D. [Charade: The Covid Lies That Crushed A Nation](#). Bombardier Books. 2021.

they are statements of intent, solidarity and identity.”<sup>267</sup> Oblivious to the darker symbolism of mask wearing, and indeed the health impacts, the article from the *Huffington Post* gushes:

*“The mask is a new tool for expression which can be conveyed through colour, print, design and embellishment. It is important to make it ‘your own’, especially if this becomes the new normal,” says Morris Winmill.*

*“We have hundreds of facial expressions the human brain reads,” she adds. “Our new expressions now include a face mask shielding from nose to chin and hiding what we would normally read of someone.”*

*This idea of mindful presentation resonates with Maria Williams, a designer from Dallas, who carefully matches her handmade masks – which range in hues from gold to midnight blue – to her clothes and accessories. But for her part, she sees real positives in wearing them.*

Peter Hitchens believes that face masks turn us into voiceless submissives – and it’s not science forcing us to wear them, it’s politics. From his article about mask wearing in the UK’s *Mail on Sunday*:<sup>268</sup>

*The scientific papers in favour of muzzling are full of weak, hesitant words such as ‘probably, ‘could’ and ‘may’ – which can equally well be expressed as ‘probably not’, ‘could not’ or ‘may not’. The truth is that the muzzle policy is all about power and fear.*

*The Government began its wild, disproportionate shutdown of the country by spreading fear of a devastating plague that would destroy the NHS and kill untold thousands...Findings are now also pouring in which suggest that a horribly high number of the excess deaths during the last few months were not caused by Covid, but by people failing to seek treatment for heart attacks, strokes and cancer.*

*Look at the muzzled multitudes, their wide eyes peering out anxiously from above the hideous gag which obscures half their faces and turns them from normal human beings into mouthless, obedient submissives. The psychological effect of these garments, on those who wear them, is huge. Dissenters, who prefer not to muzzle themselves, are made to stand out from the surrendered majority, who then become quite keen on pressuring the non-conformists to do as they are told, and on informing against them.*

Masks also signify censorship, mouth covering, gagging and the suppression of a free voice and expression. Censorship is a key part of the SARS-CoV-2 messaging and submitting to this narrative means compliance. Submission means relinquishing unrestricted access to oxygen, despite the lack of evidence mask wearing makes any difference to the transmission of SARS-CoV-2. Masks are also dehumanizing, and visions of busy streets with masked crowds are reminiscent of scenes from the *iRobot* movie set. Masks create distance and separation for people, families and communities, making it harder to communicate and harder to share feelings and emotions. While relating to mask wearing in the hospital setting, a May 2020 article in the *New England Journal of Medicine* comes to similar conclusions.<sup>269</sup>

---

<sup>267</sup> Adam Bloodworth. [How Face Masks Became A Powerful Symbol Of Expression In Dark Times](#). Huffington Post. 26 August 2020.

<sup>268</sup> Peter Hitchens. [Face masks turn us into voiceless submissives - and it's not science forcing us to wear them, it's politics](#). Peter Hitchens for the Mail on Sunday. 19 July 2020.

<sup>269</sup> Klompas M. et al. [Universal Masking in Hospitals in the Covid-19 Era](#). N Engl J Med 2020; 382:e63 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp2006372

*It is also clear that masks serve symbolic roles. Masks are not only tools, they are also talismans that may help increase health care workers' perceived sense of safety, well-being, and trust in their hospitals. Although such reactions may not be strictly logical, we are all subject to fear and anxiety, especially during times of crisis. One might argue that fear and anxiety are better countered with data and education than with a marginally beneficial mask, particularly in light of the worldwide mask shortage, but it is difficult to get clinicians to hear this message in the heat of the current crisis. Expanded masking protocols' greatest contribution may be to reduce the transmission of anxiety, over and above whatever role they may play in reducing transmission of Covid-19.*

To ensure the prevailing narrative is protected against those who dare to question, *The New England Journal of Medicine* placed this warning above the article:

*Editor's Note: This article was published on April 1, 2020, at NEJM.org. In a letter to the editor on June 3, 2020, the authors of this article state "We strongly support the calls of public health agencies for all people to wear masks when circumstances compel them to be within 6 ft of others for sustained periods."*

Symbolism and virtue signalling to be seen where ever there are masked humans, serving as a constant reminder to the pretence of a raging deadly pandemic that kills every person it touches. The weaponization of fear during SARS-CoV-2 has its roots in compliance and obedience, and there is no greater symbol of this level of control than mask wearing. Looking to antiquity and even more recent times, masks were worn by slaves as a sign of submission to masters. Throughout history rituals that practice dark arts also use masks to symbolize submission, to make victims faceless, anonymous and therefore inhuman. As we have seen throughout this paper, if there is little to no evidence to support mandated mask wearing, except in limited medical circumstances, it is curious that there is such insistence by the mega corporations, pharmaceutical giants, mainstream media, academia, international globalist money lenders, and government agencies who ensure lockstep control of the messaging.

