

# Graham and John speak to a panel about the Spotlight breakdown - part 1 of 2...

John, we've been fortunate enough to get an incredible panel for tonight's program and uh, they've all given very generously of their time and we've allocated over two hours to this program. I've got a feeling we're going to use it, so we may be breaking this one into two sections.

I'd say so, Woody, uh, just looking at the caliber of the, uh, the people on our panel.

I think there'll be plenty of debate and likely to go a couple

of hours. I think so, mate. I think it's going to be one of the most pivotal programs we've done in the last three years. And, uh, I think we need to be doing more of these big panel discussions. But, um, so to everybody, you're about to embark on a on an epic journey into the minds and strategies and thoughts and opinions of some wonderful Australians and we really hope you enjoy it and part two will be available for you tomorrow night so thanks for watching us and enjoy this program.

Well hi everyone and it's Monday the 8th of July and this is I think one of the most critical programs we've ever done John because we are at a point in our history through this COVID debacle, where the dam wall is cracking so wide open, and it requires even further pressure, uh, especially on the mainstream media.

Johnny, welcome back to, uh, to Club Grubbery for this week.

Thanks, Hoody. Great to be back. And I, I concur with you. I think people like Kerry Chance should be calling the commissioner of the SES. The damn wall is busted.

The damn wall is busted. Oh, there's so much I could say about that. We just, uh, I listened to the election results in, uh, in Britain on, uh, ABC news radio the other day, and they were talking about a catastrophic weather event hitting the East coast.

They interviewed the head of the SES, Who said yes, it's going to be a lot of rain, but it's not a significant weather event, but we suggest anybody who's who can defer their travel should defer it and stay home. Don't go out there. It's too dangerous for goodness sake. What have we? What are we? It's not a significant weather event, but don't go anywhere.

I mean, anybody who is addicted to this, Doctrine that keeps pouring all over us, uh, needs to turn everything off. Even us, if, if we're upsetting you. So anyhow, let's not get started, but I want to introduce a wonderful panel. We've got a panel of people, some of whom were at the spotlight studio when that, uh, That debacle was recorded and they're going to enlighten us on what happened, what was happening in the studio audience.

And by now you've all seen the social media clips where studio audience members recorded that and we are in a position now where the only thing holding this together is the mainstream media and the mainstream media have been the demons of this, uh, this betrayal of the people of Australia and indeed the rest of the world.

There's nothing about, uh, there's nothing about truth in the media anymore, in the mainstream media. And we're about to expose what really goes on behind the scenes. Now we have, uh, for the last three years, John, we have repeatedly said that there will come a time in the near future, where the mainstream start to paint a different narrative of their own involvement to paint a little exit sign for themselves to get out.

I did predict at one stage that Four Corners would come out with an expose that they would claim they'd been working on for three or four years about the COVID malfeasance. Uh, we're yet to see that, but I'm sure it's coming because they're all running for the lifeboat. I want to introduce our panel tonight, which is an excellent panel comprising all different walks of life.

And it's going to take me a read a time to read through this. First of all, we have returning to our panel. Professor Gigi Foster is professor of economics at University of New South Wales, a very outspoken advocate for freedom of choice and a, and a, and a, and a go to expert on the social sciences that we're all involved in at the moment.

Um, Professor Foster, thanks for joining us again.

Thanks so much for having me, Graham and John. It's a great pleasure to be on this panel with these great people.

And once again, you were the sole panelist on that program and you put up a sterling performance. I mean, it was, it was a David and Goliath. It really was.

We also have joining us Dr. Judy Wilderman, who is a doctor of public health, and she's the author of Vaccination, a wonderful book, Australia's Loss of Health Freedom. And she's been a staunch advocate, a political candidate, and And always a go to person for us on Club Grubby and a regular, uh, guest on our program.

Judy, welcome.

Thanks, Freddie. Good to be back with you.

Wonderful to have you with us. And we have joining us for the first time, an incredible person. She's a very rare breed. She is actually a real journalist. A real journalist. That's right. I know you thought that they were like dinosaurs. They no longer exist.

This is a lady who, Uh, who was edited to oblivion in the spotlight recording and it's Alison Bevich. Now, Alison is a, uh, a journalist who worked for News Limited, the Daily Mail and Reuters. She's a mainstream girl. She now writes letters from Australia, which is a wonderful sub stack, uh, which everybody should have a look at.

And she's currently writing a book about the COVID vaccine scandal. And she was a bombshell from the audience that night. Sadly, not everything she said was heard by people on the program. Alison, welcome to the show.

Thank you so much. That's a very kind intro. I really appreciate that.

No, that's our pleasure.

And as I said, you are a rare breed and we've got to keep you alive, you know, you're protected species on Club Grubbery. We also have Asa, Asa Gochner Chanel. Asa was, uh, Asa is a soprano, a singer, an opera singer of some renown, and she sung like a bird. from the audience on the spotlight program. And that's one, uh, segment that they didn't cut out.

I'm sure there was a lot more that she had to say, but what a voice on that night. I, so welcome to the program.

Thank you very much for having me. And yes, they did cut out a substantial section of what I said as well.

Uh, and I'm sure we'll, you know, we'll unpack all that with you over the next hour or two as we get into this.

Also joining us, the gentleman, you notice I did the ladies first because I'm still a bit old fashioned. We have joining us, uh, we haven't had him on for a long time, he hasn't been well, but it's great to have Professor Ted Steele back on the program. Uh, Ted is a professor of biology and virology. He's known for his work on somatic on somatic hypermutation, I got that right, and, uh, and is renowned for his work in academia for more than half a century.

Professor Ted Steele, welcome to Club Grumry. Thank you. And a return guest, as always, and only last week from the Altman Report, Dr. Philip Altman. He has a PhD in pharmacology with expertise in clinical medical research and, uh, pharmaceutical regulatory affairs in Australia. And he holds a master's and a PhD in drug development and has worked for more than 40 years with the TGA.

Welcome back, uh, Phil Altman.

Thank you very much, Graeme. Nice to be back.

Right. We've exhausted two hours. Thanks everyone for watching and we'll see you next time on Club Grubbery. No,

no, no.

Let's get into it. Okay. Now, um, John and I really want you guys to, to, uh, roll with this. Uh, we'll throw the odd question in here and there.

