

2024-10-04 Graham and John discuss with our panel things political and the state of our nation today...

Hi everyone and welcome to another great episode of Club Grubbery, Wednesday the 2nd of October. We're recording this. It'll be up probably on Friday and we have a special panel today, Johnny, and it's great having these two on. They are just wonderful human beings. We love having them on. They're always available.

They never say no to us. And we're talking, of course, about Professor Gigi Foster, Professor of Economics at University of New South Wales. Great to have you with us, Prof.

Thanks for having me.

And also a stalwart in the campaign about the truth around COVID and the TGA and the mismanagement of the vaccine rollout, Dr.

Philip Altman. Always great to have you on for an Altman Report, mate. Nice.

Nice seeing you all.

So before we go into the main topic of our discussion today, which is, which is misinformation and disinformation and, and all the rubbish around that. And we need to clarify a whole bunch of things there. Uh, Philip, have you got any updates on where you're sitting at the moment with TGA and, uh, the latest science that you can reveal to us?

Well, one interesting thing that, uh, came out of, uh, one of the legal cases that I've been involved with as an expert witness was that I, uh, uh, said to the lawyer in this particular case, it will, this case will be a very, very important case. Uh, can't say too much about it now, but, um, uh, I said to this lawyer, you know, it was illegal for the, uh, TGA or, uh, health bureaucrats or the health experts from the government to actually say.

In an unqualified way that the COVID 19 vaccines were safe. I said to him, you know, that's illegal. And he said, what do you mean? And I said, well, well, I've been in this business for 40 years. And I can tell you, I was never allowed to use that word and I would never use that word in an unqualified way.

And he said, well, why specifically do you say that? And I said, well, it comes from the TGA's own advertising code. It says specifically that no one can claim a therapeutic agent of a drug is safe. You always have to qualify those sorts of statements. He said, Well, and how did they say it? And I said, Well, I don't know.

And he, he did some digging. I pointed him in the right direction. And lo and behold, he came back to me and showed me exactly where the amendment was made by John Skerrick himself in June 2021, where they inserted A line in the regulation saying, yes, you can't claim anything was safe except for COVID 19 vaccines.

Ah,

what? Unbelievable.

What?

You, you, you look just like I looked when I found out.

Look at the words. I found out

officially how they did it because really, to begin with, the COVID 19 vaccines were never approved. We've been over this a dozen times and everyone in this space now, now knows what, what the sleight of hand was. They were provisionally approved.

And there's a huge difference. The provisionally approved drugs, that regulatory pathway was only introduced in Australia in 2018. And it was supposed to be reserved for In rare cases of life and death, when people were facing, say, death due to a rare genetic disease or something like that, and there was a new drug under investigation, and the idea was, well, you know, some people should be allowed to be able to use something like that.

It was never envisaged. To use provisional approval for drugs used population wide in healthy people, in pregnant women, in breastfeeding women, in children, in infants, when it wasn't proven to be safe. Yet, they were able to say in an unqualified way, and people believed them. People had faith in the senior health bureaucrats and the TGA, and I did in the beginning when they said, you know, this wasn't going to be a problem, but they used the word safe and it really, really hurt.

When I, when I heard that, I, I couldn't believe that they were saying it, because as we all know, vaccines take about 10 years to develop, and even then, many of them have been withdrawn due to lack of safety, because they don't, they're not subjected to long term safety observations. We now know that.

Flotkin himself, who is the, uh, godfather, of vaccines worldwide. He, he, he wrote the Gray's Anatomy of vaccines, right? And he was testifying under oath, and he said, to the amazement of people, when he was testifying under oath, Vaccines generally aren't tested for safety long term. So, how could our government say in the very beginning that they were safe?

Now, you might, you might take the position that okay, this was a noble lie. They were so scared of the consequences. You'll recall that Paul Kelly came out and predicted upwards to 150,000 deaths. And Gigi knows, knows very well about that, right? And, uh, she's looked at the data, she's looked at the data more and in, in, in more precise terms than anyone else in the country as far as I'm concerned.

And, and of course, You know, we were all scared. Now, now maybe he was acting out of pure fear, and he was telling a noble lie,

but he didn't. What is fear? What is fear but false evidence appearing real?

Well, I mean,

we've all

learned our lesson, haven't we?

Well, we have. I thought the gnome would have learned his, I'm sorry, Paul Kelly would have learned his lesson by now.

Sorry. Well, it's,

it's, it's rumored that he will be the new head of the Australian Center for Disease Control.

What could possibly go wrong, Johnny? What could

possibly go wrong?

Wow. Wow. Wow. Wow. Indeed. Wow, indeed. Now we're seeing Ben Fordham coming out big time now, John. He's really, I think it's almost like he's been let out of the starting blocks.

