

## 2024-06-10 - Graham and John speak afresh with Professor Robyn Cosford...

Hi everyone. Friday the 7th of June. Welcome to Club Grubbery and uh, Robin Cosford. Welcome back to our show after a week away from it. Yeah. Thank you. Hey, I'm 10 weeks away from Australia but yeah. Yeah. So you're you're back at home now and uh you've got a lot of news to share with us and we look forward to unpacking that with you shortly.

How are you John? Couldn't be better, mate. Now I had a, uh, a good day, so we're ready for, uh, more action now with, uh, Robin. Hopefully there's, uh, another, uh, whack in the guts for these grubs. Exactly, because, uh, they're getting a bit of a touch up out of The Courier Mail in Brisbane today. At long last, the mainstream media is starting to report on the excess deaths, and, uh, it's gone ape on Facebook.

The Courier Mail's Facebook page has been, I think the last I looked was 700 comments. Not one of them, not one of them saying anything other than you grubs. Why didn't you report this earlier? You were the ones pushing it. We've been trying to tell you forever. People, uh, saying that they're sick. They've had all these jabs and I've wondered why they weren't well and now they're really angry.

So let me just share screen and show, um, show what we have here before we go to Robin's report from what happened in, um, in Geneva. And here we go. Um, Now, there it is. Uh, that was the, uh, the picture in the paper in the Courier Mail. It shows the, uh, Forest of the Fallen, uh, Moderna. This changes everything.

Bombshell study links COVID vaccines to a global mortality spike. Now, they can't say safe and effective, and they can't say extremely rare, Robin Cosford, because they're talking about a global spike. A spike is not a minor adjustment. It's not an extremely rare thing that's happening, one every now and then.

This is a spike, which says an awful lot, doesn't it? Absolutely. Uh, this study that they're referring to does cover quite, they've tried to assess it globally, which is pretty, pretty hard to do, but they have acknowledged we're talking millions. That's, that's a massive number. Can't be ignored. Um, and they've daily telegraphed UK had its head a couple of days ago.

similar, that excess mortality can now be linked to the spike protein. Now, in the face of this, we've got a situation in Australia where we are struggling to get our government to accept the fact that we have excess mortality. And yet Australia is one of the countries they quote in all these studies, time after time.

They do. And is it any wonder, Johnny Larder, with the people we've got running this country? Well, I mean, look what it says on the window there under Pfizer, a happy new year signs will win. Uh, and then we know the real picture, uh, the, the storm of, of death, uh, that is evident to everyone, uh, except these people that are covering all this mess up.

We have to go hard now. I mean, that, that, that is a magnificent headline hoodie. I've got to say, uh, well done to the courier mail for, for printing that in that context. I mean, they could have, uh, they could have done the usual sort of, uh, throw it in the corner somewhere, but that says it all. And the fact that they showed that photo of the Pfizer window and the forest of the fallen, now the forest of the fallen has been going for a couple of years now.

And that's the first time I've seen a photo of it in mainstream media. Um, man, there's a lot in that picture. There's a lot in the article. Frank Chung has written an article on it as well. He's been. Pretty consistent with his skepticism about these vaccines. John, he has, Frank, uh, has been very, very, uh, good.

I've got to say, uh, I've tried to, uh, contact him a couple of times and haven't had a lot of success. So, uh, Frank, we'd love to talk to you on Club Grubbery. Actually, if you're, uh, if you're interested in coming on, uh, uh, I think, uh, it would be good to get your perspective of. It would, and, uh, it is, it is a breath of fresh air to see that in the Courier Mail, and, uh, as it would have been to see it in the UK, uh, Telegraph.

Robin, you've been, you've been waking people up or trying to wake people about, up about this stuff for a long, long time. As have we all, and we've had some very credible, um, uh, interviews on Club Grubbery, including last night, Dr. Tess Laurie, talking about the scandal around the, um, around the, uh, disenfranchisement of ivermectin.

Uh, the one thing that was interesting, uh, about Dr. Tess's interview last night was when we approached her, should there be an inquiry, she said, no, there shouldn't, we've just got to get on with healing everybody. Um, which really, uh, really, uh, Flummoxed us a little bit, I've got to be honest, because if we don't hold people to account, then we're enabling bad behavior to continue.

So I disagreed with her on that and John vehemently disagreed with her on that, but the interview was amazing. And we thank you for your part in helping us line that up. Um, she is one incredible woman and I like what she's doing. She's focusing really on solutions and she gave a lot of people hope last night that there are a great many people like yourself.

Uh, working on how we can help people who've been vaccine injured, people who can relate to that headline we just saw. Yeah, absolutely. And there is while we are still getting our head around exactly what is in these injections and exactly what it is doing to people because there's a huge spectrum of that.

There are a lot of things that we can do. Even your your your simple naturopaths are still going to be able to put in place quite a few things that help people. There are some people who will be at a level of very of illness that they will need those with a, with a significant amount of expertise to be able to, to get what's needed.