And, uh, well, let's see where this unpacks. But first of all, as we look at, uh, I want to ask some questions a bit later on about some of the things that were said by the panel, uh, in particular, uh, Professor Boye. Um, which I'm sure we're all going to be talking about, but let's unpack the relationship that those people on the panel have with the various organizations that have been orchestrating this fast, we call the pandemic response.

So, Alison, I'd like to go to you first. Um, you've done a lot of research as have all the other guests on this panel, but in particular from a, a, um, a journalistic perspective on Professor Bui and, and, uh, the things that he's been involved in and the things that he should be involved in, but perhaps isn't.

Can you give us a broad brush stroke on the man who seemed to be the star of that panel for Channel 7?

Well, just very broadly, Professor Boy is very closely tied to the pharmaceutical industry. So I know a fair few people have probably seen by now. Medicines Australia has, um, sort of a conflicts of interest database that you can search on their website so you can type in the doctor's name and see if they get payments from industry.

And so Professor Boy, I think it was Aussie 17. He's quite a big Um, a large anonymous Twitter and sub stacker. He, he tweeted out, um, a list from medicines Australia and I also went to the medicines Australia database and downloaded and how to look at all his various payments. He's also sits on the board of the immunization coalition, which I'm pretty sure Judy Wileyman will know a lot about this.

She researches a hell of a lot more than I do. Um, so that, that group called the immunization coalition, it's kind of a front group for industry whose existence is there to promote vaccines. And it's funded by all the big vaccine makers like GSK, CSL, sequirus, Pfizer, et cetera. And Madonna. And so, basically, he always appears on press releases.

When you're a journalist, the reason he's always quoted in news stories is when you're a journalist sitting in a newsroom, you tend to feel like medical stories before COVID, you would feel like a medical science story was slightly less political than, say, a party political story, for example. So if there was a new medical breakthrough, they will list perhaps a few experts on the bottom with their mobile numbers who you can ring for expert comments so you can get an independent quote to put in your story and make your story different to everyone else's.

And they make good filler stories, you know, for Channel 7. It's easy to get them on camera. For newspapers, it's easy to quickly ring and they answer the phone really fast. So you can get your, your, your story together and get it out and then move on to the more difficult stories. And so this has become the problem in newsrooms because people like Professor Boyd, they are linked to the industry.

Their careers and promotion require the good opinion of industry. And, um, so they will always have their names on the bottom of those press releases. So he doesn't just do, for example, um, promotion of like, like spotlight, you know, speaking out in defense of the, of the, um, gene vaccines. He also was recently.

Speaking out, I think in defense of the RSV vaccine, and he does a lot, he speaks on behalf of GSK quite a lot, um, another large pharmaceutical company, he'll be on their press releases. He'll be easy to contact and that's why you see him all the time. And he's, he's, he's quite influential. He's also on the board of the group that gives advice to the TGA on what, um, flu strains that you need to have.

A vaccine for the following year. So he's, he's becoming quite influential, um, in that space.

Thanks, Alison. We'll come back to you, too, about what happened in the studio and some other interesting things, including the, uh, the black triangle. Judy Wildingman, what, what can you add to what Alison had to say about Professor Robert Boyd?

Um, well, basically, I can give you a bit of context. On this issue, because of course, I've been looking at it and researching it for 15 to 20 years. And, um, so these conflicts of interest, parents have been trying to reveal them for, for decades, literally, and particularly Elizabeth Hart and myself. So that, you know, a lot of the conflicts of interest are revealed in my, in my book.

PhD research, um, the majority of people on these boards do have conflicts of interest with industry, and they're not putting, um, independent researchers on the boards in balanced numbers. So I think, um, I'm going to happily confess that I didn't, um, Watch the spotlight program because I've seen this sort of charade before.

We've watched Bowie for 20 years now. He was the, uh, co director of the National Center for Immunization Research and Surveillance in 2004 with Peter McIntyre. And Peter McIntyre was there for 17 years. Um, from 1997 to 2017, and Bowie has been there, um, for again, 20 year period as well. So these people are staying in these jobs for long periods of time, they've got all these conflicts of interest, and The spotlight program was a, a repeat of what I experienced in 2010 with Meryl Dory from the Australian Vaccination Risks Network when she did community talks around Australia for parents when the influenza, the childhood influenza vaccine, uh, just after the swine flu.

Um, caused a lot of damage in children and several were killed and we were doing these talks concerned parents were inviting people like, uh, Professor Fiona Stanley and the health ministers, um, to our talks so that they could hear what parents were concerned about. None of them turned up. And I can tell you in 2010, Meryl Dory, uh, one of our talks in, in, um, Um, and at this point, the industry lobby groups were actually cancelling a lot of our talks because, of course, there wasn't the big spotlight that was that is now on this issue.

And many, many people didn't know about it. Um, so a lot of the venues would cancel the talks before we could even. She didn't talk to parents, but what she did was she placed a chair out the front with the names of these officials who wouldn't turn up to hear parents concerns about the flu vaccine that had damaged thousands of children across Australia and killed a couple as well.

And that included Professor Fiona Stanley and the health ministers in WA. So we've seen this before, and one of the main Conflicts of interest that I exposed, uh, in my research was, um, at the Murdoch Children's Research Institute. Which is the largest vaccine research development program in Australia.

And that was set up in 1990. Now Professor Terry Nolan headed that program for 15 years. Then in 2005, he was put on the board of the Australian Technical, um, Immunization Group. Um, ATAGI, Advisory Group on Immunization, and he chaired that board for a decade. As chair of that board, he was directly recommending vaccines to put on the childhood program.

And the ATAGI board is actually attached to the WHO, the World Health Organization. So that's where the World Health Organization was influencing government policy. And we had the head of the Murdoch's program on that board for 10 years. Um, during that decade, he was also the Deputy Chair of the National Health and Medical Research Council.

And in that role, he was controlling the funding to governments to, to studies. So if you defund an area of science, like the safety of science, Then you don't have any evidence to prove you wrong, and you can make claims on safety and efficacy on a lack of evidence, not on hard evidence from empirical scientific studies.

So for a decade he controlled the funding, and for a decade he was recommending vaccines to, directly to the health minister. However, in 2015, as we were revealing that all these conflicts of interest in the government, he retired. Uh, in 2014, December 2014, and went back to Virgo, where he now still heads at Murdoch Children's Research Institute program on vaccine development.

