

"All that is necessary
for the triumph of
evil is that good
men do nothing . . ."
— EDMUND BURKE.



THE NEW TIMES

SURVEY

THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol. 22 No. 05

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

May 2021

CONTENTS

The Douglas Social Credit Attitude Towards Authority by John Burton	1
Warning Democracy By CH Douglas - <i>extract</i>	2
18 Reasons I Won't Be Getting a Covid Vaccine by Christian Elliot	4

THE DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT ATTITUDE TOWARDS AUTHORITY by John Burton

In these times of draconian lock-downs, mask mandates, talk of vaccine passports, and so forth, it is easy to fall into the trap of thinking that authority is the problem and that 'freedom' means, above all, 'freedom from authority'. Without any doubt, the abuse of authority is a very great evil and the source of many social diseases. Without any doubt, the looming threat that we now face, with the SARS-CoV-2 virus and 'climate change' as pretexts, is of a 'Great Reset' and the imposition of an international totalitarian regime. But it is important to realize that the failure of authority is also a great evil and is likewise the source of many other social problems. In fact, the best way of neutralizing the 'Great Reseters' is to strengthen the legitimate organs of authority in society and to sweep away those things which interfere with their proper functioning. The reality is that freedom and authority are two sides of the same coin and we actually need the right kind of authority to be put in place in order to maximize the widest possible scope for the right kind of freedom in association.

That this general orientation is in line with Douglas' thinking can be easily demonstrated by referencing the Douglas *corpus*. Consider, for example, the following quote from one of his earliest works, *Credit Power and Democracy*: "... we are confronted by the fundamental alternatives of freedom and authority. But it should be possible ... to see that these are not necessarily alternatives at all -- they are policies each fundamentally 'right' on its own plane of action."

The Douglas Social Credit contention has always been – in keeping with the Christian adage "Whose Service is Perfect Freedom" – that we obey rightful authority for the sake of preserving and increasing our freedom. That is, authority exists and should be exercised for the sake of making us freer than we otherwise would be. Hence, the institution that would be responsible for introducing and administering the correct financial policy in a Douglas Social Credit commonwealth, which is a policy of decentralized credit power, was to receive the name of "The National Credit Authority".

In no way, then, is Douglas Social Credit opposed to the *proper use of rightful authority*. Just the opposite: Douglas Social Credit is as much pro-authority as it is pro-freedom, because one cannot achieve the latter without the former within the context of association. And what constitutes the proper use of rightful authority? Well, the due relationship between freedom and authority that was just mentioned provides us with the litmus test: does the exercise of this or that particular authority makes us freer than we otherwise would be, free as much as we could be given the nature of reality and its Canon? If the answer is 'yes', we can have confidence that the authority in question is functioning appropriately. If the answer is 'no', then we can conclude that something is very much wrong and in desperate need of revision.

As far the principle of authority in society is concerned, we can discern two basic points of cleavage and four separate categories that result from those distinctions. To begin with, authority is either legitimate or illegitimate. That is, an authority either receives the justification for its existence on the basis of some kind of law, and ultimately natural law, or it is lacking in any such foundation. The idea here is that, apart from God, authority must receive its validation from something outside and greater than itself in the form of objective realities, facts, agreements, etc., in order for it to be considered legitimate and possessing, therefore, the right to exercise itself. As has been said: "Truth is authority. Authority is not truth".

Similarly, authority is also either fully functional in its deployment, or it is less than fully functional. That is, authority is either deployed in an effective, efficient, and just manner, so that the aims of authority are easily and duly fulfilled, or it is deployed in a manner that is not as effective, or as efficient, or as just as the physical facts of the situation would allow.

These two sets of distinctions cut across each other and give rise to four categories: 1) legitimate authority that is properly deployed, 2) legitimate authority that is improperly deployed, 3) illegitimate authority that is properly deployed, and 4) illegitimate authority that is improperly deployed.

In the context of the Coronavirus ‘pandemic’ and the accompanying threat of a ‘Great Reset’, what we are threatened with are governments and other bodies that mostly fall into categories 2 and 3. With any luck, some of them may eventually be found to fall into category 4 (I say: ‘with any luck’, as category 4 authorities are likely to be little else than a transient and laughable nuisance that no one can take seriously). The answer to this state of affairs is not to decry the principle of authority, as that would be to throw the baby out with the bathwater, but to insist on the rehabilitation of authority in line with the demands of category 1.