But there is hope and we have to, in all things, always hold hope. You know, we, we have to do that. So, so certainly there, there is hope and people do need to be looking at all of these things. There are so many places you can look. Um, I've got some stuff online. FLCCC have put out protocols. Tess Laurie has got one on the World Council for Health site.

There are just so many ways that you can look. But yes, hold hope. And if trying to do things yourself doesn't work, then do seek out one of the practitioners who've got expertise in this field. And there are increasing numbers of us. Unfortunately, standard medicine has nothing of use that it can do in Vax related conditions.

I probably shouldn't say nothing that's that's too broad a statement. Let's say limited tools that standard medicine, after all, it's standard medicine that created this very problem. So they really have [https: otter. ai](https://otter.ai)

Well, you know, they, they can do an awful lot. Uh, I, I disagree with you there because they can stop injecting people. That's the first thing mainstream medicine can do. Yeah, I'm talking about helping people who are still who are sick by it but oh yeah. I know. I know. Have to push for. We do have to keep pushing for truth to be revealed.

We do have to keep pushing to say what you have done is wrong and must be Stop. We do have to because we haven't won that one yet. They're still promoting boosters. Uh, where was it? I read the other day. I'm not sure if it was U. S. but one of the countries is still saying yes, you need to have a booster every three months.

Every three months have another booster, have another kill shot. It's, it is, it is incredible. The whole scenario is incredible. And this of course brings us into what the WHO are trying to do with the IHR that they're putting out. It's, it's following on the same thing. So you've got your finger in the, in the pie with the Align Council of Australia, haven't you?

Yes. Yeah. We had another meeting this morning. So I know Katie and Katrina well, we've, we have done stuff together before. So I had a meeting with them this morning so that, you know, we're all, we all know exactly where we're at with this. So yes. And the World Council for Health, uh, the Tess Laurie was talking about last night aligned also with, uh, the Align Council of Australia.

And 1. 73 million Australians involved in the 36 organizations behind that. Uh, Johnny, it gives us confidence, doesn't it? Because we, we, we put that all together with the headlines that we're now starting to see. As much as we hate to see those headlines, if it brings pause to this situation, then it has to happen.

Because regardless of what people think the cause may be, there is enough concern to stop what they're doing and take a proper and thorough look at this, is there not? Oh, 100%. And, uh, look, look, I'd go one step further to say that these people have now, uh, created such doubt in people's minds and about vaccines.

across the entire spectrum, that we need to have a pause on everything. Not, not just these mRNA vaccines. I mean, we've, we've spoken about it a great deal since, uh, since speaking with the AVN, Australian vaccination, uh, network, but look, this is so important now that these grubs don't get a foothold, um, in, uh, you know, they've, they've overcooked the goose here.

You know, that's what they've done. Um, they've, they've played a very bad hand because Now there is absolute, uh, fear in the community about vaccines across the spectrum and I, and I think that's justified. That's why we need to have a pause. I'm not saying they're all bad. I'm not, I'm not a doctor. I'm not a research specialist, but all I'm saying is in terms of safety.

It's in, it's imperative that these, that there's a pause, uh, everywhere and, and re evaluate where we go from here. Yep. Absolutely. I mean, I can bite straight in on a couple of other things that are highlighted again right now. The Gardasil vaccine's being highlighted again, um, because it is now being brought into light, into court actually, that the trials that they first did for the Gardasil vaccine were not properly done, as in.

They told all the trial participants. We're talking thousands of women here. They told the trial Pacific, um, participants that they were having a placebo and it was indicated that it was a saline placebo. In fact, the so called placebo was this new adjuvant and aluminium hydroxyphosphate sulfate, which is not the same aluminium adjuvant that are being used prior and was actually already known to be effective.

And yet they indicated to them it was safe. So the so called placebo was actually, even though not an active vaccine, it was an active dangerous substance. And so the side effects that were documented in the placebo side, when they appeared in the vaccine side, well the vaccine has no side effects because the placebo had them, but it wasn't, A placebo.

So there was not informed consent. There were lies about what it was. There was cover up about what it was and it's on the basis of that then that a known toxic adjuvant that could cause neurological side effect was injected into this vaccine which is being pushed through all the adolescent girls and adolescent boys around all these all these different countries and so we see girls with significant neurological and autoimmune issues.

and under immune side effects from something that actually was known, but was hidden. And so this is, this is the playbook that they run with. And this is, it's been done time and time again. These guys make Joseph Mingala look like a Boy Scout. I mean, it's just corporatized. It's global. It's, it's on a global scale.

They make Joseph Mingala look like a Boy Scout. I mean, it's just unbelievable that they're getting away with this. We've got to bring it to a halt. We do have to be fighting this side of things. So say, you know, when we think about this thing about the global push for vaccination, and this was one of the other side meetings, I might go into this first.