Uh, so these are the sorts of conflicts of interest we've had for decades, and parents, it was only parents that knew about it because we're a minority. It's parents with young children that were seeing the damage caused by the, the huge increase in vaccines on the program, but we didn't have a voice. So when, um, we were doing our community talks, I was in Perth at the time and the Telethon Institute, uh, retaliated and they put on a public seminar for parents and it was exactly the same as the spotlight issue.

You could only ask one question, you had no right of reply when they told a lie, and then they wouldn't, um, give you any more debate on the topic. It was completely controlled. Uh, so I've seen these strategies for decades.

Unbelievable. Gigi Foster, the whole program, the whole recording phase of the program lasted how long?

I guess, uh, geez, Allison was there as well. I want to say probably about an hour and 40 minutes or so. We were there for about four hours in total that evening. So we came, we did the makeup, we did the the micing, we did, we had, we were given some food to eat for dinner. And then we got into the studio. I didn't have my phone with me, but I would say it was about an hour and 40 or so.

Obviously, there was a whole bunch of stuff that was edited out.

Yeah. Um, as you've been seeing in the feeds through Twitter, and I don't know whether, I mean, there was a threat that more is going to be released. There certainly was an awful lot more that I haven't yet seen released on Twitter or through, through any mechanism.

Um, not just that the audience said, but also that I said, and, uh, and even probably some that the other panelists said. So, yeah, I mean, but that was always to be expected. I mean, just like Judy was saying, I, I was expecting this to be just another mainstream romp. What I was very, very. Surprised and delighted about was the the fact that the audience was so full of people who were kind of on on on planet Earth, you know on the side of science and sanity And that I had not had any hand in that at all that was entirely organized by the resistance community And actually last night I had over to dinner someone from that community who told me that That apparently a lot of employees at channel seven have been vaccine injured.

And it was the at the instigation of some of them that the word started to get out about, um, you know, the need to fill this audience with people who would ask difficult questions of the other panelists.

Well, look, we're, we're told that a former compere of the Spotlight program was severely vaccine injured, uh, and is no longer working for Channel 7.

He's off sailing in a yacht somewhere. I mean, this stuff just keeps bubbling to the surface, and it still amazes me that people are not paying any attention to it. So the audience was volatile. The audience seemed to be of one accord, and for good reason. And, um, Azar Gokner Chanel, you, you, um Your, um, your initial thrust at the panel was, uh, was largely, it seemed, kept intact.

Was that the case?

Uh, so, my question was And, um, uh, I guess, um, before we got there, we were down at the cafe. I just want to backtrack a bit and, um, and the audience members were seated at the cafe. So it gave us a little bit of a time to suss out what's, what's with the audience. Who are they? Because there were, uh, there were very few of us, very few of us from the resistance group.

Um, but we were there with a lot of determination. We knew. That, um, you know, Alison and my mutual friend who alerted us to this program, uh, that it was going to happen and that there was going to be an audience and that there was going to be a panel, but we didn't know who was going to be on the panel.

But we knew that the audience might be given the opportunity. To ask questions and, uh, and so, um, we had, uh, friends who facilitated for a few of us to be there. Um, the rest were people, some who receive emails like the ABC Q& A does. You have your regular sort of, uh, list of, uh, guests, audience guests who receive emails about a program and then they show up to fill the space.

But as Gigi said, I think, um, once, uh, the audience started to become privy to the conversation is when things actually turned when things actually turned. Um, so, and, um, and before arriving there, once I knew that, um, uh, that we were registered to show up, uh, I reached out to my social media to say, Hey, Send in your covert questions to me.

And I wanted to see if there was anything more compelling than what I was crystallizing in my head. Um, and because I wanted to address, I wanted to be able to capture the attention off. Those who are on the other side of the narrative, not those who are, who are already convinced like us. I really, it was, it was a bit of a sense of mission.

And, um, many of you may not be aware, but I have been an audience member with ABC Q& A when we were fighting, um, Santos for our water for the great artesian basin. So some of us have been activists. On different front lines for quite some time, and I wanted to go there in my legal capacity. I didn't go there as an opera singer because it was, you know, I, I had, um, initiated the, the, the bringing together of the teams and resources.

And Philip knows me from, um, from that time when I guess we, we pulled in, um, uh, you know, experts and legal experts for the AVN case. I was the one calling up chamber after chamber, looking for a counsel and then sending our legal opinion to Geoffrey Robertson, His Majesty's counsel, who was also one of the barristers for Julian Assange.

So we were in the thick of it. And it was that thing of going there and seeing what's going on. What's happening and trying to get a hold of the mic. I'm also a teacher. I teach at a tertiary institution as a voice lecturer. And, um, uh, and, you know, as a singing teacher, and I saw many people falling sick repeatedly, repeatedly.

And then, uh, you know, also that the fact that we were turning our minds to the fallacy of long COVID. As well. It all kind of came together in that show. We were all very skeptical when we arrived there and, um, uh, and those who have been a little bit more skeptical, decided to do the special work of audio recording.

Uh, so that, um, because, um, I think Gigi and Alison would recall, I shouted out saying, you know, how much of this is going to be edited? This was during the commercial break. Right. So this was during the, that's right. This was during the commercial program break where I said, how much of this is going to be edited to suit the mainstream narrative?

How is this going to be portrayed? And then Michael Usher, the host yelled out from the desk, uh, nope, everything's going to be kept in. It's all going to be, you know, that's, that's, you know, I'm paraphrasing, but we have it on audio that he reassured us that it wasn't going to be, uh, edited. And it was. And it was.

And, um, you know, and when I asked my initial question, which has now, um, you know, allowed a lot of the vaccine injured to reach out to say, We're in a situation. We're sick. Um, and, uh, to say how is the how is what's going on with the immune systems of those who are not vaccinated and those who are, and we have ample amount of information about, uh, compromised immune systems with subsequent doses.

We have such solid, um, data and research on that. So that was the initial question. And then after that, Robert Boy responded with a whole lot of fallacies. And I, you know, I saw red at that point, and I wanted to get a hold of the mic and respond, especially when he started talking about non vaccinated getting long COVID, which is completely fallacious.

