

Who is afraid of rational debate?

by Karin Mont



Karin Mont,
MARH, ARH Chair

The world is currently at an interesting crossroad. On the one hand, humanity seems to be catapulting itself towards a crisis-point yet, on the other hand, an increasing number of people appear willing to take the time and trouble to try to understand why we are facing so many challenges. Healthy solutions to the problems we face will be found by arming ourselves with knowledge and understanding, which we can then pass on to others, quietly, calmly, and rationally.

We must remember to listen, too, because we each have our own particular fears and concerns, making one person's truth or dearly held belief another person's anathema. That shouldn't matter – we all have something to learn from the experience of others and, if we are prepared to talk things through, no one needs to be right or wrong. That is the whole purpose of rational debate; to air and share differences in a balanced, objective manner, and reach a point of understanding or, better still, consensus.

So, how did we arrive at our current unsettling place? Undoubtedly, there are many causes, but conditioning is definitely one factor – as long as everything seems to be ticking along as usual, there is little need to scrutinise how the status quo is maintained. It's hard to remember exactly when massive global industries started to dominate our lives, because their creep has been slow and insidious, and they have taken decades to attain their power. Critically, we have helped them on their way. How? By buying their story. Generally, it is a narrative which creates the perception of a need, then provides a solution to that need, followed by the ruthless marketing of that need, until we succumb, at which point the perceived need suddenly morphs into a 'must have'. It works every time.

Industries now affect and influence vast swathes of people, and thereby governments, the world over. They matter because we rely on them to feed us, employ us, inform us, entertain us, connect us, and provide us with the medicines which are meant to keep us healthy. They also arm nations, finance politicians, finance political agendas, influence global economies, and deliver vast profits to their shareholders. Some corporations do contribute to social and cultural causes, but the true spirit of philanthropy has more usually been overtaken by the philanthropy sham, a state where giving back to the community is used as a cover, perhaps to extract a reciprocal 'favour' from the beneficiary.

More worryingly, corporations exert a powerful influence over many governments. When things go wrong, we tend to blame our politicians, but governments need the goods, services and financial investment which we expect to receive, and corporations deliver on those requirements. If we 'follow

the money', it is easy to understand how so many politicians end up acting as pawns to corporate interests. When we consider the role the pharmaceutical industry plays in medicine, or biotech in food production, or both mainstream and social media in controlling the news, it becomes clear that big corporations infiltrate everything.

More recently, we can add information technology (IT) to the mix, and we have the perfect tool to manage and control our daily lives. On the plus side, IT allows us to readily access and disseminate information, wherever we are. But it also enables data relating to our everyday activities to be tracked, monitored and shared on a massive scale – we know that the corporations delivering IT can, and frequently do, hijack, utilise, suppress, censor or misrepresent any information that conflicts with their vested interests. **That's power on an unimaginable scale!**

The sudden appearance of a new respiratory virus, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19), set the scene for the evolution of a new 'narrative', which the mega corporations could both influence, and help to promulgate. The emotive message, repeated relentlessly by politicians, the media, and miscellaneous celebrities, has terrified people the world over. They have been led to believe that humanity is facing an unprecedented threat from COVID-19, and they accept without question what they're being told.

As a result, governments everywhere have succeeded in disrupting normal life by implementing extreme measures which deprive us of many of our hard-won civil liberties. We've been told that this approach would save lives, slow down the virus, and prevent our health systems from being overwhelmed. The reinstatement of the freedoms, so recently snatched from us, would be dependent upon the development of vaccines against COVID-19, and these vaccines were to be developed as a matter of priority. The narrative was thus skilfully established; a significant problem was identified (the discovery of a dangerous virus), which generated an urgent need (vaccines). The 'need' made vaccines against COVID-19 a 'must have', and the pharmaceutical industry, one of the largest corporations of them all, was tasked with coming to the rescue.

Normally, vaccines take ten years to go through all the standard clinical trials, but the COVID-19 vaccines were fast-tracked, and appeared in less than 12 months. They all use gene-edited material which introduces DNA, sourced from the COVID-19 spike protein, into the body of the recipient. The vaccine works by stimulating the body to start manufacturing the spike protein, which then triggers an immune response, and antibodies to COVID-19 are supposedly created.

This is experimental gene therapy which represents a completely new approach to vaccine production, and nobody knows what long-term affect this novel intervention will have on human health. Most of the usual safety and efficacy trials required of vaccine development have been bypassed, and most people lining up for their ‘jabs’ are blissfully unaware that they are taking part in phase three of a clinical trial. To date, these trial vaccines have only been granted emergency use authorisation, and there is an increasing amount of evidence to suggest that they are not performing quite as expected.

