

I think it is true that most of us would rather find information that confirms what we already believe rather than seek out information that challenges our beliefs. It would appear that even when presented with facts that directly contradict what we believe, thanks to our ego, we may become even more entrenched in those beliefs that we hold whether accurate or inaccurate.

Seeking information has usually been the task of journalists and especially investigative journalists. We could then review what has been written, which would be comprised of positive and negative aspects of the story. Or we could search out alternative sources which would provide us with both sides of a story or topic. In recent years journalism has changed. Journalists whether through newsprint, news channels on radio or television appear to follow a narrative which does not allow for reporting on both positive and negative aspects of the story. The narrative is rigidly followed resulting in one sided reporting that meets the requirements of the news outlet, the government, the corporation, or the editor, but does not always adhere to the reporting values of truth and accuracy, independence, fairness and impartiality, humanity and accountability.

Where have all the investigative journalists gone? Where are the Bob Woodward's, and the Carl Bernstein's, of this generation? They are out there, but their stories don't seem to get the exposure that we used to give to investigative journalism. Then there are investigative reporters such as Sharyl Attkisson, who left mainstream media so that the stories she wanted to tell could be told.

Throughout the day we are fed the narrative via mainstream media. If you look towards social media you will get almost another narrative, plus conspiracy theories alongside aggressive opinions from anyone with a phone or a keyboard. However, if you don't look beyond what is being presented, you will never have the information you need to make informed decisions.

Thus the question, are we moving forward or backwards? I am referring to the Covid 19 pandemic when I ask that question. It has been two years since the pandemic was first identified. Since then we have gone through lockdowns, travel bans, vaccines, masking, and social distancing mandates. All of which have impacted virtually everyone on the planet with devastating effect. Most of the world has since dropped all mandates and travel bans. Infections and deaths are declining globally, and it would appear that we are turning the corner on the virus. Europe dropped all mandates and vaccine requirements months ago. President Biden stated in an interview that the pandemic was over. The pandemic is now being called a controlled pandemic. If this is the case, then why are we still being asked to take a vaccine that was authorized as emergency use. The emergency is over and has been over for over eight months. Having said that, Pfizer has an FDA approved vaccine, but they are not shipping the approved version. The emergency use covered shot gives the pharmaceutical industry total immunity for legal liability. Whereas the FDA approved shot does not. This is not about saving lives and ending the pandemic, this is about money and liability. Where is the media on this issue?

So are we still in a pandemic? Will Covid 19 be designated as endemic? In epidemiological terms, an endemic infection is one in which the overall rates stay more or less the same without huge spikes or falls. It should be understood here that the overall rates don't get out of control, where the reproduction number, which is the number of individuals an infected person would infect, stays below one. For example common colds and influenza

are cited as endemic diseases. So also are diseases such as malaria and HIV/AIDS, which are considered endemic despite widespread occurrences. In retrospect, in the year 2020, malaria killed over 600,000 people, HIV/AIDS over 680,000 people, TB killed around 1.5 million people. Even the flu kills over 650,000 people yearly. Why are we not having serious discussions around the status of the pandemic, along with discussions on what is needed to declare Covid 19 as endemic.

We are finally beginning to study the effects of the Covid shot, but these studies are small, isolated, and are not openly discussed. Why is this case? I have been reading studies that have identified that there is cross immunity from colds/flu/influenza to Covid. Even the Lancet has issued studies that show waning immunity after receiving multiple Covid shots, while natural immunity is increasing.³ Where is the open discussion on this?

There is an increase in deaths globally that is unaccounted for? The increased deaths number excludes Covid deaths, and shows an increase in deaths over a five year rolling average. This has been identified in the U.K., in various countries in Europe, and in the USA. Where is the discussion on this?

There has been a dramatic increase in severe colds, the flu, and RSV infections this fall. At the moment Strep A (Scarlett Fever) is surging in the U.K., resulting in the deaths of children. This is indeed tragic, since if properly identified there are common antibiotics that will cure this virus. Strep A is a concern for children aged two to eight years, but is not generally considered an adult disease since we would have developed natural immunity. Where is the discussion on this?

There have been deaths, and chronic side effects do exist because of the mRNA Covid shots, but it is forbidden to discuss this.¹ If you attempt to discuss this on social media you will be blocked. I have just finished reading a study on myocarditis, by German pathologists, in the journal of Clinical Research In Cardiology. This study shows clear association with the Covid shots to myocarditis in patients. This study was driven by over 25 deaths of vaccinated individuals whom all died at home from myocarditis.² There is a need to have open discussions on the rise of myocarditis cases globally, causes and remedies.

The Omicron variant is likely the best vaccine for Covid as it provides natural immunity at a level that no vaccine can achieve. Why is this not openly discussed?

Main stream media outlets are not addressing any Covid shot issues that are against the narrative. We are not being given alternatives to the Covid shot, and any doctor suggesting alternatives has his/her license revoked. This is not just immoral, it is criminal.

This is moving backwards in my opinion.

At the last G20 meeting in Indonesia in November of this year(2022), there was a call for vaccination passports globally. All 20 participants agreed to implement vaccine passports. Why is this being discussed when we are clearly nearing the end of this pandemic, if we have not already done so. The WHO (World Health Organization) has been advocating for more control globally in declaring pandemics, identifying solutions, directing solutions, dictating vaccine roll outs, globally and by country. In other words, the WHO would dictate to all governments what vaccines their populations must use and when. The WHO is getting a lot of support in this area from many influential people. Even the Lancet Commission is calling for more WHO control and involvement globally. If vaccine passports are ever rolled out, all our freedoms of choice, and movement, will be eliminated. This is an ethical minefield that the WHO is prepared to enter. Where is the media outrage on this issue? Is anyone reading this even aware that this is happening, and happening now? I suggest we all

become better educated on the agenda that the WHO is pursuing. How could our government ever consider allowing the WHO to dictate to us how to manage our health system. There is more to this topic than meets the eye, and managing a pandemic is the key that opens the door to more control in other areas of your life and mine.

I have addressed just a few points that affects us all directly, which are not being given air time on any media platform. Either everything that I have addressed is inaccurate, or we are being kept ignorant on purpose. You decide.

1. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9167431/>
2. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00392-022-02129-5#Sec.3>
3. [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/eclinm/article/PIIS2589-5370\(22\)00272-3/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/eclinm/article/PIIS2589-5370(22)00272-3/fulltext)