Um, and then, uh, to, to re, rebut his arguments on that, I cited, um, you know, uh, a research paper. That had laid out, um, you know, immune systems, um, results with, with the various doses and that there should be a further research done on exactly who's getting long covert, whether it's the vaccinated. All the non vaccinated and we know, we know that it is the vaccinated who, you know, who are getting really sick and that they have coins this term long covert.

We, we know that it's not the vaccinate unvaccinated. So, this is this is how it kind of transpired, but in brief I don't want to say, I think, Gigi was preview. Allison was preview to. And the entire audience was privy to a lot of things that were left out from the final cut. And it was, there were essential, substantial, um, information that is of great public interest, um, that, that needed to be aired.

What a, what an amazing summary. And we'll come back to you, Issa. But, um, Professor, uh, Professor Ted, um, you have had a working relationship with one of the other panellists on that program. Can you tell us a little bit more about him?

Yes, I will. But just, but first of all, I'm also a mucosal immunologist like Robert Clancy.

I spent the first five years of my scientific life. Working on the mechanisms of secretory IGA, how to induce it, its functions, pur, purifying it to homogeneity, but is making it really pure and testing all it, all its functions. So by the time I wrapped up my PhD in 1975, 76, you know, I thought, well that's done.

You know, all this will enter the textbooks, like all the other, you know, confirmatory work that I was doing and others were doing. And sure enough it did. And so by the early aching, a lot of, you know, now the gut associated lymphoid system, that is when you take in antigen through the mouth, the oral and nose and down to the gastrointestinal tract, as Gigi correctly said in her interview the other night with you, that activates this mucosal immune system.

That's what Robert Clancy was making a point of. And that's been known for over 40 years. You know, that's basic immunology. That's 101 immunology. Because no shot in the arm of any sort, whether it's dangerous like the mRNA, or whether it's a subunit, you know, just pure protein like spike by itself, or some other antigen that the virus is expressing, none of those will induce that mucosal immunity.

That's changing now in the research community, because I'm on the receiving end of getting, you know, And having to ask to do referees reports on papers that are going in now trying to excite mucosal immunity. So, at least that's one blessing so I can actually, you know, influence what's going on there.

But, but that was at the start of my career. Then, as you correctly said, I worked on somatic hypermutation and then I, and then I, so I'm a basic scientist. Okay. And so, A little bit different for some of the other panel members and I operate slightly differently. I really operate from hard evidence all the time.

So everything I'm going to say now we've published or I can point to hard evidence for it. You know, I'm just not making it up or speaking through the top of my head. And the That migrated, so for about 30 to 40 years, I had various other battles in my work on genetics, evolution, the evolution of the immune system, uh, and, uh, by about 2015, uh, after the embers of those metrobites were dying down, I, uh, Um, I, I, I, I turned to Chanda Wickramasangi, a colleague of mine, and became very interested in the whole question of the origin of life and how that, how life evolves and spreads in the universe.

So by the time COVID arrived, uh, at the end of 2019, um, you know, I was, I was fully, fully, fully versed on where, where it was likely to have come from. But then the alarming thing for me was watching the big pharma stampede. And I understand it better now for knowing Judy, Elizabeth Hart, and all the others.

I just know now how they, how they did it. And convincing governments there had to be vaccine mandates. The utter corruption itself. Uh, in various levels of science in my society and career, but I hadn't realized it was on such a powerful grip on the medical, uh, immunity. Uh, so, by the time they're rolling out the vaccines and my, all my knowledge on mucosal immunity, I was, I was actively campaigning that none of these vaccines, whatever they turn, whatever they put out, could COVID.

And, and sure enough, by the middle of, uh, 2020 21, it was very, very clear they weren't protecting or stopping transmission anywhere in the world from all the epidemiology studies. That was very, very, very, very clear. But getting back to Sananyaki,

Sanjaya, you see, I've also been involved because of my astrobiology knowledge over the last eight to nine years. With, um, working on the origin of COVID and prior to COVID, we were, you know, she knows what I look, look back those healthy on days before this massive stampede took place. Uh, there was some reasonable dialogue and Dr.

Sanjaya Sananyaki got in touch with Professor Chandrawick Ramasangi and they got in touch with me and, and they brought our attention to the strange, uh, pandemics in fungal diseases that were, that appeared simultaneously around the world. In 2009, a very interesting story. It looked like an infall, you know, cosmic infall event, bringing this stuff in.

I don't want to go into that at the moment, but that's part of the reason why you got in touch with us. So we, we started. We, we put together one paper and he was co author with me on, um, uh, and was entitled Space Weather and Pandemic Warnings, and just to give the other members of the panel, I don't know anything about this, every 11 years, the sunspot cycle drops to a minimum, okay, you know, the sunspots that appear in the sun, they count them, and about every 11 years, and that, and that, that minimum part of the cycle was arriving at the end of 2019, 2020, at the beginning of 2020, 2020.

Okay. Pandemics of all sorts seek to crop up globally, okay? Incidence is higher during the actual minima. Now, the physics and the astrophysics and all that, you know, I'll leave to other experts, but that's a clear correlation. And we've known that correlation for almost a hundred years now. And, you know, dating back to the, you know, the big pandemics in the early part of the 20th century with the Spanish flu.

So we actually know what that cycle is. And Sanjay was so excited, you know, he got in touch with us and he said, look, It's amazing, 2009 was right at the middle of the cycle when this fungal disease struck simultaneously all over the world, in different regions of the world, in, you know, all within the space of a few months.

That was too fast for any person to person. So we wrote him into our next paper. You know, after that paper, we wrote him into our next paper, and we didn't know COVID had struck there, and we were writing about, we were writing about, uh, suddenly a mood in diseases and particularly focus on, uh, you know, a fungal disease, his expertise.



So he wrote the first section of our paper, and he agreed with our conclusions. Our conclusions were that it looks very, very much like a space weather. And then when COVID struck in the first week of January, the first, sorry, the first week of February, 2020, after we were exchanging manuscripts and his revisions, he gets in touch with me and says, please take my name off the paper.

I'm going to be being interviewed by the media all over Australia, and I can't, and I don't want my name associated with your, with your group. This is after I've already, already published the paper for this. So that's my beef with Dr. Uh, well, pro professor Sanja Nki, uh, a real well Grub since we're on the club, club grubby show.