As a matter of fact, the only escape possible from illegitimate authority of whatever kind, or the abuse or failure of legitimate authority, is the proper (competent, efficient, and fair) use of legitimate authority.

WARNING DEMOCRACY By CH Douglas - extract - Engineering, Money and Prices

I propose to deal briefly with three points, each of which may serve as points of departure for further discussion...

I. Engineering

In regard to the first, the charter of the Institute of Civil Engineers defines engineering as “the application of the forces of nature to the uses of man.” It is quite probable that what are commonly known as physical forces were in the mind of Telford when he framed this admirable definition, but I suppose that, on consideration, there is no one here tonight who would not recognise that such a restriction is unwarranted. It is not sensible to detach an engineering project from the purpose to be attained by it. The force of gravity is not half such a serious obstacle to the development of, let us say, the Severn Barrage scheme, as a lack of finance, and a strike on the railway system of England is much more effective in paralysing transportation than an inferior valve gear. We are constantly being told of the necessity of goodwill and tact in industry. While these are obviously desirable, it seems to me that arrangements which require so much tact and good-will are suspect, just as would be a machine which required too much oil, and that it is our business to look into those arrangements, even if it were only to enable us to conform to them intelligently.

A curious point in connection with this matter is that the truth of what I have just been saying is fully recognised within the limitations imposed by the factory walls. No one would contend that it is outside the province of the Works Manager to make such arrangements as would tend to keep his men at work, but it is well enough understood both by the Works Manager and by the Trades Union agitator that the one difficulty

Authority has to be appropriately regulated and put in its due place if true freedom is to find its proper supports and is to be experienced as a concrete reality. If you reject the establishment of any kind of authority or prevent the exercise of any legitimate authority, what you end up with is anarchism. But with anarchism you don’t get total ‘freedom’, or freedom from any authority, because nature abhors a vacuum. What you get is the private domination of the strongest: the law of the jungle. ‘Authority’ is then exercised as a ‘*de facto*’ reality: ‘might is right’. Such privatized ‘authorities’ are even more likely to defy any concern for legitimacy and to exercise themselves abusively in opposition to the common good and the public interest. ***

References:

ⁱ C.H. Douglas, *Credit Power and Democracy* (Melbourne: The Social Credit Press, 1933), 144. Cf. C.H. Douglas, *Programme for the Third World War* (Liverpool: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 1943), 59-60 also: “Amongst the less intelligent criticism of the group of ideas known as (Douglas) Social Credit is that it is disguised anarchy – a kind of go-as-you-please free for all. The argument is equivalent to saying that a claim to choose whether I play cricket or tennis is a claim to make the rules of cricket or tennis.”

which never remains composed for any length of time is the wages difficulty. On the other hand, during the past few years, we have witnessed the reconstruction of many of the largest engineering concerns in this country—a reconstruction the necessity for which has almost uniformly been attributed to bad management, but which can, in fact, simply be attributed to the *inability to sell at prices which the market can afford to pay*. That situation was the direct result of the policy of the Bank of England acting within the existing financial system, and management had very little to do with it.

These reasons alone would be sufficient to justify the inclusion of the financial system as an integral part of the production and distribution system...

II. The General Nature of Money

The best definition of money with which I am acquainted is that of Professor Walker, which is that “money is any medium which has reached such a degree of acceptability that, no matter what it is made of, and no matter why people want it, no one will refuse it in exchange for his product.” ... The essential quality of money, therefore, is that a man shall believe that he can get what he wants by the aid of it. This is absolutely the only quality that it is required to possess, although, of course, certain minor attributes, such as convenience, have a bearing on the decision as to what particular description of money, if it fulfils the major requirements, is likely to come into the most general use. The cheque, no doubt, owes its popularity to this latter attribute. Looked at from this point of view, money is simply a ticket. A railway ticket is, in the truest sense, a limited form of money and differs only from any other sort of

money in that the owner of it only believes, and is only justified in believing, that he will receive in return for it a particular form of service, i.e., transportation.

Now, if the whole of the population of Great Britain were to besiege the gates of the great London termini, under the urge of some necessity, such as, let us say, the invasion of London, to remove themselves to Scotland, and were to be told that there were plenty of trains, plenty of tractive power, and that, in fact, the whole of the railway system was physically capable of meeting their necessity, but that unfortunately only 15 percent of the tickets necessary to entitle them to seats were available and that the Traffic Department, as a matter of policy, did not propose to print any more, it would probably be agreed that the Traffic Department would hear something to its disadvantage.