This is one of the other side meetings that who were running at the same time along the IHR and the pandemic treaty, they had a lot of things running simultaneously. And this is a clever thing in a way for them to kind of pull

the wool over people's eyes of what's actually going on. Many of these meetings were behind closed doors, but they had a whole set of meetings about immunization, and they were called, it was called EPI because they are still planning to have global, massive vaccination on all things for all people by 2030, which isn't that far away, because it was analyzed on, and I actually lectured on this in my Brazil talk for World Council for Health, Two years ago that they recognized in their, uh, marketing, let's say techniques that there was a gap right that they really did that there was a gap in their vaccination sales.

So the only vaccines they had selling to adults at that time would travel vaccines and so on. Oh, there's a gap here. This is so this is since then they have been pushing into convincing all adults that they have to be vaccinated. So what are the adult vaccines that are happening now adults are being told you've got to have another DTP.

Especially if you happen to have babies and small children in your family. You're not allowed to see them if you haven't had a DTP booster. Uh, adults are being told that they should have another measles because their old ones have run out. Adults are told that you should have a um, shingles vaccine.

Adults are now being told that you have to have an RSV vaccine. So they are pushing now to try to get adults across the board, oh and pneumococcal vaccine, multiply vaccinated. Because that was a gap in their marketing strategy. Here's a whole group that we haven't got well vaccinated. We've got kids pretty well vaccinated up to 18 months, five years, and no, no parents allowed to get away, you know, no jab, no play and so on and so on.

So that it is all about money. It's the old story. Follow the money. It's got nothing to do with follow health. Nothing. How is it? Dr. Teslory made the point, uh, when we interviewed her that, you know, her, her research is unbiased and, and I believe that, I mean, she doesn't have any dollars coming in from, um, Pfizer or whoever, uh, so whatever's coming out the other end, I mean, it might be biased from her personal opinion, but at the end of the day, it's not the drug companies.

Now, how is it that the governance around the world allows these drug companies to put out this research? That has no counterbalance anywhere else. There's no independent, um, research done in, in, in contrast to what they're putting out. I mean, it should be mandatory that if Pfizer is telling you something's good.

That you have someone independent looking at it. Again, it comes back to money. There is no money in and we've now got jumping back a few steps. This was actually picked up by the BMJ a number of years ago. And that is that the pharmaceutical industry do what's called cherry picking. When the studies are initially being done, any study that didn't give positive results for what they're trying to sell, they would just.

Push that study out. So then it got introduced instead that all studies had to be registered so that people could say, Hey, there's actually all of these studies what's happened to those ones. So that was supposed to counteract that problem. The other big problem we have is that running a study is extremely expensive, big money and non pharmaceutical industry tends not to have the money required to be able to fund the studies.

And that's been a big problem for the complementary medicine industry. You know, there just is not enough money available to fund the kind of studies that the pharmaceutical industry can. So we're back to money again. So, while, yes, it absolutely should be that there are counter studies to re look at things and everything is theoretically supposed to be backed up by another study, if that other study is also funded by the pharmaceutical industry, again, this has been proven and written up before, those studies are biased to a positive outcome, because they've funded them.

So, so we've got a major issue here, truth in pharmaceutically based studies is probably never going to come out. Probably never. And then even if they do put it in the study, and we can actually point this with the Pfizer study, where they did analyze, they did their analytics and said, Oh, it's got 94 percent effectiveness.

But remembering they took absolute, uh, sorry, relative, not absolute, as in they, they said, Oh, look, you know, of the people who were vaccinated, 94 percent of people didn't get sick, but they didn't tell you actually how

different was that from the unvaccinated, how many of those got sick. When you made it a proper absolute risk reduction, that these are the numbers that this is what we've actually got.

You find that in fact, it was barely effective at all. So there's this fiddling. They, they can even put the right numbers in, but then analyze it in such a way that the fiddle comes out and says, hey, this is wonderful. But if you look at those same figures another way, you go, this did nothing. So in Australia's case though, I mean, how, how can you have a, a, a situation where there's this perception of a, uh, of a corrupt outcome when your own, uh, therapeutic goods administration is heavily funded by the pharmaceutical companies.

I mean, there shouldn't be 1 from these people, uh, put in, put into the administration and governance of these drugs at a state level. 95 percent funding, 95 percent funding Australia's TGA. Is the most heavily funded authority in the world by big pharma. And so this is part of, again, this big picture of both the revolving door, that pharmaceutical industry top people make it across into governmental departments and so on.

So they are, they can't, they're not separated. It's all interconnected. And we've got that situation happening now in, in the, in the justice, this whole issue about, uh, the, the question. I won't go into that, but, uh, problems in the judicial system where we've got pharmaceutical industry influence, shall we say, uh, where it shouldn't be.

Section 72. Yeah. Well, what did the judicial system say about the Courier Mail today? What are they going to, what are they going to do now? I mean, they've thrown every case out. Exactly. So, so these are where it's going to be very, very interesting to see all this. And this same partnership deal is what's happening in WHO now.

And this really is the major part of the problem. When WHO was first set up, it was funded purely by the countries who were the member countries. That's how it was funded. But as we move towards, you know, 2000, beyond 2000, we get this private public partnership happening. And of course, who are the top donors when we start talking about that?