Um, let's pray that that continues. Um, and I'm wondering where all that sits with 2GB, especially as he's in the same stable, excuse the pun, as, uh, Ray Hadley. It must be interesting when they pass each other in the corridor.

Wow. Uh, well, look, the figures they've released this morning, uh, um, are interesting because They've said there's a 50 percent increase in chest pain, uh, during that period of the, uh, main vaccinations.

In fact, and, and the COVID rates were low. Um, so it's obvious that there's an issue, but the thing that I find quite, uh, unbelievable with New South Wales Health is that the data that was released by the New Zealanders was relating to those under 40. And there was a 950 percent increase in, in presentations to emergency departments.

Now, news of Wales health have been a bit disingenuous once again. And it'd be interesting to get GDG's opinion on this with facts and figures. But I don't think that those figures that Ben Fordham was given to report on this morning were Related to the under forties. I think that was the entire picture.

Uh, which would, uh, uh, you know, certainly make those figures look a lot better than they probably are.

Yeah. I don't know if you want me to comment on, uh, on that, but I just, the other day I used, uh, in my, one of my lectures to 300 students or so, the example of the covid uh, shots as a potential situation where we would've thought there might be positive externalities, which is where.

A transaction happens and there's a positive effect on someone unrelated to that transaction or a negative externality situation where a transaction happens and there's a negative effect. This is my technique for trying to open their mind a little bit without stuffing something down their throat. And what I used was the data from the New South Wales Department of Health back from 2022 when they were still releasing hospitalization with COVID and death with COVID data by vaccination status.

So they had zero doses, one dose, two doses, three doses. four plus doses. And I show them the charts first, so far away that they can't read the legend. And you can see that one bar is really, really high. And then, you know, the other bars are low. And I say, well, if in fact, vaccination had positive externalities, they, they kept people healthy and therefore, um, maybe not transmitting to others and they reduced the health budget that needed to be spent on them, thereby allowing money to be spent on other people.

That's a positive effect on others. Then you'd expect that the highest hospitalization and death rates were amongst the unvaccinated and that the vaccinations caused that those rates to come down. And then, of course, I blow up the chart and you see that no, no, it's the four plus vaccination group that has a high rates, particularly of hospitalization.

Also true for death, but it's not quite as stark a pattern there. And then we have to discuss the selection problem. You know, who actually went into each of these groups? Was it maybe the already very sick people who were in the, uh, four plus vaccinated group? Well, maybe, but where's the data? New South Wales health.

So again, I'm trying to make an argument to the students. students that they need to insist on transparent data sharing with the institutions that are in charge of their health. Uh, it is not acceptable for us to have to just deal with whatever breadcrumbs the New South Wales Department of Health decides to release.

And actually as, as in that same line, I don't know if you've heard, there is, <https://otter.ai> Admission that the ABS is able to match death certificates with vaccination status and to release those data to organizations. So ASF is planning just not last night. We agreed to do this to apply for those data and then to undertake an analysis of those data.

And we'll see what kind of, you know, data. Points they've got, whether they've got, for example, as you were saying, John, age, um, and gender, you'd like that. You'd like as detailed data as they have, right? I mean, that's

what we deserve to see. Um, and we deserve to be able to replicate whatever analysis they feed to us and do our own.

Well, one would have thought that I would, GG

says the, the, uh, New South Wales, uh, health statistics were one of the best sources of hospital statistics in the world. I often use those statistics. In my, in my substack, the, um, uh, Office of National, uh, Statistics in the U. K. was, was also a good source, but there weren't many good sources, and, and when these sources, like the New South Wales Department of Health, started to publish the data, which, uh, didn't show statistics that supported their narrative, They just stop publishing the data,

which is completely unacceptable.

I mean, it's, it's just, there's no grounds, you know, in a developed Western democracy like Australia that in my mind could defend that action. That's just completely irresponsible and shouldn't be called out. I think the fact that it hasn't been called out more loudly by the citizenry is. a reflection of the general apathy that we still unfortunately have.

I mean, you were saying, Graham, that we've learned our lesson, or maybe, maybe Philip was saying we've learned our lesson. Unfortunately, some of us have, sure, but I think we're still in the very small minority. I think most people in the country A, they don't really understand what has happened here, and B, even if they did, they don't have the mindset to push back and insist on accountability and insist on change and simply reject the, the nonsense that's being fed to us and the totalitarian measures that are being increasingly inflicted upon us or suggested to be inflicted, um, the way that would, would be reflective of a healthy, um, Society.

So I think that's one of our big problems to activate people, um, just people on the street, people who would like to get on with their lives and not have to worry about power dynamics and politics and unpleasant stuff like that. But you know, when, when too few people worry about that, that's when you get abuse of power.

It's when you get betrayal.