The extraordinary feature of the present day is that, when people are told that the workshops of this country are clamouring for orders, that the shops and department stores are full of goods, that a large proportion of the population is, at one and the same time, asking to be allowed to make more goods and services, while complaining that it cannot get more than a bare minimum of those goods and services that are available, because it has not got the tickets to hand over in exchange for them, the situation is regarded as being in the nature of an act of God, and impressive gentlemen deliver homilies to us on the inexorable nature of economic law. In other words, the statement that a thing cannot be done because there is no money with which to do it is accepted as a good and final reply to a demand for action.

III. An Outline of the Nature of Prices

Some examination into the mechanism, therefore, by which these tickets that we refer to as money are issued, and the conditions governing the control of their issue, is an important part of this subject. In the first place, we have a number of tickets described as "legal tender," which are comprised under the description of Bank of England notes, Treasury notes, gold, silver, and copper coin. In round numbers, in this country these amount to about 380 millions, and bear about the same relation to the total volume of tickets as do teetotallers in America to Prohibition. In figures, it is about 10 percent. The other 90 percent of the ticket system with which we are dealing is represented by bankers' credit, that is to say, by payment by cheque. Now, every effort is made to convey the impression that a cheque upon a bank is an order to the bank to pay out money which was paid in, either by the drawer or by someone else. This idea is, of course, fostered by the fact that, so far as *personal* banking accounts are concerned (as distinct from commercial banking accounts) it is roughly a true statement, but it must be remembered that very few personal banking accounts bear any considerable ratio to the so-called wealth of the persons to whom they refer. Very few people keep large personal bank balances.

Nevertheless, no transaction as between a buyer and a seller can take place without the use of money in some form or another. To see where this money comes from, it is necessary to examine the technique of Bank Loans.

The railway ticket, described above as a limited form of money, has, however, in addition to being only a demand for transportation, a rigid relation to a certain kind of transportation: that is to say, one first-class ticket will obtain one first-class seat, other things being equal, but £1 sterling in 1914 would obtain probably more than twice as much of the average articles that you use as the same £ 1 sterling in 1927. To begin with, you buy in 1927 to the extent of at least 20 percent of your income something that you do not want, that is to say, taxes. It has, therefore, to be recognised as fundamental that the amount of money available at any one time only derives importance in relation to the price of goods. In other words, a money system derives its features not either from money alone or prices alone, but from the ratio between the two of them. If this ratio of money to goods is such that there is more money than goods, goods will be important and money will be unimportant. If the ratio is such that there are always more goods than money, money will be important and goods will be unimportant. The plain issue before the world at the present time is which is more important, money or goods? The facts of the situation are that there are clearly more goods than there is money with which to buy. The reason for this situation is complex, but one of the fundamentals, without attention to which the situation cannot be rectified, is as follows. When a manufacturing concern pays out wages and salaries, its costing department enters this payment in the costs of production. Let us imagine that these wages and salaries are always paid in Treasury Notes. These Treasury Notes go back to their source after a very short time, through the agency of prices paid to retail distributors, and are paid out again. *Each time* that they are paid out, they pass through the cost accounts and, consequently, *each time* appear as a component of *prices*. There is nothing in this circulation of the Treasury Notes which increases the amount of money in the world, but each cycle represents the creation of a batch of prices. To put the matter shortly, *when you make goods you make prices* but you do *not* make money. As a result of this divergence, total prices produced over a given period of time are greatly in excess of total money distributed over the same period of time. In consequence, the ratio of money to prices is considerably less than unity, and there is a constant struggle on the part of the industrial system to obtain purchasing power, either from export markets (which struggle is the prime incentive to war) or by the manufacture of so-called capital goods, the money distributed in respect of which temporarily assists in the payment for consumable goods.

The problem set for, I believe, the engineer to solve, therefore, may be stated thus.