Usually, it’s only homeopaths who are slaughtered if they broach the topic of vaccination, but now anybody expressing concerns about the COVID-19 jabs is instantly demonised. The mainstream media (MSM) does not support rational discussion about the jab rollout, and differing views or opinions are discredited, ridiculed, or suppressed. A dissenting voice will instantly be labelled an anti-vaxxer or, worse still, a conspiracy theorist spreading fake news. Even respected and world-renowned scientists struggle to find a public platform where they can share and discuss their misgivings about the jabs. This includes high calibre scientists such as Dr Robert Malone, the pioneer of mRNA research, and Dr Mike Yeadon, a former top scientist at Pfizer. Enlightening interviews and discussion with Malone, Yeadon, and other scientists currently unconvinced about the safety or efficacy of the COVID-19 jabs is usually only found on online media platforms, or through the growing number of campaign group websites. The MSM doesn’t want anyone to upset the narrative!

We already know enough about the jabs to ask a couple of awkward questions: Are we the ones being peddled fake news by Big Pharma and our governments? Why is the MSM so afraid of allowing rational debate, if they are telling us the truth in the first place? Perhaps the answer can be found in what we do know: The jabs have not completed proper clinical trials – phase three of the trials is not due to end until 2023 for adults, and 2025 for children, so long-term safety data is unavailable. The jabs do not prevent individuals from contracting COVID-19, or from transmitting it to others, which suggests limited effectiveness. The claims that the jabs stop people from getting serious COVID-19 are based on unsubstantiated opinion, not fact – it is impossible to know how someone’s health would be affected if they had acted differently. Furthermore, increasing evidence is emerging to indicate that hospitalised COVID-19 cases are most prevalent in jabbed individuals, so it is entirely possible that an unjabbed person would not be infected by COVID-19 at all! In the first year of the jab rollout, there have been more serious adverse reactions, including deaths, than from all existing conventional vaccinations combined – the figure is rising rapidly, as more booster jabs are delivered.

As stated earlier, there is no long-term safety data available for the jabs, which have only been authorised for emergency use. They use experimental gene-edited material as their active ingredient and, in the event of jab-related adverse reactions, the jab manufacturers are immune from prosecution. People are not being

properly informed about any of the above, and they have no idea what they are actually putting into their bodies. Despite all these very real concerns, some countries have decided to mandate the jabs, in direct contravention of the principles of informed consent and bodily sovereignty.

COVID-19 continues to flourish, and we have endured nearly two years of locking people down, locking them up, masking them, distancing them, sanitising them, preventing them from working, preventing them from learning, preventing them from socialising, preventing them from comforting the sick and the dying, then injecting them with an experimental substance.

Furthermore, the legislation which removed so many of our basic freedoms remains in place today, and is being expanded on in an alarming manner. The jab hasn’t changed anything for us, and now these experimental vaccines are being mandated, regardless of mounting safety concerns. This action goes way beyond the vaccine debate – it is not about whether the vaccines work or not, and it is not even about whether the vaccines are safe or not – **this is about an individual’s right to bodily autonomy.**

The good news is that, for most people, the new and highly transmissible Omicron variant of COVID-19 only seems to cause mild symptoms which are very similar to the common cold. In the UK, we have moved into a ‘wait and see’ phase, and the ‘doom and gloom’ merchants of the Government’s advisory committee seem to have reined back a little. There have even been some tentative suggestions that we might just have to learn to live with COVID-19. It would be nice to think that we’re approaching a time when health ministers are at last willing to acknowledge and explore natural immunity, and how that might be achieved and supported. But we’ll probably have to work on that.

Natural health is not financially lucrative, so is not of interest to corporations and their shareholders. The only way natural health will be accepted as part of national healthcare delivery is if the public insists on its availability. Although this is unlikely to happen soon, the ongoing COVID-19 debacle may just help to incentivise more people to take back control of their own health, and look for safer alternatives. The flaws within the official COVID-19 narrative are becoming increasingly difficult to conceal, and the truth will eventually emerge.

Also, a significant number of qualified, knowledgeable, and highly motivated individuals, are coming together to scrutinise volumes of documentation associated with the origins, development, and delivery of the jabs. Add to that the extraordinary and shocking revelations outlined in Robert Kennedy Jr’s recently published book, *The Real Anthony Fauci: Bill Gates, Big Pharma, and the Global War on Democracy and Public Health*, and we see that the current status quo is as unsustainable as it is unacceptable. Kennedy’s book presents a comprehensive, meticulously-researched, and invaluable record of what goes on within the corridors of power. It is a must-read for anyone seeking irrefutable and verifiable facts, and we need those facts if we are to work to achieve a fairer, kinder, and healthier way of life. □