Uh, so he's not a scientist or even a, he is not an honest medical person, nor is he an honest, honest scientist. 'cause honest people don't do stuff like that. So that's how, that's why I sent my email out earlier in the week when everyone was saying, you've gotta watch the clips from the spotlight. I eventually got about 17 minutes that I saw.

Uh, I, I saw Isaiah stand up, I didn't know Alison was there, but I watched Gigi and because I knew, and by the way, in the first part of 2020 and 2021, Bui and Senenyaka were on my big email groups. You know how I was blasting them with my email group, they knew what was going on, okay? And I watched Gigi and I love the way you did it, Gigi.

You just tried to stop these two propagandists, because that's all they are, they're just propagandists. Uh, and, and you just gently told them, you know, there was a, a massive level just below the mainstream of massive discontent and lots of different people disagreeing with everything you just said. And it might be worth your while becoming aware of what they're saying and just watching to some of these interviews and other stories.

And I love the way you did that. Because that got me.

Did you say gently, Ted?

Well, relatively gently, yeah, probably a little, but it's certainly more gentle than I would have said, you know, But anyway, uh, so look, so that's where I've come out. I've come out as a mucosal immunologist. I've had many years of experience of publishing and peer review literature.

I'm very much interested in the origin and spread, which we're not going to get to. I realize that. But, you know, I understand the vaccine and the reason why the vaccines don't work. But I should just want to leave people with one final message. And Judy was taught me this. That in the mid eighties, when Reagan bought in that thing with the FDA and the CDC, that there was no longer a requirement for big, for big pharma to, you know, pay compensation to vaccine injured, how all that was relieved.

Now that, that opened, opened the floodgates as Judy's pointed out in her great PhD, which I read by the way, I read her great PhD, and I recommend it for any other immunologist to read her PhD. Anyway, um, of course. that opened the floodgates and I'm utterly convinced that since then, nothing they've produced has been has worked anywhere in the world.

And I'm also convinced that they could produce a poison and still get it approved by the by the by the seed by the. You know, uh, the, uh, the FDA, and of course, TGA, which just ticks boxes and follows in, in suit. So, uh, that's when my anger levels really got going. I could, I, I realized that here was I, as an innocent guy, finishing my PhD, thinking I'd left a valuable information on mucosal immunity, how you induce this sort of immunity, and all of it was junked.

The whole textbook knowledge was junked. So that just lifted my, my anger, anger levels again. So I'm now convinced that all vaccines, this is my position on vaccines, all vaccines have got to be, have got to cease. Because as Judy also correctly pointed out, you know, the incidence of SIDS with number of shots around the world and those big global studies indicates that, uh, we, we just got to stop what we're doing, go back to the drawing board and work out why it's not working.

You know, the incidence of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome going up in a regression. Literally with number of shots in the first year of life is appalling. And that, that's objective data. See, I'm an objective analyst. I look at data like that all, all the time. Anyway, I'm not going to say any more except to say that that's how I got involved in it, and I came at it, and my My anxiety of everything they were doing just got worse and worse and worse.

So I, I left Victoria. I was actually very bad for my health living there. When I, when I, when I think back now, everything that happened and I'm actually better off now in Queensland. Um, but so look, thank you very much to Gigi. To, uh, I say, uh, thanks very much for Phil. Thanks very much for doing all these things you've been doing because I basically, apart from the origin, in some case, I agree with everything.

You've analysed, deduced, and concluded. Thank you.

Ted, look, it's a pleasure. Don't go anywhere though, we haven't finished with you yet.

No, no, I've, I've, I've, I've, I've, I've, you know, it's just not somatic type mutations. It's been my big thing, I've done all my life. But, but, you know, I've also, I'm a mucosal immunologist, and I'm an astrobiologist.

You know, an absolutely unique thing. Combination of knowledge skills to understand what's going on.

I've got to tell you when I sit down and analyze what you guys have all been up to and then I've got to try and condense that into something that that doesn't take up the whole show. I tell you what, you guys have got me thinking about things and words I've never even heard of before.

But I've got to say, um. Professor Bui mentioned that we should be proud in Australia of the work being done with this pandemic, that we've got a couple of potential Nobel Prize winners. Do

you know who

those two guys

are? I know, well I know several of the Nobel Prize's, recent ones, but I know Doherty pretty well.

Um, unfortunately, he's, he, for me, he's besmirched the Nobel Prize. He has betrayed science. You see, we've written, I've written a lot of papers during COVID. Some of them in peer reviewed. One of them was a big paper in Scandinavian Journal of Immunology where we analyzed the entire epidemic experience in Victoria in 2020.

And we did all the genetics. So all of the covid sequences, there were 15,000 of them. And then, and then there was all sorts of other knowledge coming in from the Victorian government health database with the mainstream media. And I could always check totals against both two separate ways of, of, of reporting.

Anyway, it was the Doherty Institute that did all the sequencing, you see, and when it became clear to me that all of the mystery cases, which was driving Daniel Andrews mad and causing him to get worse with his lockdowns and, you know, the rubber bullets and everything else like he was doing, shutting, shutting primary schools, you know, shutting, uh, shutting, shutting playgrounds, And each week, the mystery cases were sort of ramping up and no one could work them out.

And then when I looked at the total, and they kept saying, well, we know they're mystery cases because they're from the genomic sequencing, Brett Sutton and Daniela kept saying that on, on the TV nightly news. And when we tried to reconcile the numbers that were sequenced with the number of mystery cases, we reckon there would have had to have been about 19, 000 genomic sequences of COVID, yet only about 15, 000.

Look, I could be out by a thousand or two, I haven't looked at our papers for some time. But there was a deficit of 4, 000 mystery sequences. That should have been there in the set that we were trying to analyze because if I'd

seen the mystery sequence, I would have been able to explain them because I knew how it was, where this thing comes from.

I wrote to Peter personally. I said, look, it's beholden upon you. This is before you started advocating a vaccine, by the way, that you, could you please release those? You know, I know you're sitting on the, on the sequences. And he said, I'll see what I can do. He couldn't. He was, uh, you know, somebody, a clamp came on, he couldn't release all these, these 4, 000 genomic sequences.

Now, to me, in science, that is a really big no no. To me, that is scientific misconduct. You know, refusing to release publicly funded data to other experts so they can analyse the data. And so I, I got very angry at that point, but then of course, I discover as 2021's unfolding, he's bearing his arm and advocating people to get the shot in the arm.