There we need to say it, you know, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, you know, the top guys that and Bill Gates, of course, who famously on the TED talk was saying this is the best investment I ever made my investment in the vaccination industry, 20 fold return. Excuse me. He also said in 97 that he want, we need to reduce global population by 15%.

In 1997, and he said we can do that through vaccination. Vaccination, that's right. And he thinks, excuse me, those two terms should be mutually exclusive. But he put it together in the one thing and then goes and funds vaccines. So, you know, hidden in plain sight, as they say, you know, it is there. So, what was interesting is who was running another set of meetings concurrent to the IHR and the Pandemic Treaty meetings on funding.

And they're trying to push their funding to private companies. donors, not, not the countries. They're trying to push, and the, the spiel to them said, for every dollar that you put in, you'll get a 35 return, 35 fold return. That's the spiel they're using to get money coming into who? How did they get the return?

Exactly. How are they getting a 35 fold return? Because the money they put in, they get back in sales on vaccination and this and that and the other. They didn't, they weren't going to detail that. But, so 30, and the next part statement they said, I might pull it up to make sure I quote it exactly. But they basically said, and human capital.

A return in human capital. What does that mean? Wow. Wow. Yeah, so, so it is all about money, financing by those who have money to get more money to get more control over people, depopulate, get control. So so if we if we come at what happened from that angle of recognizing it's money, money, money to those who already have money to take control of the rest of us, then we can see okay, so what are they doing?

They, they did not get through everything they wanted to get through by a long shot. So there are some who are saying, and they're saying themselves, we, you know, amendments are passed. So the real story in that is that it

was supposed to be, as you know, their own laws say that there's meant to be a four month period that they got the draft to the country.

So the countries could read and analyze before it was passed. Ignoring four months, they didn't even have four minutes. So there was no. Final documentation made available to member states to be able to read through and analyze before that it ended and there was a time to vote. Wow. So that's in breach of their own laws, but the legal opinion was, so that doesn't matter, we can make our own laws.

That again is in line, there's a great article recently put out on, from the Brownstone Institute that's actually headed up about Canada, but really what it's talking about is the difference between the rule of law and rule by law. And it makes the point that what's happening now is that the managerial system that is in place, the managerial technocracy, is all about Fluidity of law.

You can't go back and say the constitution says this and refer to this past case in this past case. All of that's irrelevant now. It's fluidity of law. They make the law according to what they want to need for that case that time. And we see, this is what we're seeing with the judicial system. All I have to do is add the word emergency in front of the law.

Oh, that's right. Stick emergency in front and then nothing else counts. So, and then, so how then do we get to emergency? Well, this is, this is what Hu, of course, are particularly good at. And Ted Ross, we know, has already shown how he can do that. He called monkeypox, O P H E I C, public health emergency of international concern, event of international concern.

against his committee that was split six nine. He, he said, nah, it's going to be a PHEIC. He declared it. Now monkeypox, you know, it didn't fly. Everyone recognized it as monkey business or money box and it got nowhere. So it didn't work that way. But the point is, this is the playbook. This is the way that they will do it.

So it's against that background of knowing that it's all about the sale of vaccines and other products for those in power. Who are selling them. It's all about the control of people to enforce that, that sale and the administration of those things and to get them sick so that they then dependent again on the pharmaceutical industry for the products to get them well.

So, given that we have that, and that we have who headed up by Tedros who unilaterally will declare a PHEIC whenever he sees something that he thinks might fly. What's the one that's flying around now? Literally, bird flu. Bird flu. Now what's interesting about this one, when you, when you look at it in a little bit more detail, bird flu itself, true bird flu, has been around for quite a long time.

I think it was first identified 2006, I think. But what's different about this recent variant, and it's called the clade variant, and I forget the numbers linked with that, but it's a different variant, is that it has very rapidly spread around the globe to different countries and different populations.

Is no longer limited to birds, but has been found in cats and cows. So let's just stop and think quickly for a second. Why are they want to find it in birds in not just birds, but why do they want to find it in chickens and in cows? Just simple answer. It's the food supply, isn't it? Yep. So they've gone, they've been eradicating as we know, Victoria lost how many million birds not long ago.

And there's now an egg shortage, I understand. Yep. What they're now saying with the cattle is that it's being isolated in cattle. It's not actually dangerous to cattle. It's not killing cattle, but nevermind, we're gonna start monitoring and killing cattle. It's also been, they have now identified it in raw milk, so what's that gonna mean?

You're not allowed to, to have raw milk, but let's come back and how are they identifying it?

Guess what? PCR PCR tests. Um, exactly. We are back with the PCR tests. As was proven and scientists have proven the whole thing about you and World Health Organization themselves did actually release a leaflet saying

that if the cycle count is too high with a PCR test, it's not testing live virus, it's testing bits of virus, and it's probably false positive.

So once we get past the 27 cycle count, our false positive rate from some studies has been as high as 94%. In other words, virtually nothing is actually properly positive for being the virus. So we're using a false test to test for a virus which historically is of no threat to humans that has now changed.

