

Patrons of Chiropractic Science Inc.

Incorporated Association: A0108053N

A not-for-profit association

SUPPLEMENTARY SUBMISSION TO THE COVID RESPONSE ENQUIRY

10 JANUARY 2024

This additional supplementary submission is made by the President of Patrons of Chiropractic Science ("PCS") to provide further input and an opportunity to review the decision of mandating or at least encouraging the broad application of experimental vaccines during a classified viral pandemic.

As previously noted, PCS is a charitable research organisation with 130 members (and broader reach to the 6176 registered Australian chiropractors). I am a retired chiropractor who practiced for over 40 years, taught at universities, published many clinical studies and authored a series of educational texts.

In the early stages of the declared pandemic, it was clear that all State and Federal government agencies were largely ill-prepared. This is concerning given the technical influenza A(H3N2) viral “pandemic” of 2017, where around 1200 Australian died from this virus. For Covid, each agency rushed to grasp at any superficial intervention, whether proven or not, and in some instance made “Captains Calls” based on anecdotal advice, often in direct contradiction to numerous published and peer reviewed studies. At the time, each intervention was promoted on the basis that it was supported by science. In many instances, this was simply untrue, and triggered the steady erosion of public trust. From this point onwards, each agency placed all its faith in a single saviour, or panacea; the myopic hope for a rushed, experimental vaccine.

PCS’s initial submission to you has touched on these matters, but our major concern for your review is to consider some important information, which may generate recommendations that better equip our health agencies for a possible future epidemic or pandemic. PCS wishes to facilitate access to credible technical advice to improve your understanding of the fundamental requirement for an effective vaccine, and to describe the circumstances where a vaccine may help, or harm, the medium and long-term outcomes arising from a pandemic.

As noted in the PCS submission, the most significant concern PCS had in 2020 was the concept of a rushed, poorly tested, new experimental mRNA vaccine for a SARS type virus, when all previous attempts to manufacture a vaccine (SARS-CoV-1 & MERS), had failed to produce a safe or effective product.

PCS, and the majority of non-conflicted parties in health care would all agree that the key elements for an effective vaccine is that it protects the recipients from both **infection and transmission**. This has been the case for polio, measles and smallpox. As the vaccine introduction and mandates commenced, the manufacturers implied that their products achieved both elements. All governments, and worse, their “expert advisors”, despite considerable contrary evidence, blindly accepted that these vaccines would both protect and limit transmission, and would not entertain any other view. Pfizer and Moderna claimed a 95% risk reduction in infection, which governments accepted without question and widely promoted. Many public recipients believed in this impressive level of protection. However, the correct measure to use was the **Absolute Risk Reduction: 0.89%**, (i.e. for every 119 individuals vaccinated, only one would be protected from Covid infection; source The Lancet 2021 and later Pfizer’s own admission). It was much later in 2022 when all parties began to understand that the vaccines barely protected a recipient, and certainly failed to limit transmission. The current rhetoric now claims the vaccine will help recovery from a Covid infection, but this claim is again without valid scientific RCT evidence and remains doubtful.

This brings PCS to make the following critical point and offer to the Royal Commission an opportunity to directly question a highly credentialed virologist, who as early as March 2021, issued a number of very public statements and warnings about the dangers of vaccinating the population during a pandemic. But he was vilified because his views were against the interests of the involved pharmaceutical companies,

the World Health Organisation (“WHO”), and general government rhetoric. Unfortunately for his detractors, he has subsequently been proven to be totally correct in his warnings.

Without considering this advice, the Royal Commission runs the risk of conclusions in relation to vaccination that may lead Australia down a repeat of the hardship and health outcomes that now currently plague the Covid pandemic, which are likely to lead to numerous dreadful public health outcomes.

[REDACTED] wrote to the WHO in March 2021. A copy of this letter is attached. While it was WHO that appeared to lead the charge against the Covid pandemic, PCS warns the Royal Commission to encourage caution when taking future advice or instruction from WHO, as their funding links to the pharmaceutical industry has the potential to create conflicts and dubious outcomes.

[REDACTED]

PCS recognises that it would be optimal for [REDACTED] to directly and carefully explain to the Royal Commission what he postulated would happen if the world decided to broadly vaccinate for Covid-19, particularly when the “approved” vaccines failed to adequately protect from infection and transmission. As shown by the steady number of aggressive mutations and variants of the SARS-CoV-2 virus that are now developing, as he predicted, his point that the ineffective vaccines are likely to promote the steady creation of mutations via a mechanism of immune escape now seem to be disturbingly accurate. A significant number of other virology experts support this scenario.

Naturally, you will be strongly pressured against accepting our offer to facilitate such a meeting, largely by those parties that have direct interest in maintaining the current rhetoric for either fiscal or reputational reasons. Unfortunately for these negative detractors, [REDACTED] March 2021 vision of the future is to date accurate, and certainly significantly better than those parties that will no doubt discourage the Royal Commission for even listening to his views. PCS acknowledges that a number of published papers were later created to argue against [REDACTED] suggestions, some even suggesting they all knew there would be variants (and failing to ever mention it in the early days), but each of these papers actually do not address his logic or explanations. PCS has concerns about who encouraged and/or funded these counter publications. The key point for you to consider is all qualified expert views should have been properly and independently reviewed, particularly in the early stages of the pandemic.

We therefore encourage you to accept our offer so [REDACTED] opinions may be considered by you, to potentially better equip the government in its attempts to halt the Covid-19 disease progression, and to help avoid future fundamental errors in judgement and policy if another pandemic materialises.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Christopher Hart
President

PCS can be contacted by email or phone:

Email: admin@patronschiroscience.com

Phone: [REDACTED]