Remember he had the former head of the Australian Academy of Science lined up, he had a few others and a few of the other names that Judy mentioned, they were all, you know, showing we've all got to go out and get the shot. And I knew it wasn't going to work. You see, coming back to one final thing, coming back to Judy's point about the leading, you know, uh, taking the indemnity of, of, uh, drug companies.

See, the annual flu shots don't work. They've never worked. They've never protected anyone against getting the flu. Any of these shots on respiratory infections, they don't work. All they're doing is unnecessarily hyper immunizing people, which is a very dangerous exercise. You know, in my PhD, I used to do that in rats and mice, but I would never have dreamt of doing it in a human being.

It's very dangerous. So there was a whole lot of things coming together by 2021, which just revolted me on the way the Doherty Institute behaved, and particularly its namesake head, who was effectively, you know, running the Institute. So I got, you know, I lost a little bit with him, but he was, he was my main target on all my main email broadcasts during that period through 2020 and 2021 over not releasing the mystery sequences, but releasing the And then advocating something that was not going to work and could be dangerous, because it already was clear that MRNA could have been dangerous.

So, that's what I did in those first 18 months. I was on the, you know, on my email group, mainly attacking, uh, Peter, Terry Noland, all these other people.

A whole lot of them, and all the other ones like Tony Blakely, uh, Catherine Bennett down at the Deakin Institute, you know, Epidemiology, the ones in Sydney, uh, Paul Griffin here in, uh, in Brisbane at the Martyr Hospital. There's so many of them. There was just so many of them. I was just appalled by it. So good night.

Go on. Look, I'm 34, but you can see why I got involved. Yes.

I'd just like to support you on that, Ted. Um, the modeling, the, the fraud, the medical fraud in the mathematical modeling, most of that came out of the Doherty Institute as well. Uh, the fraudulent testing where they're getting results that were being misused and misinterpreted, uh, any Nobel prizes in vaccinology is a complete farce.

And it's pretty disgusting that this continues and continues for decades.

May I jump in on that too, just one second, because I've read some of the Doherty um, reports and they always reference Neil Ferguson from Imperial College London, who was the original liar and catastrophist whose models were more than seven times out and who has been wrong almost his entire career and has never sat.

And Imperial College London is of course funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. So there you have it. All the people who hear Gates Foundation and think conspiracy theory will know he's a massive funder of fraud in this space. Correct.

Emeritus Professor Robert, I'm sorry Ted, Emeritus Professor Robert Clancy, uh, has been, uh, held up very highly by Prime Ministers and the like as one of Australia's leading scientists.

Um, I want, we've had him on the show. And I, I'm sure that Professor Robert Boye would know Robert Clancy, uh, and if he doesn't look up to him, he should. I want to share a clip of what Robert Clancy said briefly on our program, uh, which was, I think, way back at the end of 2021, early 22. So let me share screen.

And bring this one up.

I was working with Messenger RNA as a Bachelor of Medical Science student. We were doing the first Messenger RNA work in the world in metazoan multi cell systems in, I hate to say it, 1963. As a, as a, an undergraduate student for a year, and it was very, very exciting stuff. And so we've come a long way with messenger RNA, but to make that messenger RNA into what they call as a vaccine means they've got to modify it in a number of ways.

They've got to make it so it persists longer that it competes against the cells, natural messenger RNA. All of this, we sort of knew. They were the red flags that struck me. And if I had to summarize my whole concerns about these vaccines, I'd say just a couple of things. I'd say I have never understood why.

They went that route. It certainly wasn't for speed. If you go back to the 56 and the 65, 66 pandemics with flu, they had relevant vaccines on the market within six months. It took 12 months to get the, um, vaccine going for, uh, for, for COVID. And you never hear anyone talking about this. They say, Oh, look how quick it is.

And we're going to set up big factories in Australia to make these. Uh, vaccines. If no one else, if nothing else comes out of these discussions, for God's sake, stop these factories until we work out the safety of messenger RNA genetic vaccines, because they're going to have exactly the same problems as that we're running into with the COVID.

Which I believe are red flags waving with great force when red flags with much less density have been exposed for vaccines. For example, one of the earlier flu vaccines, and I think it was an RSV vaccine, a couple of these. A few red flags flew. They stopped it straight away, straight away, uh, and said, let's work it out.

That is what's not happening now. The red flags are flowing with such great, uh, profusion that people just think that's normal. I just want to see the, uh, vaccines sorted out. I want a halt. on these vaccines until and unless they're shown to be safe and effective. There

you go. Um, so

that's the man who's held up. He's the man who's held up as the doyen of all of this stuff and he's been, you know, a Nobel Prize winner and all that sort of, I mean, anyone who says that the people on this panel And Clancy and all the others we've interviewed. Harvey Reich, uh, Angus Dalglish, Tess Lorry, you name it, we can go on and on.

Peter McCullough, anyone who says that these people are cooks are in denial, which means don't even know I am lying. You are in denial because we need to listen to these voices. These voices must be heard and censorship is destroying them. Now, um, let's get on, uh, to, uh, Phil Altman. Um, we talked to you about this the other night and John, I want you to take over in a minute because I'm starting to lose your voice.

The one thing I noticed about that video was you and I have aged a lot since we did that one with Robert Clancy. But, uh, Phil Altman, uh, Robert, uh, not Robert Clancy, Robert Bowie said that what the TGA desperately needs is more funding. I would propose that what the TGA desperately needs is not more funding, but independent funding, because 95 percent of its funding comes from pharma.

What's your take on that?

Okay, they don't need more funding. All they need to do is do their job. And they're capable of doing their job. And I, as I've said on many occasions, in many venues, the one thing that really scares me, really scares me, is that after working with the TGA for more than 40 years, I can tell you with a hundred percent certainty, they are not incompetent.

There are people in the TGA, many people, most of them, who can see the big picture, know what's going on, and they can't say anything because they won't have their job if they do. This is a thing that has really hit me the hardest. COVID really caused me to think about a lot of things in life because this was so obvious and so dramatic, uh, the, the errors that were being made.

And I thought in the beginning that, um, it was incompetence and people were just missing it and people were just fearful. And as time went on,

it dawned on me that people do know what's going on. The people who are making decisions know what's going on, and they're allowing this to continue. And that, to me, is the scary thing. I thought about it today. You might have recalled the, um, uh, Kubler Ross Five Stages of Grief, when someone is told that they're about to die, right, and they go through stages.