Isn't that funny? This virus has suddenly changed. A paper has already been published only just this last week that analyzes all of this and says this is a synthetic virus. What have they done? They've changed the receptors on the virus. So that it's not just in birds now, it's in cats, it's in cows. It's more infective, it's highly transmissible, and there will be some that's going to come across into humans.

So far, only one death as I understand from this variant, and it's happened in Mexico yesterday, I think. Uh, three other reported very mild cases, one of which was just a sore eye. But, how are they going to create our cases? They're now saying that the cattle, uh, UK, uh, US are saying this and I think UK as well.

Cattle should be being PCR tested every week and dairy workers and chicken workers should be PCR tested twice a week. US is saying they're going to pay their workers 75 a test.

How many false positives are we going to get out of this? And then they're going to roll out all these mRNA vaccines on, on the, on the cattle and the chickens. So, and not just cattle and chicken. Moderna and Pfizer. Okay, let's let's look at the vaccine side of it. So again, it's the same playbook, right?

It's the same playbook. We're going to generate fear. We will falsify our numbers by doing a test that gets high rates of false positive, even though we haven't really got an issue with people dying, but we'll pretend we have. And then we bring in a vaccine because this becomes an emergency. So CSL, thank you, CSL already has a bird flu vaccine and millions of doses are being exported and picked up by UK and US and they're starting to say we should be vaccinating our workers who are at risk of.

So that's already started. Agreements are already now being done up with Pfizer and Moderna to develop mRNA vaccines for flu vaccine, for avian flu. It's the same playbook, everybody. This is the same playbook. Now Tedros did say something I agreed with during the last week. He said that misinformation must be crushed at all costs.

Yes. So we do agree with that, but it's pretty obvious that they're going to come after us and everybody else's broadcasting. Oh, absolutely. And what's interesting is the meetings that he said that in was the immunization meetings. That's where it's at. Well, and I think that's why it's important that we have to come after them.

We have to. We can't let them off the hook. Exactly. We can't just down tools. We can't let them off the hook. We've got to keep doing research. We've got to keep writing papers. Yes, we have to treat people. We absolutely do. And, and as you know, I'm really passionate about trying to teach people how to take care of their own health.

That's what the healthy 100 is about. You know, if people can learn how to take back control of their own health and not be dependent on the pharmaceutical industry and the doctors, then they're not going to be afraid when they hear, Oh dear, oh dear, oh dear. Here's another pandemic. Because they'll actually know that they're in a better state of physical health and that there are things that they can do.

But yes, I think people will gravitate that way anyway, Robin. I mean, I know I have, uh, I think it'll be a natural progression that people will, will seek out alternative, um, remedies and medicines and, uh, and you know, it won't just be, uh, the mainstream, uh, operations that were happening. prior to the COVID situation.

So I, I think that that's a positive out of this really. Yeah. I think there certainly are positives. And that is, this is one of them that people are becoming more aware of their baseline health, because again, it was very clear and it'll be the same thing with this, that you're most at risk people with those with underlying diseases, most of

which are lifestyle diseases, high blood pressure, diabetes, You know, baseline poor health, overweight, these are lifestyle diseases that can be read and even dementia can be radically altered by diet and heart disease, you know, ischemic heart disease, all of these, you know, diet and lifestyle are massive factors in.

So if we could, you know, and this, this is what staggers me that if this really was about population health. If it really was, then instead of pouring millions and billions into fake testing, PPEs, vaccines, a few million poured across into educating the community about lifestyle and wellness and supporting that, teaching them about vitamin D, getting, allowing doctors, encouraging doctors to measure vitamin D levels and give vitamin D, allow people, government funded access to vitamin C and zinc.

And ivermectin, and hydroxychloroquine, azithromycin, you know, these kinds of things. If we could do this, there'd be no need for all of that. But of course they had to quash all of this so that they could say, it's a public health emergency, there's no other authorization, there's nothing else that works, therefore we've got emergency use authorization to put these highly, totally experimental, highly dangerous drugs in you, because by the way, there's nothing else that works.

Only because we've said there's nothing else that works, not because that's the truth. And so we see the same thing happening in who, where instead of putting their money into nutrition for Africa, clean water for Africa, clean water, basic nutrition in all these countries. What are they doing? The money has been taken away from those programs.

The money is now going into instead the vaccination programs. So we only need to look with open eyes and you can see what the motivation is and you can see that it's got nothing to do with health. It's all about the mighty. It's like these, uh, soft drink companies, you know, saying they're helping the diabetics with these sugar free drinks.

You go and look at the list of numbers that these toxins in these products that they use to make these, this fake sugar, I'm going to make your hair stand on end. Well, absolutely. And then, you know, adding on to that story, this latest craze with this drug Ozempic, the SGLT 2 blockers, which are supposed to be third tier, second, third tier in diabetes that are now being used off label by lots and lots of non diabetics because they effectively make them lose weight.