He has to obtain a clear statement as to what the production system is aiming at. Such a statement is certainly not available at the moment. If the aim is maximum production, he must stipulate for the provision of buying power to take away the production as fast as it is turned out. If it is a given standard of living with a consequent steady increase in leisure, he must specify for the provision of buying power which is not derived from employment, because such an objective postulates a constant decrease in the amount of labour required in the industry. What he cannot be expected to do, in my

opinion, is to combine the *fundamentally in-compatible objectives of labour-saving and the provision of unlimited employment*. Having attained an objective, he ought to be in a position to state the conditions under which he can achieve it. These conditions, on the one hand, have to do with the physical capacity for output of his plant, but they have equally to do with the number of demand tickets, or money, which his output brings, or ought to bring, into existence. If this latter aspect is not satisfactorily adjusted, his programme of production must break down. ***

18 REASONS I WON'T BE GETTING A COVID VACCINE by Christian Elliot

(Republished from: <https://www.deconstructingconventional.com/post/18-reason-i-won-t-be-getting-a-covid-vaccine>)

The interactive version of this article can be read on-line

A few friends have asked my thoughts on the covid jab(s) so I thought it was time to write an article on the topic...I don't know everything, but so far no one has been able to answer the objections below. So here are the reasons I'm opting out of the covid vaccine.

#1: VACCINE MAKERS ARE IMMUNE FROM LIABILITY

The only industry in the world that bears no liability for injuries or deaths resulting from their products, are vaccine makers. First established in 1986 with the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act, and reinforced by the PREP Act, vaccine makers cannot be sued, even if they are shown to be negligent.

The covid-vaccine makers are allowed to create a one-size-fits-all product, with no testing on sub-populations (i.e. people with specific health conditions), and yet they are unwilling to accept any responsibility for any adverse events or deaths their products cause. If a company is not willing to stand behind their product as safe, especially one they rushed to market and skipped animal trials on, I am not willing to take a chance on their product. No liability. No trust. Here's why...

#2: THE CHECKERED PAST OF THE VACCINE COMPANIES

The four major companies who are making these covid vaccines are/have either:

1. Never brought a vaccine to market before covid (**Moderna** and **Johnson & Johnson**).
2. Are serial felons (**Pfizer**, and **Astra Zeneca**).
3. Are both (**Johnson & Johnson**).

Moderna had been trying to "Modernize our RNA" (thus the company name)--for years, but had never successfully brought ANY product to market--how nice for them to get a major cash infusion from the government to keep trying. In fact, all major vaccine makers (save Moderna) have paid out tens of billions of dollars in damages for other products they brought to market when then knew those product would cause injuries and death--see Vioxx, Bextra, Celebrex,

Thalidomide, and Opioids as a few examples.

If drug companies willfully choose to put harmful products in the market, when they can be sued, why would we trust any product where they have NO liability?

In case it hasn't sunk in, let me reiterate...3 of the 4 covid vaccine makers have been sued for products they brought to market even though they knew injuries and deaths would result.

- **Johnson & Johnson** has lost major lawsuits in 1995, 1996, 2001, 2010, 2011, 2016, 2019 (For what it's worth, J&J's vaccine also contains tissues from aborted fetal cells, perhaps a topic for another discussion)
- **Pfizer** has the distinction of the biggest criminal payout in history. They have lost so many lawsuits it's hard to count. You can check out their rap sheet here. Maybe that's why they are demanding that countries where they don't have liability protection put up collateral to cover vaccine-injury lawsuits.
- **Astra Zeneca** has similarly lost so many lawsuits it's hard to count. Here's one. Here's another...you get the point. And in case you missed it, the company had their covid vaccine suspended in at least 18 countries over concerns of blood clots, and they completely botched their meeting with the FDA with numbers from their study that didn't match.
- Oh, and apparently **J&J** (whose vaccine is approved for "Emergency Use" in the US) and **Astrazenca** (whose vaccine is not approved for "Emergency Use" in the US), had a little mix up in their ingredients...in 15 million doses. Oops.

Let me reiterate this point:

Given the free pass from liability, and the checkered past of these companies, why would we assume that all their vaccines are safe and made completely above board?

Where else in life would we trust someone with that kind of reputation? To me that makes as much sense as expecting a remorseless, abusive, unfaithful lover to become a different person because a judge said deep down they are a good person. No. I don't trust them. No liability. No trust. Here's another reason why I don't trust

them.

#3: THE UGLY HISTORY OF ATTEMPTS TO MAKE CORONAVIRUS VACCINES

There have been many attempts to make viral vaccines in the past that ended in utter failure, which is why we did not have a coronavirus vaccine in 2020. In the 1960's, scientists attempted to make an RSV (Respiratory Syncytial Virus) vaccine for infants. In that study, they skipped animal trials because they weren't necessary back then. In the end, the vaccinated infants got much sicker than the unvaccinated infants when exposed to the virus in nature, with 80% of the vaccinated infants requiring hospitalization, and two of them died. After 2000, scientists made many attempts to create coronavirus vaccines. For the past 20 years, all ended in failure because the animals in the clinical trials got very sick and many died, just like the children in the 1960's. You can read a summary of this history/science here. Or if you want to read the individual studies you can check out these links:

- In 2004 attempted vaccine produced hepatitis in ferrets
- In 2005 mice and civets became sick and more susceptible to coronaviruses after being vaccinated
- In 2012 the ferrets became sick and died. And in this study mice and ferrets developed lung disease.
- In 2016 this study also produce lung disease in mice.