As the evidence shows, masks have played a relatively small role, if any, in reducing the virus' spread across the world over the past year or more. Prior to mask mandates as an alleged protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection and transmission, masks were infrequently worn in hospitals and other medical facilities. Even in the hospital setting masks were only used in operating theatres or for visiting seriously ill patients to prevent infection into open wounds or to partially protect visitors from acquiring and transmitting pathogens more dangerous than SARS-CoV-2. Very few studies were needed to justify this practice since most understood viruses were far too small to be stopped by the wearing of most masks, other than sophisticated ones designed for that task and which were too costly and complicated for the general public to properly wear and keep changing or cleaning. It was also understood that long mask wearing was unhealthy for wearers for common sense and basic science reasons.

The paper has shown there are many studies where there is little or no scientific evidence for mandating the wearing of a face mask for prevention and transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in the community. It was also established that there are dangers to wearing a face mask, some deadly, especially for long periods. Several studies mentioned in this paper indeed found significant health problems with wearing face mask, particularly for children. This ranged from headaches, to increased airway resistance, carbon dioxide accumulation, to hypoxia, all the way to serious life-threatening complications and even death. The tribal symbolism of

mask mandates was also covered – the cheap, effective, and dehumanizing edict to separate people, families and communities from each other to ensure submission by the faceless, anonymous, unclean masses.

Finally, the unnecessary and greatly exaggerated fear campaign based on reporting case numbers is nothing more than propaganda. There, it has now been said. The messaging about and subsequent compliance with mandating face masks would make the father of propaganda and public relations, Edward Bernays, proud. As noted, history shows us that governments, monarchs and tyrants have long used fear to control their populations. From antiquity to the terror campaigns waged over the last few centuries, fear has controlled the masses. During the first world war, the British established a war propaganda bureau using the press, films and advertisements to portray the “enemy” (who were just Germans, who probably never wanted to fight anyone) as evil and something to be feared, thus whipping up nationalism for the people to fight for their country. Using Bernays’ principles, the fear machine has been finely tuned since then. The student and nephew of Sigmund Freud, Bernays wrote in his seminal book, *Propaganda*:<sup>270</sup>

*The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country...*

*If we understand the mechanisms and motives of the group mind, it is now possible to control and regiment the masses according to our will without their knowing it. In almost every act of our daily lives, whether in the sphere of politics or business, in our social conduct or our ethical thinking, we are dominated by the relatively small number of persons who understand the mental processes and social patterns of the masses. It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind.*

At the end of the “Great War,” there is still debate and controversy about how it started and what it all meant. In the end, millions died, borders were changed, and the notion of culture would never be the same. A five-year war can achieve more culture change than 50 years of incrementalism. Channelling Plato’s Republic, and the idea of ignorant masses and benevolent rulers, Edward Bernays created the conditions in the public arena through cleverly crafted public relations campaigns using the press to reshape the political reality by engaging universities, lawyers, the media, business and government in the effort. Why is this formula still working after a century? Because it is the basis for weaponizing fear and controlling the population by clever manipulation. Are we not in a “war” against SARS-CoV-2? Are we not “all in this together?” Don’t we all need to “do the right thing (by staying home, wearing a mask, and taking experimental vaccines)?” Straight from the Bernays playbook, it is classic propaganda 101 deploying public relations and behavioural science experts to hone the messaging. Though much more sophisticated with artificial intelligence technology to analyse, censor and control and social media, the overarching tactics and strategies have changed little. While propaganda had been used for centuries, Bernays set out a clear scientific framework to make the public obedient using their own consent. Joseph Goebbels, Minister of Propaganda in the Third Reich, was an avid admirer of Edward Bernays and also drew heavily upon his work, and the rest they say is history.

---

<sup>270</sup> Bernays E. *Propaganda*. 1928.

## SARS-CoV-2 vaccinations