But hang on, you're using a drug, pharmaceutical agent that's very expensive with side effects. to artificially make your body lose weight, whereas if you changed your lifestyle, you got rid of toxins, you ate well, you ate all of these things that are basic health, that would do it, not just safely, but would actually fix your background diseases, you know, as well.

And so again, this, And so they, the pharmaceuticals are laughing about that. I mean, that's wonderful. An absolute win for them. Celebrities are on it. All of these people are on it. They're very happy. While you're in Geneva, of course, Mark Butler, our health minister, was over there waxing lyrical about how the government is going to support.

We had Penny Wong come out and donate an extra 100 million of taxpayers money over and above the allocated funds to the WHO. Um, How confident are you in this government to, um, to make sure our sovereignty is protected? I am confident this current government, the way they're running, are just running the who protocol.

They're not going to protect us at all. They, they are in line. We have to come in and do a great deal more on the ground. I, I actually, this, this was just very interesting. I'm in Sydney at the moment. I haven't made it home yet. I went to the local, uh, Coles supermarket and outside were two lovely young people representing the Starlight Foundation.

Uh, lovely young man, they're just a delightful, you know, young people. They didn't even know, they knew nothing about the who. They knew nothing about the IHR and the Pandemic Treaty. So most of your average



Australians have absolutely no idea what's going on. No idea. And so while they've got no idea, they're not interested, not, well it's not so much lack of interest that, you know, certainly media are doing nothing with it.

So, so while that's the case, then there is not going to be any pressure brought to bear on MPs for MPs to then come in and try and do the right thing in government. So I think we've got to do it from the bottom up. We really have to, to be getting out and, and making this an election issue. The whole issue about who, pandemic, control, governmental control, enforcing lockdowns, vaccinations, all of this stuff has to be made an election issue.

Um, because now the way, again, tricks of the World Health Organization. December 22, uh, when the first round of this went through, the countries, the few countries who kind of said no at that round, have been given a little bit of leave of, leave a stay, let's say. Australia didn't make a noise back then. We only have 10 months to opt out of the currently accepted IHR or we are bound by it.

New Zealand have got 18 months. We've only got 10 months. How did that work? Well, because the countries who, who made a, uh, a noise about it in December 22 were given longer to be able to make a decision of whether they were going to come in or out. But again, you know, it's just amazing. It really, the sleight of hand that's gone on all the way through all of this, uh, is, is quite staggering.

So get back to the IHR, these, these amendments. Most of the, the discussions on this, much of the discussions on this was being held behind closed doors. That even up to the final day of meetings, there still was not a written document given to people to read and work out, but the go, but who were determined to get something over the line before things closed.

So basically they, they got a final watered down version that that was agreed to. We are talking closing minutes. They were determined to get something over the line, they couldn't be seen not to. The pandemic treaty, they couldn't get over the line, but they've said, that's okay, they kind of put it aside and, well, that's okay, we'll negotiate on this in the next 12 months.

They still expect that they're going to be able to push everyone to get it over the line in 12 months time. Even if they don't get everything else over the line, what they did succeed to get through it. With two things, one was actually went through on Friday of the week before, and I hadn't been aware of that at the time because I was focused on what else we were, we were doing, but they did manage to get through about the patenting of genetic material, even in the natural.

Now we're going to let that sit for a minute. Legal opinion is still going around and it is being tested I think in Supreme Court USA at the moment as to whether a person who has been submitted to genetic therapy that has altered their DNA, just let this sit for a minute, can be patented by the company who patented the injection.

The person whose DNA has been changed by genetic manipulation by a gene therapy, can they be patented? The person. The person, their DNA has been changed.

What could possibly go wrong?

These people are sick. So that got stuck through Friday, the week before. It's being tested now. The other thing that they did get through in the IHR, well, misinformation, disinformation, we're not surprised about that. The countries are all doing that anyway. No surprises there. But surveillance. So this is a big one, and this, I was touching on this as we were then talking about the bird flu.

The idea is that they are now pouring millions and billions into using PCR, of course, to test for funny viruses all around the place. The idea being that if they can, same playbook, if they can locate the virus that might have potential, it'll go into a little lab, it'll get tweaked a little bit. That's the idea.

Made a little bit more pathogenic, somehow make it back out into the environment or back out into whatever. Then they're doing more PCR testing to find it. Oh dear, here's this problem. Oh dear, this problem's now spread

a bit further. Oh dear, this problem's spread through more species. Oh dear, this problem has spread into a few people.

Oh, now we need the vaccines. Oh, look, aren't 100 day vaccine. Another mRNA. Here are our vaccines. Now, all you people who are workers in that field, you need to have it. Are we going to mandate it or you can't keep your jobs in those fields? And by the way, you can't, you can't have chicken anymore. You can't have cattle anymore.

You can't have raw milk anymore. You can't have milk anymore. You know, so you can just see it. We're talking the same playbook. You can see why surveillance, and this is not just camera surveillance of us, that's a different sort of surveillance, but surveillance of possible pathogens in the environment.