The typical pattern in the studies mentioned above is that the children and the animals produced beautiful antibody responses after being vaccinated. The manufacturers thought they hit the jackpot. The problem came when the children and animals were exposed to the wild version of the virus. When that happened, an unexplained phenomenon called Antibody Dependent Enhancement (ADE) also known as Vaccine Enhanced Disease (VED) occurred where the immune system produced a "cytokine storm" (i.e. overwhelmingly attacked the body), and the children/animals died.

Here's the lingering issue...*The vaccine makers have no data to suggest their rushed vaccines have overcome that problem.* In other words, never before has any attempt to make a coronavirus vaccine been successful, nor has the gene-therapy technology that is mRNA "vaccines" been safely brought to market, but hey, since they had billions of dollars in government funding, I'm sure they figured that out. Except they don't know if they have...

#4: THE "DATA GAPS" SUBMITTED TO THE FDA BY THE VACCINE MAKERS

When vaccine makers submitted their papers to the FDA for the Emergency Use Authorization (Note: An EUA is not the same as a full FDA approval), among the many "Data Gaps" they reported was that they have nothing in their trials to suggest they overcame that pesky problem of Vaccine Enhanced Disease. They simply don't know--i.e. they have no idea if the vaccines they've made will also produce the same cytokine storm (and deaths) as

previous attempts at such products.

As Dr Joseph Mercola points out...

"Previous attempts to develop an mRNA-based drug using lipid nanoparticles failed and had to be abandoned because when the dose was too low, the drug had no effect, and when dosed too high, the drug became too toxic. An obvious question is: What has changed that now makes this technology safe enough for mass use?" If that's not alarming enough, here are other gaps in the data--i.e. there is no data to suggest safety or efficacy regarding:

- Anyone younger than age 18 or older than age 55
- Pregnant or lactating mothers
- Auto-immune conditions
- Immunocompromised individuals
- **No data on transmission of covid**
- **No data on preventing mortality from covid**
- **No data on duration of protection from covid**

Hard to believe right? In case you think I'm making this up, or want to see the actual documents sent to the FDA by Pfizer and Moderna for their Emergency Use Authorization, you can check out this, or this respectively. The data gaps can be found starting with page 46 and 48 respectively. For now let's turn our eyes to the raw data the vaccine makers used to submit for emergency use authorization.

#5: NO ACCESS TO THE RAW DATA FROM THE TRIALS

Would you like to see the raw data that produced the "90% and 95% effective" claims touted in the news? Me too... But they won't let us see that data. As pointed out in the BMJ, something about the Pfizer and Moderna efficacy claims smells really funny.

There were "3,410 total cases of suspected, but unconfirmed covid-19 in the overall study population, 1,594 occurred in the vaccine group vs. 1,816 in the placebo group."

Wait...what? Did they fail to do science in their scientific study by not verifying a major variable? Could they not test those "suspected but unconfirmed" cases to find out if they had covid? Apparently not. Why not test all 3,410 participants for the sake of accuracy? Can we only guess they didn't test because it would mess up their "90-95% effective" claims? Where's the FDA? Would it not be prudent for the FDA, to expect (demand) that the vaccine makers test people who have "covid-like symptoms," and release their raw data so outside, third-parties could examine how the manufacturers justified the numbers? I mean it's only every citizen of the world we're trying to get to take these experimental products...

Why did the FDA not require that? Isn't that the entire purpose of the FDA anyway? Good question. Foxes guarding the hen house? Seems like it.

#6: NO LONG-TERM SAFETY TESTING

Obviously, with products that have only been on the market a few months, we have no long-term safety data.

In other words, we have no idea what this product will do in the body months or years from now--for ANY population. Given all the risks above (risks that ALL pharmaceutical products have), would it not be prudent to wait to see if the worst-case scenarios have indeed been avoided? Would it not make sense to want to fill those pesky "data gaps" before we try to give this to every man, woman, and child on the planet? Well...that would make sense, but to have that data, they need to test it on people, which leads me to my next point...

