Mises: The Absurdity Of Covid ‘Cases’

“Casedemic” is the proper term for second phase of the global Technocrat takeover. Death counts and hospitalizations are not rising, but increased testing with highly unreliable test kits are fanning the flames of panic as people test “positive”. This is a false narrative but wildly promoted by media and Technocrat scientists alike. TN Editor

Today’s headlines announced Donald and Melania Trump “tested positive” for covid-19. Another claims nineteen thousand Amazon workers “got” covid-19 on the job. Both of these pseudostories are sure to ignite another absurd media frenzy.

As always, the story keeps changing: Remember ventilators, flatten the curve, the next two weeks are crucial, etc.? Remember Nancy Pelosi in Chinatown back in February, urging everyone to visit? Remember Fauci dismissing masks as useless? Why should we believe anything the political/media complex tells us now?

So what do these headlines really mean? What exactly is a covid “case”?

Since the beginning of the coronavirus outbreak, most US media outlets

have been exceedingly credulous and complicit in their reporting. Journalists almost uniformly promote what we can call the "prolockdown" narrative, which is to wildly exaggerate the risks from covid-19 to serve a political agenda. They may be motivated to hurt Trump politically, to promote a more socialist "new normal," or simply to drive more clicks and views. Bad news sells. But the bias is clear and undeniable.

This explains why media outlets use the terms "case" and "infection" so loosely, to the point of actively misinforming the public. All of the endless talk about testing, testing, testing served to obscure two important facts. First, the tests themselves are almost laughably unreliable in producing both false positives and negatives. And what is the point? Are we going to test people again and again, every time they go out to the grocery or bump into a neighbor? Second, detecting virus particles or droplets in a human's respiratory tract tells us very little. It certainly does not tell us they are sick, or transmitting sickness to anyone.

Take a perfectly healthy person with no particular symptoms and swab the inside of their nose. If the culture shows the presence of *staphylococcus aureus*, do we insist they have a staph infection? When someone drives to work without incident or accident, do we create statistics about their exposure to traffic?

—*A virus is not a disease*. Only a very small percentage of those exposed to the virus itself—SARS-CoV-2—show any kind of acute respiratory symptoms, or what we can call "coronavirus disease."

The only meaningful statistics show the incidence of serious illness, hospitalizations, and deaths. The single most important statistic among these is the infection fatality rate (IFR). Data collected through July shows that the IFR for those under age forty-five is actually *lower* than that of the common flu. The covid-19 IFR rises for those over fifty, but it is hardly a death sentence. And the data does not segregate those with preexisting health issues caused by obesity, diabetes, and heart disease. If we could see data only for reasonably healthy people under fifty, the numbers would be even more reassuring.

Mild or asymptomatic covid cases are effectively meaningless. The world is full of bacteria and viruses, and sometimes they make us a bit sick for a few days. There are millions of them in the world all around us, on our skin, in our nose and respiratory tract, in our organs. We are meant to live with them, which is why we all have immune systems designed to help us coexist and adapt to ever-changing organisms. We develop antibodies naturally, or we attempt to stimulate them through vaccines, but ultimately our own immune systems have to deal with covid-19. The virus will always be out there waiting, on the other side of any lockdown or mask—so we might as well get on with it.

From day one the focus should have been on boosting immunity through exercise, fresh air, sunlight, proper dietary supplementation, and the promotion of general well-being. Instead our politicians, bureaucrats, and media insisted on business lockdowns, school closures, distancing, isolation, masks, and the mirage of a fast, effective vaccine. As with almost everything in life, state intervention made the situation worse. We can only hope many governors are removed from office, either by impeachment or at the next election. Several, including Andrew Cuomo in New York and Gretchen Whitmer in Michigan, should face criminal charges for their lawless edicts. There is no due process exception for "public health."

Read full story here…



Poll: Majority Supports GMO Research For Human/Animal Hybrids

When animals are viewed on the same value level as humans, there is no ethical problem in interchanging DNA genetic material between them. The overriding problem is that transhuman scientists believe the world of genetics is their private playpen to do what they wish. TN Editor

Human-animal chimeric embryos—organisms created using cells from two or more species—have the potential to change how researchers study disease and generate organs and tissues for human transplants. One day, scientists have proposed, it may be possible for someone with, say, pancreatic cancer to have their stem cells injected into a modified swine embryo lacking its own pancreas so it can grow the human organ for donation.

Already, human-animal chimeric embryos (HACEs) have been created using human cells injected into pigs, sheep, mice, rats, and monkeys, although none in the US have been brought to term. In fact, their very existence is ethically contentious. What happens, for example, if scientists were to grow a human brain in an animal, blurring the line

between species?

In response to ethical, social, and legal concerns, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) issued a moratorium on funding for HACE research in 2015 pending the development of a new set of regulatory guidelines. While research continues in other countries—and even in the US, through collaborations with foreign researchers and private funding—the NIH has yet to reverse its decision, despite previous announcements that it would do so.

To gauge the American public's support for HACE research, Francis Shen, a professor of law at the University of Minnesota, recreated two recent surveys carried out in Japan, where many of the world's HACE studies are done. In those surveys, Shen's colleagues found that the majority of the Japanese public supported the use of HACEs, although their feelings varied depending on the type of organ or tissue being grown. "We thought, 'Boy, it'd be really interesting to see if the American public thinks about things the same way,'" Shen tells *The Scientist.*

Shen's team directly translated the Japanese surveys into English, asking 430 participants to rate their support for each of the three steps involved in producing an organ using HACE technology: the insertion of human stem cells into an animal embryo, the transplanting of the embryo into a surrogate, and the harvesting of the resulting organ for use in a human. As before, they gauged people's reactions to organ and tissue types, including skin, liver, blood, heart, brain, and gametes.

