The lack of Informed consent relating to Covid-19 vaccine roll-out.

The fact is that our government, governments from around the world, the WHO and UNICEF have spent billions of dollars in a misguided attempt to try to figure out how to make people take (coerce, compel, and entice) these experimental medical products (COVID-19 vaccines). This was clearly a coordinated effort.

This monumental world-wide effort to manipulate beliefs has eliminated informed consent. Informed consent is the idea that a person must be given sufficient information before making decisions about their medical care. Pertinent information includes risks and benefits of treatments, the patient's role in treatment, alternative treatments, and the person's right to refuse treatment. When people cannot get reliable safety information on whether to take an experimental product or any medical product, when they are being coerced and are not informed of important safety considerations, informed consent is gone.

Remember, Australia only has Emergency Use Authorized COVID vaccines available. These products have not had to go through the rigors of the clinical trial process to receive full licensure. Of course, much of what has been labelled as misinformation over the past three years has been proven to be truth. People were not allowed to know the truth through propaganda, censorship, and coercion.

Of particular concern is the vaccine hesitancy clinical trials that are specifically designed to see what types of propaganda, nudging, computational propaganda, and behavioural modifications work best to elicit compliance from entire populations. In funding such studies, the government and world-wide leadership have endeavoured to eliminate informed consent.

According to the testimony by Dr Robert Malone, a pioneer of mRNA gene therapy technology "Informed consent about the truth of these products and their developmental state, their immature developmental state, we, the public were given a series of lies.

Those lies included that these products were safe and effective, of course, without actually qualifying what safe and effective was. Safe and effective was repeated again and again and again without stating what that meant. That's neurolinguistic programming. That's psychological operations. That's propaganda. We also received the propaganda that these products would remain at the site of injection and the draining lymph nodes. That was known to be a falsehood before these products were ever deployed into humans, and that's revealed by the nonclinical data packages from Japan and from Australia that have now been disclosed.

So, we knew, and they knew, that these products deployed all throughout the body. We knew that they didn't stay where they were injected.

We were also told the falsehood that these products had a molecule, this modified ribonucleic acid, which would only last in your body for a short period of time. We now know that these products remain in your body and remain biologically active for an undetermined period of time, of at least weeks and probably months; another lie. We were also told that for these products, it was necessary to recognize that none of

us would be safe until we were all safe. This was part of the propaganda campaign to insist that we all accept these products.

That was done, by the way, in violation of well-established norms that involved coercion, compulsion, and enticement. Ice creams for children to take your jab, hamburgers, or whatever the enticement was; that is illegal. That is not something that has allowed under standard, well-established bioethics.

This series of lies was used to justify deployment of these experimental products, truly with great profit margins no doubt, which were intended to demonstrate safety and effectiveness of a vaccine platform technology, that then, according to a hearing in the WHO in 2021, which as I recall, was headed up by Margaret Lou (formerly of Merck Vaccines), could be used for other purposes.

During this WHO meeting it was established that this would be become a platform technology, and all that would be necessary in the future would be to swap in a new RNA sequence to produce a new product for a new disease. Now we need to resolve the controversy regarding the toxicities associated with this technology and these products, because we now clearly know that these are neither safe nor effective. We also knew at the time of initial deployment. Pfizer knew at the time, that these products would not prevent infection. They would not prevent replication and spread of the virus. Now the data is suggesting they certainly don't protect against death or prevent death and disease. We all know that, but that was what was asserted at the time that they were deployed.

What we need, in order to resolve all the controversy that swirls around these products, and whatever is the meaning of the latest data disclosure, is for governments to just be open and transparent.

All I'm asking for is that we be allowed to access, in an open and transparent fashion, the data which NHS and the healthcare agencies of the world have acquired. So that those data can be analysed, so we no longer have to wrestle over whether this data is good or that data has this flaw, et cetera, et cetera. Let's all disclose, in an open and transparent way, so that the world's scientists can evaluate that data and put to rest this controversy about whether or not these products are safe and effective.

The current data of somewhere between 700 and a thousand peer reviewed studies regarding the safety, or lack thereof of, of these products clearly demonstrates a series of adverse events. I'm just going to list them. Myocarditis, including tachycardia. Reproductive health damage. Women all over the world know about the damage to their menstrual cycles. These are all things that are widely acknowledged, peer reviewed, multiple hundreds of studies. Reproductive health. Coagulopathy, including stroke. That means blood clotting, abnormal blood clotting. Damage to peripheral ocular, and central nervous systems, including stroke. Immunologic and oncologic harms. And the biggest adverse event of all, death.

So, in conclusion, what we've had here is a rushed product, a rushed technology, a failure to provide respect for humans in not allowing them to have informed consent, and furthermore, actively deploying the most massive propaganda campaign in the

history of the modern world to suppress the ability of the public to gain access, merely to have the knowledge of what the adverse event risks are."