#7: NO INFORMED CONSENT

What most who are taking the vaccine don't know is that because these products are still in clinical trials, anyone who gets the shot is now part of the clinical trial. They are part of the experiment. Those (like me) who do not take it, are part of the control group. Time will tell how this experiment works out. But, you may be asking, if the vaccines are causing harm, wouldn't we be seeing that all over the news? Surely the FDA would step in and pause the distribution? Well, if the adverse events reporting system was working, maybe things would be different.

#8: UNDER-REPORTING OF ADVERSE REACTIONS AND DEATH

According to a study done by Harvard (at the commission of our own government), less than 1% of all adverse reactions to vaccines are actually submitted to the National Vaccine Adverse Events Reports System (VAERS) - read page 6 at the link above. While the problems with VAERS have not been fixed (as you can read about in this letter to the CDC), at the time of this writing VAERS reports over 2,200 deaths from the current covid vaccines, as well as close to 60,000 adverse reactions.

"VAERS data released today showed 50,861 reports of adverse events following COVID vaccines, including 2,249 deaths and 7,726 serious injuries between Dec. 14, 2020 and March 26, 2021."

And those numbers don't include (what is currently) 578 cases of Bell's Palsy. If those numbers are still only 1% of the total adverse reactions (or .8 to 2% of what this study published recently in the JAMA found), you can do the math, but that equates to somewhere around 110,00 to 220,000 deaths from the vaccines to date, and a ridiculous number of adverse reactions. Bet you didn't see that on the news. That death number would currently still be lower than the 424,000 deaths from medical errors that happen every year (which you probably also don't hear about), but we are not even six months into the rollout of these vaccines yet. If you want a deeper dive into the problems with the VAERS reporting system, you can check this out, or check this out. But then there's my next point, which could be argued makes these covid vaccines seem pointless...

#9: THE VACCINES DO NOT STOP TRANSMISSION OR INFECTION

New Times Survey

Wait, what? Aren't these vaccines supposed to be what we've been waiting for to "go back to normal"? Nope. Why do you think we're getting all these conflicting messages about needing to practice social distancing and wear masks AFTER we get a vaccine?

The reason is because these vaccines were never designed to stop transmission OR infection.

If you don't believe me, I refer you again to the papers submitted to the FDA I linked to above. The primary endpoint (what the vaccines are meant to accomplish) is to lower your symptoms. Sounds like just about every other drug on the market right? That's it...lowering your symptoms is the big payoff we've been waiting for. Does that seem completely pointless to anyone but me?

1. It can't stop us from spreading the virus.
2. It can't stop the virus from infecting us once we have it.
3. To get the vaccine is to accept all the risk of these experimental products and the best it might do is lower symptoms? Heck, there are plenty of other things I can do to lower my symptoms that don't involve taking what appears to be a really risky product. Now for the next logical question:

If we're worried about asymptomatic spreaders, would the vaccine not make it more likely that we are creating asymptomatic spread?

If it indeed reduces symptoms, anyone who gets it might not even know they are sick and thus they are more likely to spread the virus, right? For what it's worth, I've heard many people say the side effects of the vaccine (especially the second dose) are worse than catching covid. I can't make sense of that either. Take the risk. Get no protection. Suffer through the vaccine side-effects. Keep wearing your mask and social distancing...

And continue to be able to spread the virus. What? It gets worse.

#10: PEOPLE ARE CATCHING COVID AFTER BEING FULLY VACCINATED

Talk about a bummer. You get vaccinated and you still catch covid.

- It's happening in Washington State
- It's happening in New York
- It's happening in Michigan
- It's happening in Hawaii
- It's happening in several other states too.
- It happened to 80% of 35 nuns who got the vaccine in Kentucky. Two of them died by the way.

In reality, this phenomenon is probably happening everywhere, but those are the ones making the news now. Given the reasons above (and what's below), maybe this doesn't surprise you, but bummer if you thought the vaccine was a shield to keep you safe. It's not. That was never the point. If 66% of healthcare workers in L.A. are going to delay or skip the vaccine... maybe they aren't wowed by the rushed science either. Maybe they are watching the shady way deaths and

cases are being reported...

#11: THE OVERALL DEATH RATE FROM COVID

According to the CDC's own numbers, covid has a 99.74% survival rate. Why would I take a risk on a product, that doesn't stop infection or transmission, to help me overcome a cold that has a .26% chance of killing me--actually in my age range is has about a .1% chance of killing me (and .01% chance of killing my kids), but let's not split hairs here. With a bar (death rate) that low, we will be in lock-down every year...i.e. forever. But wait, what about the 500,000 plus deaths, that's alarming right? I'm glad you asked.