The Scientist: What can we do with HACEs, or what are we hoping to do with them?

Francis Shen: Organ transplantation is a major goal, and that would be a major breakthrough. When I describe [HACEs] to . . . colleagues who maybe haven't heard of them before, I talk about organ transplantation. And they understand that, yes, if you grow an organ from your own cells, it makes intuitive sense that your body might be more receptive.

I think there are also a large number of applications that fall broadly

under regenerative medicine. One is to better understand the mechanisms of disease and organ function. There's basic science advances to be achieved there. And then there are applied clinical advances and improvements in treatment across a wide range of diseases and disorders. We can develop better interventions, pharmacological and otherwise. The techniques are not just about improving organ donation. There are also a number of ways, through both basic and applied science, this work can really improve our knowledge and therefore response to any number of diseases and disorders.

TS: What did your survey tell you about the American public's thoughts on human-animal chimeric embryos?

FS: One of the main findings was that there seems to be very broad support, even broader than in the Japanese public, for the different steps of HACE research. Support was 59 percent, so a strong majority, support all three steps, including the returning of the organ into a human.

Second was that there are some differences across subgroups in the public. One thing that we thought was interesting is that, although lower, in some instances the support of those who are politically conservative was still quite strong . . . suggesting that this type of stem cell research—using [induced pluripotent stem] cells and not embryonic stem cells harvested from a fetus—perhaps could be more politically palatable.

Read full story here…

DARPA-Funded Biochip To ‘Save’ Us From COVID-19?

Technocracy is to society what Transhumanism is to people who live in society. What is thought to be a coup d’état for Technocracy might also be a coup d’état for Transhumanism as implantable tech is implemented to fight COVID-19. To the extent that it is accepted, it will provide continuous tracking and internal monitoring of every human. TN Editor

The most significant scientific discovery since gravity has been hiding in plain sight for nearly a decade and its destructive potential to humanity is so enormous that the biggest war machine on the planet immediately deployed its vast resources to possess and control it, financing its research and development through agencies like the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) and HHS’ BARDA.

The revolutionary breakthrough came to a Canadian scientist named Derek Rossi in 2010 purely by accident. The now-retired Harvard professor claimed in an interview with the *National Post* that he found a

way to “reprogram” the molecules that carry the genetic instructions for cell development in the human body, not to mention all biological lifeforms.

These molecules are called ‘messenger ribonucleic acid’ or mRNA and the newfound ability to rewrite those instructions to produce any kind of cell within a biological organism has radically changed the course of Western medicine and science, even if no one has really noticed yet. As Rossi, himself, puts it: “The real important discovery here was you could now use mRNA, and if you got it into the cells, then you could get the mRNA to express any protein in the cells, and this was the big thing.”

It was so big that by 2014, Rossi was able to retire after the company he co-founded with Flagship Pioneering private equity firm to exploit his innovation, – Moderna Inc., attracted almost a half billion dollars in federal award monies to begin developing vaccines using the technology. No longer affiliated with Moderna beyond his stock holdings, Rossi is just “watching for what happens next” and if he’s anything like the doting “hockey dad” he is portrayed to be, he must be horrified.

Remote control biology

As early as 2006, DARPA was already researching how to identify viral, upper respiratory pathogens through its Predicting Health and Disease (PHD) program, which led to the creation of the agency’s Biological Technologies Office (BTO), as reported by Whitney Webb in a May article for *The Last American Vagabond*. In 2014, DARPA’s BTO launched its “In Vivo Nanoplatforms” (IVN) program, which researches implantable nanotechnologies, leading to the development of ‘hydrogel’.

Hydrogel is a nanotechnology whose inventor early on boasted that “If [it] pans out, with approval from FDA, then consumers could get the sensors implanted in their core to measure their levels of glucose, oxygen, and lactate.” This contact lens-like material requires a special injector to be introduced under the skin where it can transmit light-based digital signals through a wireless network like 5G.

Once firmly implanted inside the body, human cells are at the mercy of

any mRNA program delivered via this substrate, unleashing a nightmare of possibilities. It is, perhaps, the first true step towards full-on transhumanism; a "philosophy" that is in vogue with many powerful and influential people, such as Google's Ray Kurzweil and Eric Schmidt and whose proponents see the fusion of technology and biology as an inevitable consequence of human progress.

The private company created to market this technology, that allows for biological processes to be controlled remotely and opens the door to the potential manipulation of our biological responses and, ultimately, our entire existence, is called Profusa Inc and its operations are funded with millions from NIH and DARPA. In March, the company was quietly inserted into the crowded COVID-19 bazaar in March 2020, when it announced an injectable biochip for the detection of viral respiratory diseases, including COVID-19.

A wholly-owned subsidiary

In July, a preliminary report funded by Fauci's NIAID and the NIH on an mRNA Vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 was published in *The New England Journal of Medicine*, concluding that mRNA-1273 vaccine. provided by Moderna for the study, "induced anti–SARS-CoV-2 immune responses in all participants, and no trial-limiting safety concerns were identified," and supported "further development of this vaccine."

A month earlier, the NIH had claimed a joint stake in Moderna's mRNA COVID-19 vaccine, citing a contract signed in December, 2019, stipulating that the "mRNA coronavirus vaccine candidates [are] developed and jointly owned" by both parties. Moderna disputes the federal government's position, stating that the company "has a broad owned and licensed IP estate" and is "not aware of any IP that would prevent us from commercializing our product candidates, including mRNA-1273."

Read full story here…