Is a key thing they wanted, because that's the tool they're going to use to apply the PCRs to, to say this is a problem, now we need our vaccines for this. There was a study I read excerpts from, and I can't remember off the top of my head where it came from, only the other day, that there are proteins in egg white that actually attack spike protein.

Have you heard that? Yeah, yeah. So, um, biotin and avidin. So, avidin, the protein in, in avidin can bind your egg white, which is another reason. Sorry, it's actually, it's in the egg yolks. That might be the biotin. Yeah. Yeah, this is another reason why they're wanting to get rid of chickens. They've got quite a few reasons they want to go for chickens.

This, well, I can't categorically state that. Let me pull that back. This is possibly another reason why. There are many reasons why they'd like to get rid of chickens, because chickens can easily, um, cost effectively be grown by your average people in a small backyard garden. They can be self sustaining with a few chickens and getting their own eggs, your average backyarders.

And as you all know, people used to do that. You know, that's what people used to do is to have their own backyard chooks. So, so if they, and to, to get to that level, they have to first wipe out the mass industry chickens. So they're going for those first. But there is push, you might've heard it, there is push for people to have to register their home chickens.

Yeah. Why the heck do they want to register home chickens unless they're going to start coming around and then forcibly testing them and doing like they've done for people and their beehives eradicating your chickens like they're eradicated people's beehives. So it's, it's just another one of their ways to gain control of people and to, you know, shut down independence.

What are they going to do with pigeons and the seagulls? It's going to be a bit hard for them to get all the pigeons and the seagulls. They're, they're quite happy to have them left there as carriers, I think. Unbelievable. Unbelievable. Look, we had, uh, we had, uh, Augusto Zimmerman on the program with Tim Dwyer discussing the Australian constitution and Tim Dwyer is working on a people's referendum, he's got massive amount of funding to set it up.

It'll be an app and a question can be posed on the app and people get a chance to say yes or no. And all that data is collated and then handed to the government. It's, it seems so much better than a petition to me. Yes, that sounds really good. I was just saying to, to Katie of ACA, this needs to be a referendum, but there's no way, you know, that, that, that we'll get this, but if we could get that up done, then we can, we certainly need to get that around and get basically a referendum on, do we want to be, do we want to be part of Do we want to have any organization telling us things like we must vaccinate, we must, we must.

It all comes back to a question of personal sovereignty as compared to external sovereignty over us. over our own bodies, over our own lives, over our own health. We have to make a stand to take back personal sovereignty. We've handed this, we've handed it over. We've handed it over to the doctors. We've handed it over to the specialists.

We've handed it over to the pharmaceutical industry. We've handed it over. We have to take it back. And with that, of course, it means taking back responsibility. They go hand in hand as a problem. But by handing it over, they actually haven't taken responsibility. They've taken control, but not responsibility.

Can you see the difference? Yeah. We have to take back and take responsibility. I think that people's referendum is a great idea. We need to get Tim Dwyer back on to discuss that. I think because, um, now's the time. We don't have much longer to mess around with this sort of stuff. And, and the headlines like the Courier Mails today, I don't know that it was headline, but the feature article, uh, helped to cement the, uh, the need while the people are, are opening up and realizing what's going on.

Yeah, we do. We, we do have to strike. It's, we, we can't sit back and think, wow, this is fantastic. You know, the World Health Organization didn't get through their IHR, all that's, that's given us breathing time is what it's given us. It hasn't, it's not a win, nor is it a lose. It's given us some breathing space.

And if we wise and make use of that, activate people, get things going, then when it comes to, you know, when we hit the end, we, we may make it. We won't, if we sit back and twiddle our thumbs. Well, it's been very enlightening, Robyn. Was there any other aspects of the Geneva project you wanted to discuss? Oh, I think I've probably got the main, the main things out.

I think the big thing for people to get is to recognize the amount of subterfuge here. That they run multiple things simultaneously and get a little bit that way. If they can't get it this way, they get another way. And, and this is their modus operandi. You know, it is, it is not anything to do with health.

Thank you. of people, countries, nations. It's, it's got nothing to do with that. It is all about how can we wangle things to get the money, the most sales for our companies who are now funding, who this is our big problem, who is privately funded and increasingly privately funded. And so like any company, they want their money back and more.

It has to be a good investment. Final question, Johnny. Well, not so much a question, honey, but I, you know, I just can see what's going to happen here. I mean, you know, we're going to end up with all these surveillance people turning up at your house, uh, to get rid of your pet chook and, uh, and whatever else.

I mean, I think we've got to start looking closely at what, what happens over in places like America. I mean, we morons to turn up at our homes. trespass, uh, on what authority? What right have they got come to come in and, and, and take your beehive and destroy your bees or, or kill three chickens? I mean, we're, we've got to stand up to these morons now and not let them in.

Uh, and you know, I'm not suggesting, uh, you know, anything, uh, anything violent, but I tell you, we have to, uh, start looking at what our rights are. And, and enforcing them. And, and, and unlike what we did, uh, the majority did in relation to the COVID mandates, you've got to stand up and you've actually got to be principled and everyone has to stand together and say, no.