#12: THE BLOATED COVID DEATH NUMBERS

Something smells really funny about this one. Never before in the history of death certificates has our own government changed how deaths are reported. Why now, are we reporting everyone who dies with covid in their body, as having died of covid, rather than the co-morbidities that actually took their life? Until covid, all coronaviruses (common colds) were never listed as the primary cause of death when someone died of heart disease, cancer, diabetes, auto-immune conditions, or any other major co-morbidity. The disease was listed as the cause of death, and a confounding factor like flu or pneumonia was listed on a separate line.

To bloat the number even more, both the W.H.O. and the C.D.C. changed their guidelines such that those who are suspected or probable (but were never confirmed) of having died of covid, are also included in the death numbers. Seriously? If we are going to do that then should we not go back and change the numbers of all past cold and flu seasons so we can compare apples to apples when it comes to death rates? According to the CDC's own numbers, (scroll down to the section "Comorbidities and other conditions") only 6% of the deaths being attributed to covid are instances where covid seems to be the only issue at hand. In other words, reduce the death numbers you see on the news by 94% and you have what is likely the real numbers of deaths from just covid. Even if the former CDC director is correct and covid-19 was a lab-enhanced virus (see Reason #14 below), a .26% death rate is still in line with the viral death rate that circles the planet ever year. Then there's this Fauci guy. I'd really love to trust him, but besides the fact that he hasn't treated one covid patient...you should probably know...

#13: FAUCI AND SIX OTHERS AT NIAID OWN PATENTS IN THE MODERNA VACCINE

Thanks to the Bayh-Dole Act, government workers are allowed to file patents on any research they do using tax payer funding. Tony Fauci owns over 1,000 patents (see this video for more details), including patents being used on the Moderna vaccine...*which he approved government funding for*. In fact, the NIH (which NIAID is part of) claims joint ownership of Moderna's vaccine. Does anyone else see this as a MAJOR conflict of interest, or criminal even? I say criminal because there's also this

pesky problem that makes me even more distrustful of Fauci, NIAID, and the NIH in general.

#14: FAUCI IS ON THE HOT SEAT FOR ILLEGAL GAIN-OF-FUNCTION RESEARCH

What is "Gain-of-Function" research? It's where scientists attempt to make viruses gain functions--i.e. make them more transmissible and deadlier. Sounds at least a touch unethical, right? How could that possibly be helpful? Our government agreed, and banned the practice. So what did the Fauci-led NIAID do? They pivoted and outsourced the gain-of-function research (in coronaviruses no less) to China--to the tune of a \$600K grant. You can see more details, including the important time-line of these events in this fantastically well-researched documentary. Mr. Fauci, you have some explaining to do...and I hope the cameras are recording when you have to defend your actions. For now, let's turn our attention back to the virus...

#15: THE VIRUS CONTINUES TO MUTATE

Not only does the virus (like all viruses) continue to mutate, but according to world-renowned vaccine developer Geert Vanden Bossche (who you'll meet below if you don't know him) it's mutating about every 10 hours. How in the world are we going to keep creating vaccines to keep up with that level of mutation? We're not. Might that also explain why fully vaccinated people are continuing to catch covid? Why, given that natural immunity has never ultimately failed humanity, do we suddenly not trust it? Why, if I ask questions like the above, or post links like what you find above, will my thoughts be deleted from all major social media platforms? That brings me to the next troubling problem I have with these vaccines.

#16: CENSORSHIP...AND THE COMPLETE ABSENCE OF SCIENTIFIC DEBATE

I can't help but get snarky here, so humor me. How did you enjoy all those nationally and globally-televised, robust debates put on by public health officials, and broadcast simultaneously on every major news station? Wasn't it great hearing from the best minds in medicine, virology, epidemiology, economics, and vaccinology from all over the world as they vigorously and respectfully debated things like:

- Lock-downs
- Mask wearing
- Social-distancing
- Vaccine efficacy and safety trials
- How to screen for susceptibility to vaccine injury
- Therapeutics, (i.e. non-vaccine treatment options)

Wasn't it great seeing public health officials (who never treated anyone with covid) have their "science" questioned. Wasn't it great seeing the FDA panel publicly grill the vaccine makers in prime time as they stood in the hot-seat of tough questions about products of which they have no liability? Oh, wait...you didn't see those debates? No, you didn't...because they never happened.

