

The Long Read: Many of my undergraduate courses covered the process of scientific progress. We were required to examine key watersheds, including the advent of relativity, quantum mechanics, and Copernican astronomy for example, and were tasked with finding out what made these theories better and how their opponents were eventually silenced by evidence.

This article is available as an Audio file and PDF document.

Later my own original research focused on the role of consciousness. As behaviourists had been seeking to exclude consciousness from science for decades, I learnt first hand how carefully you had to reason and how much evidence you had to produce to ensure publication of results which swam against the prevailing current of ideas.

Scientific Pride Led to Unrealistic Aspirations

We are in a new era of science and have been since the discovery of the structure of DNA in 1953. With the exception of military-related expenditure, genetics has become the most highly funded and studied sector of science. The iconic heroes of genetics are Crick and Watson. Every student and researcher in the life sciences aspires to gain a similar stature and fame by discovering some amazing application of genetics which benefits the whole of humankind. There is an ingrained certainty in the biotech community of this final outcome for some insightful and lucky person.

For years there was an understanding that, at some point, a pandemic would emerge, at which time the brilliance of biotechnology would vanquish the age-old foe of disease forever. Instead, millions have died, and the reputation of science has been tarnished. So how did it all go so terribly wrong, and why are so many still defending biotechnology and trying to rewrite an abject failure as a success?

We have already covered one reason, biotechnologists were so certain of ground-breaking discoveries and ultimate success that failure was almost inconceivable. Scientific hubris ensured that many could not even register the chaos and adverse outcomes that were being played out the daily in lives of individuals and recorded in pandemic data sets. Last week we reported, for example, that Dr Rochelle Walensky, head of the CDC, knew of Covid vaccine limitations but still told the public they worked. She was not alone.

There were even more significant scientific reasons for caution that were overlooked from the start. The differences of kind and scale between the biotechnologies of genetic intervention and those of prior medical procedures were never really registered by most scientists nor widely discussed by those who were aware of them.

Medicine Aims to Uncover Specific Diseases, Not General Syndromes

The whole of medical science is geared to identifying specific causes of illness and mortality. Do you have something wrong with your heart, liver, brain, etc.? Are there imbalances in particular hormones, biomolecule concentrations, organ systems, etc.? Are you suffering from the effect of particular toxins or pathogens? Once this fundamental cause has been diagnosed, the physician and the patient heave a sigh of relief, and the specific treatments can commence.

Little would those used to this diagnostic system appreciate that genetic intervention could and had led to generalised rather than specific illness. DNA is in every one of the 37 trillion cells in the body. Alter the way that cells function, and you could initiate a whole system collapse. The record of earlier gene therapy experiments shows that this was a possible outcome.

This had a radical effect on the assessment of adverse effects proximate to mRNA vaccination. The aim of attending physicians was to identify a specific pathology of the adverse outcome and then determine if it was due to the vaccine or another cause. If someone had a blood clot in the brain, then it could be classed as a stroke, a common enough malady, and safely unrelated to vaccination. Similarly, for heart attacks, neurological illness, kidney disease, etc.

The very long list of adverse outcomes following vaccination compiled by Pfizer in February 2021 in its post-authorisation adverse event report released to governments in April worried no one in authority. People fell ill and died all the time, so what. The reported adverse medical events were considered not just unlikely but certain to be unrelated to mRNA Covid vaccination and most likely to be the result of pre-existing conditions or susceptibility. The current inadequate paradigm of medical science dictates that.

If mRNA vaccination did have a common side effect it was only going to be a very specific effect, not involving a generalised set of conditions. The wide range of outcomes and conditions being reported post vaccination could not possibly be related, they must be due to anxiety or imagination so doctors and others thought. Very few were aware that altering cell genetics was already known to cause broad spectrum physiological system collapse and dysfunction.

There was then a failure to communicate the known science of genetic intervention to the working medical profession, those with political responsibility for pandemic policy, and those in the media informing the public. So who was responsible for this failure?

The Rejection of the Fundamental Principles of Science

In the original Pfizer trial, it is now known through data released under court order that more people died among the vaccinated experimental group than in the unvaccinated control group. Pfizer scientists ignored this fact relying on the logic we have just outlined. In essence thinking: 'it couldn't possibly be related, it must be a coincidence'.

Some people at Pfizer, both current and former employees, did realise this was a huge mistake. Dr. Mike Yeadon, a former vice-president at the company went public with concerns for example. Others involved in earlier mRNA technology research and development, like Dr. Robert Malone, also came out to express their concerns that mRNA technology was risky and probably carcinogenic.

At this point, the reaction of Pfizer and other pharmaceutical and biotech giants gathered almost criminal intent. They sought to silence and discredit these concerned voices through manipulation of media content. Worse, they curtailed the vaccine trial. The control group was vaccinated, effectively leaving no way for the safety of mRNA vaccination to be accurately measured by the now defunct trial. They had hidden the evidence.

The science principle being violated here is absolutely fundamental and readily understandable to everyone. If you are assessing a novel medicine or procedure, the first data you need to assess is whether the experimental group is better off than a similar group who did not receive the intervention. Pfizer and others failed to disclose that this criteria had not been met.

Moreover, the implicit assumption in their repeated assurances of vaccine safety was that there were no long term adverse effects of mRNA and adenovirus Covid vaccination. As excess deaths mount, we now very justifiably suspect that what they supposed is totally in error. Yet the authorities have long since abandoned any attempt to test whether this is the case or not.

The horrific fact is that this would actually be very simple. Public health data of hospital admissions and mortality is routinely kept. There are also records of vaccination status. However, this data is being kept well hidden from public scrutiny in most countries, including our own. Why? Again the intent here increasingly appears to be the hiding of evidence and the prevention of any identification of pandemic policy mistakes. In essence, the course of justice is being perverted.