And I think we've all gone through stages with this COVID thing, and I just, just before coming on air here, I just scribbled down perhaps seven stages that, that I've gone through. And the, the, the first. And you might relate to this or not. What was shock and fear, you know, we we saw the videos of people dying and people being buried and dragged off the hospital and so forth.

And then secondly, there was this this hope there was this new vaccine and I never really thought much about vaccines. In fact, because in all my years of doing clinical trials and registering new drugs. I never had much to do with vaccines. I had, I did clinical trials and registered drugs from almost every other category but vaccines.

And now I'm beginning to know why, because you don't have to really prove that they're safe and efficacious. You don't have to spend a lot of time doing that. A lot of things are just assumed. The third stage of covid for me was the skepticism and the distrust and then that turned into disbelief.

because of my experience with the TGA. Then the fourth stage for me was anger. I, I was angry because I could, I could see that this just wasn't incompetence and I could see the censorship. And then the fifth stage was, I realized that the governments aren't going to listen, the courts aren't going to listen.

It became apparent to me that the people who were driving this weren't going to change course. They weren't going to apologize, despite the evidence. They weren't going to acknowledge the harm that's been done. The sixth stage for me was really drilling down to the true extent of the damage, that is an excess deaths, the incidence of cancers, heart attacks.

strokes, looking at the published reports of autopsies and so forth. Then I became very angry. Um, and now I believe we're in the last stage. It's the seventh stage, and it's the gaslighting stage. And that's the stage, that, that's an example of this channel seven spotlight program was purest gaslighting.

That is Don't believe your lying eyes. Don't believe you got sick right after a COVID jab. Don't believe friends of yours died for unexplained reasons after a COVID jab. That the hospitals are full of sick people. The hospitals are struggling to cope. Don't believe any of that. Believe the two doctors that you saw on the spotlight program.

That these things are safe and efficacious. Believe that. Don't believe your lying eyes. We're in the gaslighting stage. It's a really, really serious stage. And that's why we all have to speak out. We all have to reach out to friends and family and people that we know and keep spreading the information, um, as, as we see it.

Yeah, Philip, I just, I just want to jump on and, and echo what you're saying, if, if I may. Um, and, um, Uh, I think, um, we have broken a barrier, um, with what's happened at Spotlight because certain things got out of the cracks and I, I've personally have, I don't know, um, about Gigi and Alison, but I've

just lost you there, Asa.

Well, may I jump in until we get yes, by

all means, yeah, um,

ASA, ASA spoke brilliantly and so did Gigi at spotlight, but I will say one thing in defense of spotlight. We don't know how hard it might have been for Michael Usher to actually get that program up and going. And it did in fact provide a voice for vaccine injured people, Ian Lees and the family of Katie Lees was able to have a forum to speak and Karen Phelps although she is still the voice of the establishment, she was able to speak.

Speak and, um, showcase her wife as well, who is terribly vast. Oh, a's back, welcome back Asa.

Yeah, we'll just come, come back. What happened?

Is she that back? I said something kryptonite, I think. But what I was saying is that, um, what we have. is, um, corruption, right? Like what you said, um, uh, Philip, that, um, there is scientific methodology, um, and there is legal method.

Um, but we know with all arms of the government and with the health sector. There has been corruption throughout, and with the Doherty Institute and other relevant institutes, and as Alison also has investigated, everybody has, with respect to conflicts of interest, that used to be the biggest taboo in any field.

If you have conflict of interest, then you have, you're not qualified, um, to speak to an issue if you've taken money from a certain speaking point. So, corruption is what we're dealing with.

Every

time, in my opinion, every time a so called health expert speaks, They should declare up front their conflict of interest.

Now that can be, uh, direct funding or it can be indirect. It can be appointment to, uh, uh, to committees. It can be, uh, speaking engagements overseas attached to a holiday. Um, it can be lots of things. And that is the problem. Almost everyone in authority. Who's speaking on this issue, and there's very few forums where one can debate these issues, right?

Every forum is, is, uh, completely controlled by people who are conflicted in one way or the other, either directly or indirectly, and it's really serious. And they know it. Um, you, you even see this in the revolving door with the U. S. FDA, the people who become a commissioner of the U. S. FDA who approve a drug, and then lo and behold, they pop up on the board of a major drug company.

That's, that's happened more than a few times, right? And it's, it's so obvious what has happened. This is part of a career path. For a lot of these people and as Asa says, uh, someone who's conflicted, highly conflicted, has no business at all speaking publicly in support of these vaccines. It's, it's just so unethical.

This is, this is what's happened to us these days with the censorship and the, the, uh, decline in morals and, and, and, and standards of, of ethics. We see it everywhere.

Philip, you're quite correct, and it's the, um, the, uh, fox in charge of the hen house, and it has been for decades, and what I've noticed is that, um, they're downplaying these conflicts of interest.

You're meant to say they're potential conflicts of interest, and they talk about them as being potential, and, you know, you must put that word in in place.

And of course, then the general public doesn't recognize as strongly that this is a real serious thing. It is the fox in charge of the hen house. It's been like that for decades, and none of them are going to be made accountable. A show like Spotlight is there for two reasons. It keeps the public complacent because you think something's being exposed.

If you rarely talk about the side effects of a vaccine, then of course they're rare. One in a million. It's a, it's an illusion that is being created by the media. They do it on purpose and it's been happening for decades. Nothing is about to change. Uh, the, the, the commercial programs are still promoting the COVID injections and telling you to protect your, your grandmothers and granddads, you know, it's still happening.

whilst we expose all of this. Um, so they have ignored parents for decades, all our concerns, and we've been made a minority. Um, Murdoch was allowed to just promote the childhood program, which includes 16 vaccines with 52 doses over 14 years, just as no jab, no pay, play, a little jingle. And everybody assumed that They were talking about one or two vaccines when they brought in the note you have no pay.

All of this was an illusion that the media's created and nobody's going to be held accountable. There'll be no personal fines and no one will go to jail for the millions of people that have died and are now disabled and have lost their quality of life.

Can I say something about, um, this issue of, of corruption?