What happened instead was heavy-handed censorship of all but one narrative. Ironically, Mark Zuckerberg can question vaccine safety, but I can't? Hypocrite? When did the first amendment become a suggestion? It's the FIRST amendment Mark--the one our founders thought was most important. With so much at stake, why are we fed only one narrative...shouldn't many perspectives be heard and professionally debated?

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO SCIENCE?

What has happened to the scientific method of always challenging our assumptions? What happened to lively debate in this country, or at least in Western society?

Why did anyone who disagrees with the WHO, or the CDC get censored so heavily? Is the science of public health a religion now, or is science supposed to be about debate? If someone says "the science is settled" that's how I know I'm dealing with someone who is closed minded. By definition science (especially biological science) is never settled. If it was, it would be dogma, not science. OK, before I get too worked up, let me say this...

I WANT TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN

I really do. If lock-downs work, I want to do my part and stay home. If masks work, I want to wear them. If social distancing is effective, I want to comply. But, if there is evidence they don't (masks for example), I want to hear that evidence too. If highly-credentialed scientists have different opinions, I want to know what they think. I want a chance to hear their arguments and make up my own mind. I don't think I'm the smartest person in the world, but I think I can think. Maybe I'm weird, but if someone is censored, then I REALLY want to hear what they think. Don't you? To all my friends who don't have a problem with censorship, will you have the same opinion when what you think is censored? Is censorship not the technique of dictators, tyrants, and greedy, power-hungry people? Is it not a sign that those who are doing the censoring know it's the only way they can win? What if a man who spent his entire life developing vaccines was willing to put his entire reputation on the line and call on all global leaders to immediately stop the covid vaccines because of problems with the science? What if he pleaded for an open-scientific debate on a global stage? Would you want to hear what he has to say? Would you want to see the debate he's asking for?

#17: THE WORLD'S LEADING VACCINOLOGIST IS SOUNDING THE ALARM...

Here is what may be the biggest reason this covid vaccine doesn't make sense to me. When someone who is very pro-vaccine, who has spent his entire professional career overseeing the development of vaccines, is shouting from the mountaintops that we have a major problem, I think the man should be heard. In case you missed it, and in case you care to watch it, here is Geert Vanden Bossche, explaining:

1. Why the covid vaccine may be putting so much pressure on the virus that we are accelerating it's ability to mutate and become more deadly.
2. Why the covid vaccines may be creating vaccine-resistant viruses (similar to anti-biotic resistant bacteria).
3. Why, because of previous problems with Antibody Dependent Enhancement, we may be looking at a mass casualty event in the next few months/years. If you want to see/read about a second, and longer, interview with Vanden Bossche, where he was asked some tough questions, you can check this out. If half of what he says comes true, these vaccines could be the worst invention of all time. If you don't like his science, take it up with him. I'm just the messenger. But I can also speak to covid personally.

#18: I ALREADY HAD COVID

I didn't enjoy it. It was a nasty cold for two days:

- Unrelenting butt/low-back aches
- Very low energy.
- Low-grade fever.

It was weird not being able to smell anything for a couple days. A week later, coffee still tasted a little "off." But I survived. Now it appears (as it always has) that I have beautiful, natural, life-long immunity... not something likely to wear off in a few months if I get the vaccine. In my body, and my household, covid is over. In fact, now that I've had it, there is evidence the covid vaccine might actually be more dangerous for me. That is not a risk I'm willing to take.

IN SUMMARY

The above are just my reasons for not wanting the vaccine. Maybe my reasons make sense to you, maybe they don't. Whatever does makes sense to you, hopefully we can still be friends. I for one think there's a lot more that we have in common than what separates us.

- We all want to live in a world of freedom.
- We all want to do our part to help others and to live well.
- We all want the right to express our opinions without fearing we'll be censored or viciously attacked.
- We all deserve to have the access to the facts so we can make informed decisions.

Agree or disagree with me; I'll treat you no differently. You're a human just as worthy of love and respect as anyone else. For that I salute you, and I truly wish you all the best. I hope you found this helpful. If so, feel free to share. If not, feel free to (kindly) let me know what didn't make sense to you and I'd be happy to hear your thoughts too. Stay curious and stay humble. Until next time, *Christian*

PS. If you think I studied this topic well, think about how much thought I would put into helping you with your health. Helping people with their health is what I do all day, every day.

PPS. Health can't be injected, but it can be earned. ***