The advent of biotech medicine involves a vast difference in scale and complexity from that of chemical and molecular allopathic medicine.

There are other reasons why poor outcomes could be anticipated. These have to do with scale and process. In general, high school education points to simple chemical processes which are well defined. The vigorous reaction between sodium and chlorine is sometimes demonstrated in chemistry lessons. Two atoms join together to form common table salt. In contrast, a single chromosome comprises around 14,400,000,000 atoms, and there are 46 chromosomes in each of 37 trillion cells.

People educated to understand the satisfying and exact scientific explanations of such processes as making salt may not appreciate the complexity of genetic systems and what can go wrong if you interfere with them. They may not understand the possible instabilities involved in genetic processes once they have been deliberately altered or edited. These are known to exist but not well understood by science. Not just atomic content and sequencing but also the effects of molecular shape, temperature, impurities, electric fields, vibratory modes, mobility, information transfer processes, the presence of pathogens, energy availability, and prior imbalances are all involved.

This doesn't just apply to in vivo processes, the industrial scale processes involved in mRNA vaccine production are also subject to instabilities in outcomes, including the presence of unwanted and unanticipated impurities. Hence some vaccine batches are associated with much higher rates of adverse effects.

None of this is obvious to the public, who have been repeatedly and erroneously reassured that bioscience, like the familiar high school science, would always be accurate and safe and should be followed without question. Given the known problems with gene therapy and genetic manipulation, this reassurance was nothing more than deceptive political ideology. We have discussed this elsewhere as genetic essentialism, the false belief that almost anything can be accomplished through genetic manipulation.

The end result of these miscalculations, and the accompanying deliberate obfuscation, is now apparent. Covid vaccines don't prevent transmission, infection, and or even serious illness and death over the longer term. Their introduction is contemporaneous with high rates of adverse effects and record levels of excess deaths, but the authorities don't want to investigate, and the media don't want to ask the difficult questions this raises.

The failure of the media to inform the public impartially speaks volumes about the dysfunction that has dogged the evolution of the pandemic.

If you watched the recent film *She Said*, you will no doubt be filled with admiration for the tenacity of the New York Times in exposing the despicable behaviour of film mogul Harvey Weinstein against women. Unfortunately, the financial model of the media has moved on since those heady days of the Me Too movement six years ago. The media now relies on commercial sources of income and, in some cases, government funding, both with strings attached. Pfizer (\$2.8 billion in 2022) and other biotech advocates like Bill Gates (\$319 million) spread the cash very widely indeed among media outlets and are thus able to dictate much content. It is to the discredit of the NY Times and most other mainstream media that they have become uncritical advocates of Pfizer's cause. Take this June 23, 2023, NYT article, "Suddenly, It Looks Like We're in a Golden Age for Medicine" which describes "the brutal years of the pandemic...as like a premodern plague and yet a watershed of medical innovation...ushering in a golden era of mRNA vaccination." Good luck convincing anyone with that oxymoron NYT.

Social media, too, has bowed to government pressure and cancelled content at their behest. Two years ago, I published a 15 minute video, 2021 Covid Stats For Kiwis on YouTube, (owned by Google), which merely catalogued official New Zealand government pandemic data. Within a week, it had accumulated more than 20,000 views but was then cancelled, according to YouTube, at the request of our Ministry of Health. They didn't even want the public to review their own uncensored data. I haven't been able to air my pandemic content on YouTube since, despite the fact I reference my work to government data and published scientific papers. That is not science, it is anti-science.

No discussion of the causes of pandemic misinformation would be complete without noting that governments and medical authorities have employed sophisticated techniques to distort pandemic data. Not the least of these are the strange definitions of a Covid death. Dr. Jessica Rose does an excellent job of navigating these muddy waters in her sub stack post "What is a Covid-19 death?". In essence, far fewer people died of Covid than we have been led to believe. The media have been remiss in discussing these issues.

The media have also been remiss in discussing the origins of the pandemic without bias. There seems to have been a lot of money supporting a natural origin which for a long time cancelled the overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Some media outlets are now redressing this problem. The NY Post reports 19 June 2023 "10 reasons we KNOW that COVID-19 leaked from the Wuhan Lab".

If you read my blog, you will already know that I believe the arguments about who is right (pro or anti vaxxers) are

distractions. Both sides have suffered at the hands of big pharma and the biotech lobby. Whether you caught a bad case of a

lab grown virus or a shocking adverse effect of mRNA vaccination, the culprit was the same biotechnology. Throw in

governments addicted to the largess of pharmaceutical lobbyists and a penchant for total control, then you have a recipe for

disaster.

I have just finished lunch with some old friends, one of them works in the kind of mum and dad store that has a loyal

community customer base. They are overwhelmed by the rapidly growing health crisis among their many customers,

including cancers, deaths, and persistent illness, along with the inevitable grief. Another friend counts twelve cases of

cancer among her circle of friends, eleven have died. These anecdotes mirror government health statistics which are equally

appalling but unsung by our media. The government has stopped publishing most Covid stats, perhaps because the

unvaccinated are enjoying more healthy outcomes and robust natural immunity, whereas the vaccinated are showing signs

of long term immune deficiency and increased susceptibility to Covid.

There are long term adverse effects of biotechnology which are making their presence felt more and more. There is a lot of

blame on offer here, and few who are prepared to accept responsibility. Guilt gnaws at mental peace which wastes away,

making it all the more difficult to initiate redress. The longer this situation is allowed to go on, the more strained it becomes.

The data isn't lying, but people are. Time to face up to some hard truths.

Dr. Guy Hatchard

28 June 2023

https://hatchardreport.com/