So first of all, I've, I was studying corruption for about 15 years before COVID broke out. And I think that's one of the things that allowed me to see what was happening very quickly when we went into the March 2020 madness. Um, and of course, we talk about all of these sorts of revolving doors and the conflicts of interest and the great COVID panic, which I started writing with my co authors in October 2020.

Out of, you know, just pulling my hair out with what was going on and I did go through many stages not not the same order as what Philip Altman, you know, described but certainly my own path, and I think the gaslighting started very very early actually. In relation to this notion of. Whether transparency and declarations of conflict of interest is the right, uh, is a solution to this problem.

I would agree with Judy, it's not. It doesn't matter how much is made public. And I mean, I hate to say this because it sounds, it sounds cynical, but it really doesn't matter. And I can say this from, um, personal experience in the academic circles that I, that I'm in, one of my papers that basically called out the economics profession for not having stood up for the Australian people during the COVID era, Went through a whole rigmarole of, uh, trying to, you know, we tried to get in, uh, to a couple of different journals, and there was someone who at one point simply swooped down, uh, not involved in the peer review process at all, but essentially blocked publication, and that person was married to somebody who was called out in our paper to have Let down the Australian people.

And we made this very clear. We we advised the managing editor that this was wrong. Um, you know, and the managing editor simply ended up doing the bidding of this person who swept, you know, swept in after the peer review process. And yes, it's partly a fear for one's job that, that, that motivates that sort of behavior.

And it's also telling oneself that the consequences of these actions aren't that serious. Oh, it's just one person. I'm just one person. I can't possibly influence, uh, you know, something bigger like, you know, the whole destruction of science, for example. Um, there's also something I wanted to mention that Robert Boy told me in the green room before the recording.

Because I, he was talking about, he looked me up and he was saying, Oh, your ARC grants have been in this area, this area, whatever. And we got talking about his areas of research. And he said something about a survey or a, or some kind of a, an initiative to do with vaccination. And I said, well, who funded that?

And he said, well, the immunization council. And I said, well, that's obviously a biased source. Uh, you know, I think we need independent analysts. To be, uh, to be conducting any sort of project in that area. And he looked straight at me, not missing a beat. And he said, there aren't any independent analysts. Or something along those lines.

There is no independent scholar, right? And that really, I mean, I didn't even have an answer to that. I just thought I was just flummoxed by that, by that perspective. So he is telling himself essentially in his mind that he might as well do this job because everybody else is conflicted as well, right?

That's an ultimate, ultimate rationalization, right?

I've used that as an excuse to parents before. All the, all the experts have these conflicts of interest. Therefore, they can't get anyone that doesn't. That's what they tell the public. Yeah,

exactly. And that only works, of course, as long as the fiction is promulgated and sustained, that no one gets hurt.

Yeah. without a PhD or an MD or whatever expert, you know, post nominals is allowed to have an opinion or allowed to do any analysis. You know, some of the best analysis that I've seen during this period has come from people who are not medically trained, right? I mean, anybody I can look at the excess deaths and the vaccine rollout data and work out that there's a, you know, there's a correlation there.

Ted was mentioning this correlation between the the vaccine number of vaccines in the childhood schedule and the SIDS numbers. I mean, that's not, that's not medicine only that's kind of statistics and basic common sense and ability to deal with data. So just one final point I wanted to make, and this is in relation to this point about do they know, do they know.

Are they competent and do they know? I think based on my observations that most of the people, not all, but most of the people who are still pushing this nonsense have told themselves, have convinced themselves that what they are doing is correct and their self image is that they are saviors of everybody else.

And the way, one piece of evidence for that. Is that on the night on Spotlight's recording night when we were there for four hours, Sanjeev, Dr. S, whom Ted Seal has trouble with pronouncing his name, so do I, he brought his daughter along to the green room. And it was obviously from the way I saw them interacting and the way he was behaving, it was obviously in his eyes an opportunity for her to see his dad doing the right thing.

thing right her dad's already doing the right thing for the people right you can watch daddy as he fights for you know science and and good policy that's that was the attitude and when we came back after the recording She was upset and she was saying, you know, I was really, I was getting angry at people because they were really ganging up on my dad.

And I told her, you know, in, in compassion, I said, yeah, I understand how that would be when our loved ones are attacked. And, you know, it generates a defensive response and I can understand you'd be upset, but you know, you don't bring your daughter to watch you tell lies. I don't think these people are telling themselves they're good people.

They're telling themselves are good people. And that is one of the biggest problems that we face right now in our community.



Yeah, to, to me, there's an element of psychopathic behavior, sociopathic behavior here, because that would require an enormous amount of willful blindness, because of the amount of data that is available is incredible.

And these people will not expose themselves to critical analysis. In order to do that, that's willful blindness. So they, they can fool themselves up to a point. In my mind, I'm not an expert on this. I'm not a psychologist, but to me, it seems like they must be willfully blind. And so, and it takes a certain type of person to do this.

Now it's one thing to exaggerate a situation in marketing. Where the car doesn't really perform the way that the ad said it would perform, uh, lets you down a little bit. Or the food doesn't taste quite as good as you, as it, as it looks, right? But here, we're talking about hundreds of thousands or millions of people dying.

And that's the difference.

I hate to break this one up, John, but we've got to, the data file is going to be too big. We won't be able to get it up on social media.

No, I don't think so. Well, it'll take about a week to put it up. So that will, uh, not to mention all our staff will be very upset. All our staff.

Yeah. Our staff. You know, all the staff we've got. The production staff. Yeah. The production team. Yeah.

That'll be. Oh, we've got, we've got one bloke volunteering for us is, is as good as having 50 people on, on the staff. Stuart Robertson. Good ol Stuart, we call him the Sarge, but anyhow, we hope you've enjoyed the first part of um, of the Spotlight on Spotlight, and the second half will be coming to you tomorrow night, and it's gonna be up on our website, [www](http://www.clubgrovery.com.au).

[clubgrovery.com.au](http://clubgrovery.com.au). You'll be able to go back and review it because it was, uh, I don't think any of the panelists wanted to stop it, but, um, anyhow, it's divided up and we look forward to you, uh, commenting on this one and we'll bring the next half, the second half of that to you tomorrow night. So yeah, share, share, share, share, share, share.

Thanks everybody. We love you. Thanks for supporting us. And, uh, Stay out of the trees and you've often been heard to say, you just couldn't make this stuff up. And we haven't. See you tomorrow night. Bye for now.