That's it. That is our, that our biggest thing that we have to do is not comply. Civil disobedience. Exactly what it says there. Do not. Do not comply. You know, we, we, we have to do that. The legal, you know, all our channels that we thought, I think a big thing for people to realize as well is that the, the systems that we used to think that we could trust, we cannot.

Because as soon, and I, I have been saying this for years, as soon as a system is set up, it exists then to serve itself, and this is what's happening. These systems exist to, bureaucratic systems are existing to serve themselves, they do not exist to serve people. So we have to get back into our communities, our connections, connecting with God, connecting with the earth we're made out of, connecting across to each other, which interestingly forms a cross, doesn't it?

Absolutely. Which is probably a good segue into a prayer to close the interview. Sounds good. Let's do that. Dear Lord, Father in heaven, you bathe this in the light of the truth. What are we going to do with that truth, Lord? What would you have us do with that truth? Can we just spruik it and ignore it? Can we just, um, can we take action of some form or another, each and every one of us?

May you empower us to do that, Lord. Help us to step out of the cycle of fear, false evidence appearing real, and help us to stand in the light of truth, strong and capable, because we are, we are infilled with your Holy Spirit. So, Father, I pray for the people of this country that your Holy Spirit will start raining down on them, and that as a result, they will stand.

They will find courage they didn't know that existed in their lives before, and they will actually live into their destiny. For this Lord, we pray in the precious name of Jesus. Amen. Ah, boy, boy, I just, I've been doing these fireside chats for Church Without Walls once a week, and I just completed one on, uh, fear, and, uh, and how debilitating it is, and, uh, what the Bible says about dealing with it.

You know, and, and Philippians 413 says, I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me. And the sooner we all realize that there's people like yourself, uh, there's people like Tim Dwyer, who's a devout Christian who believes the same thing. We're all out there fighting and we're all out there doing the best we can to, uh, to make sure that, uh, John 8 32 lives out in our lives, know the truth and that truth will set you free.

Absolutely. Amen. You know, absolutely. And the word's very clear. You know, God says, we're to fear no thing. There is nothing he gives us permission to fear except him. We are to fear no thing. Nothing, nothing, nothing. So, you know, and why does he say that? Because if we are in fear, we are believing bad will happen.

If we're we're not believing good will happen. We're believing bad will happen and we can be controlled. We can be coerced. You know, we're not, not actively moving in the right direction. And for those confused about God being a God of fear, I love the sea. I, I used to go fishing in a 16 foot boat across the Tweed River Bar and go way out to sea all night fishing.

I loved it. And I love the sea still, but I have respect for it. I don't push it. I don't go out there if I don't think that I'm capable of doing it or my boat isn't. That's a healthy kind of fear. That's a fear that stops you walking off a cliff. But the other kind of fear, the dark fear, is what's imposed on us for coercion and control.

They're two different fears. One comes from God, the other one comes from Satan. Who are you serving? My question to our audience is, choose today who you're going to serve. You're either going to stand in the light or you're going to cower in the dark. And if you can't make up your mind, you've already made a decision.

You're staying in the dark. The choice is yours, my friends. Robin Cosford, thanks for coming on again and thanks for keeping us informed. You were very strident to get on as soon as you came back to Australia and we're so grateful to you for that. And we're going to keep pushing this message out because Johnny, you've often been heard to say.

You just couldn't make this stuff up. You couldn't. Stay out of the trees. If you love someone, you haven't told them. Call them and tell them they need it and do not comply. Those T shirts are available from Drifter, [www.drifter.com.au](http://www.drifter.com.au). Support us at Club Grubbery. And if you want to further your journey in faith, come to [churchwithoutwalls.com.au](http://churchwithoutwalls.com.au).

[churchwithoutwalls.com.au](http://churchwithoutwalls.com.au) where I've got daily devotionals and a whole bunch of other things going up every week for those people who want to have a journey in faith because they realize there's no one else they can trust. Thank you, Robin Cosford. Thank you, Club Grub Reviewers. It doesn't help if you don't spread it.

Share it. I know the socials are cancelling some people for sharing our stuff, but we're going to keep pushing it out there anyway. And we've got great interviews coming up. We're flat out. We're not letting up because the

pressure's on, Johnny. Pressure's on, but we're going to keep at it. Keep at it. Yeah, I want to celebrate when, uh, Johnny gets his job back and, uh, Dr.

Kate Manderson and, um, Harry Chant. Maybe looking for other work because Kate Mandis and I've been talking to some very sick Qantas pilots and they're sick because they took the job that you were meant really to protect them from. I think you had a moral obligation as a primary medical officer to make sure that what was being mandated into pilots arms was thoroughly tested and you did not do that.

Kate, and I'm sure you're a lovely person, but like so many you've fallen short of the mark on this one. Anyhow, God bless you all. Have a, have a great, uh, whatever it is day that you get to see this. Get out in the sun, get some vitamin D and don't forget we still live in an amazing country. Why? Because you live in it.

You're incredible. God bless you all and bye for now.