Now, not only would one have thought that those statistics would have been made available for us to analyze, but you would have thought that they would want every statistic they could in order to solve the problem. And it's, it's obvious they know there's a problem, but they don't want the statistics, it's just lies, lies and more lies.

And, uh, and so what we're doing on this program right now is we're having a debate. We're having a civil debate on what's going on. Now, the government knows that these debates are getting more and more fruitful because more and more data is being released and more and more truth is coming out. And of course, they're hurrying as quickly as they can to stifle anything like this with the censorship that they're bringing in with the misinformation and disinformation bill.

Where, uh, Gigi, I want to pose this to you. You can't have science without debate. You can't have science in a sensitive environment. Where do you think this is ultimately going and do you think it'll be successful in achieving what it's set out to do?

Well, what it's set out to do, I think, is of course nothing to do with the wrapping that it's presented in.

I think what it's set out to do is to further entrench the power and control of the, the, the bureaucracy, um, and the people who are. Pushing for this, like the wicket that they're on and they'd like to keep it that way. And it's also particularly, um, opportune timing because if such a bill gets passed now, hopefully in their, in their view, that would help to suppress some of the otherwise what I think they would expect to be a bit of an avalanche of discoveries and insights and alarm that would be generated as a result.

About what really happened during the COVID years, because we are moving inexorably as we've just discussed with the, you know, the two GB and Ben Fordham and everything. We're moving inexorably in a direction where people are starting to wake up and you kind of if you if you're one of the people who was an agent of the destruction during the COVID era, you want to find a way to stop that.

Um, at least if you are. Don't have a moral compass. And you're really just driven by wanting to maintain your image, your status, your power, um, your legacy as a positive one is very personal for a lot of these people. I think very personal, right? They, they define themselves around their careers because we can have another conversation about optimal identity formation, but People really loop themselves in personally, ego wise, to their careers, and if it's found out that the main things you did in your career were to destroy Australian wealth and health, geez, that's, that's pressure.

So these people have a huge incentive to try any means of suppressing that kind of outpouring of truth and debate, as you say. So, so yeah, that's, that's the, the goal. Will it succeed? Well, before we had this recording, I, um, I just popped on to the submission site. Of course, ASF put a submission in against the Misinformation Disinformation Provisions Act, and so did many other bodies, including, um, some peak bodies in the press, the, uh, the New South Wales Human Rights, uh, group, amazingly, actually didn't push it.

Wholeheartedly against this bill. I read their submission. Um, pretty weak. I haven't seen any submission so far. That's basically called this for what it is, which is a step towards more totalitarian control and essentially indefensible on any grounds. I don't see in any way how Pursuing the restriction of information flow yields a healthier society.

That is the way you get in, in history, across cultures, across time. That's how you get more centralization of power and more suffering and, and less joy, less happiness, less progress and less economic Success for societies. So no matter what you're barricading for, if you're barricading just for people, human beings and, and freedom and life, if you're barricading for economic success, if you're barricading for GDP growth, you don't want this.

You don't want restriction of information by any means. Um, now of course people say, well, uh, you know, do you want people to be calling for the death of whole peoples? For example, genocidal language. We already have language in our, uh, existing bills about that sort of thing. We already have quite a number of provisions that deal with a lot of the problems that this bill purports to solve.

Um, and it's not solving anything anyway, because you cannot get a healthier society through further freedom of speech restriction. What happens when you have a bad idea floating around is you get to talk about it. Other people get to hear it, and they think about it, and ultimately it gets rejected. It dies a death, a public death.

And that is how you make progress in the evolution of ideas, and the evolution of societies over time. That's how progress happens. It does not happen through some body or bureaucrat dictating what is misinformation or disinformation at a particular time, and deciding what gets suppressed and what gets released.

That is, that is not the case. That is never led to progress in the history of man. And unfortunately, a lot of the submissions seem to be pretty historically ignorant. And I think that's another problem we are facing here in Australia. We really have fallen off the wagon in terms of giving our children, our generations, even people who were born maybe in the eighties and nineties, an adequate understanding of history and the features of history to watch out for in their own society and to push against.

Well, you know, if you, if you look back, on COVID. It, it, it took me a few months to really, uh, come up to speed, uh, with, uh, COVID and the vaccines because it was a new technology. I was never trained in that technology. So I was on a steep learning curve. It took me a few months. And if you, if you look back, it's taken roughly four years.

For a small part of the population, maybe I would estimate maybe 10, 15, or even 20 percent of people to become aware to some degree that there's something really, really wrong here. Even though we had censorship, you couldn't talk about people who had, uh, adverse reactions post vaccination. They were censored.

People lost their jobs about it. Uh, media commentators couldn't mention it and we had censorship, but we've struggled over four years to get to where we are, where only maybe 10 or 15 percent of people know there's a problem. Now, if they get the misinformation and disinformation bill across the line, it's going to be much easier for there to be a COVID 2.

0. And a lot of people are expecting COVID 2.0 for one reason or the other. And that misinformation and disinformation bill will be a serious threat to getting the word out about the truth about what COVID 2.0 may or may not be about.

Johnny. Well, it seems ironic to me that the governor general was able to intervene to get rid of a prime minister back in 1975.

Over an economic issue at the time, but here we have essentially, uh, the commencement of a communist, uh, regime in Australia. And these people just think it's okay. I mean, every system, every belief that we hold within this country is based upon, uh, people having different opinions, uh, being able to voice those opinions.

I mean, even the fact that you may go and go to court. I mean, you go to court and you have a judge that listens to both sides of the story. Uh, what's going to happen now? You're going to have people go out there and be labeled as misinformation because they're Witness statements don't, uh, behold to what the government wants you to, uh, believe.

I mean, this sort of stuff is just beyond belief. I

was at an event on Thursday night last week, uh, where we were discussing the implications, potential implications of, um, you know, what we'd see in our society, basically, if this bill got passed. And one of the ladies there asked exactly that question, what happens in a courtroom?

Because at the moment in a courtroom, you know, you can have expert witnesses that are called and they can put their piece and neither of them is, is worried when they're putting their piece that. Somebody some, you know, some, whoever is gonna come down on them and say, well, I determined that you know what you're saying is misinformation.

Right? And so, of course, if there's that possibility, then it's a very, you have a very chilling effect on free speech in any realm. Now, of course, this bill is a sort of a modified version of the first bill that we saw, which exempted the government and universities and all these things. And this bill talks a lot about how it's going to encourage the social media companies and whatnot to have various codes of practice in place and certain kinds of procedures like fact checkers and all those I mean, fact checkers, come on, right?

Who, who has a, who has the, somehow who's the queen of facts, the queen of facts? There's no one person who can possibly be given the right to decide what is true and what is false. I mean, what kind of world do these people live in? It's nuts, right? The idea of truth being owned by anybody is so ridiculous.

It's so anti scientific, um, and as you say, Jon, so anti democratic that it just, it boggles your mind. But people just don't seem to see this, right? Either they are so blinded by their power motivations and their, their desire to at all costs suppress the actions that they did during COVID being found to be not optimal for Australia, or they're just totally ignorant and incompetent and unable to connect what's happening now to, to any kind of historical analogy at all.

What's going to happen? Who's going to tell the kids that Albo's cancelled the Easter Bunny, the Tooth Fairy and Father Christmas?

There you go. Are we going to have exceptions for, you know, fairy tales or, you know, traditional or whatever, whatever? Well, you can tell what will happen then. If that becomes a loophole, you know, ASF is going to be a fairy tale telling machine.

Hear fairy tale one, click here. Okay, here's the fairy tale in a, in a magical land of Oz, uh, here's what has been happening. I mean, it's, it's unworkable if, and we'll just keep playing those sorts of games, right? And why are we even doing this in the first place? If you think of all the ways we could be spending our effort to develop good new regulations or laws or acts of parliament, why this?

Well, set is going to be right, right

now, as, as we speak. I am, uh, an expert witness in a court in New Zealand, defending a GP that made certain statements about the vaccines and the other side has put on a vaccine expert who's heavily involved in the promotion of vaccines and this, uh, Expert began her expert report pages and pages of definitions of misinformation and disinformation.

And then she went through the statements. by this GP that were on his Facebook page and other places and categorize them as either misinformation or disinformation. So it's actually happening right now, so you can imagine, uh, when it's put into law, how bad it's going to be.

That is just so offensive. I mean, can you imagine how does that woman sleep at night?

I mean, how, how can you qualify somebody else's statement as misinformation? What, what a conceit that is. I mean, I've not used that word in relation to the government's statements because, you know, I just think they're wrong. I'm not going to use those words that, you know, I, I, they have a right to say something as, as do I, but to try to control people's speech via these epithets, which we never used to use these words, right?

I mean, when did you even hear that word? It was like something you use in spy movies. Exactly. Right, but it was not something you talk about as, you know, occurring to each other. And if you think about, in our submission, an ASF submission, in order to try to rectify a little bit of this historical ignorance that we sense in the population about these issues, we, with the great help of Alison Bevich, by the way, who helped us in the drafting immensely, we brought up several historical examples, which should be quite alarming to persons Seriously able to connect the dots between what happened back then and what might happen now based on what's being proposed.

One of them was to the USSR, which I don't know if you guys know I actually studied from the Soviet Union a lot when I was in my undergraduate days. I wrote my senior thesis at Yale and Gorbachev's Perestroika. And so I knew quite well what the system was like and basically said in this, in this submission that we gave, there was this man came called Lesenko, who was very popular politically.

And because of the political popularity that he enjoyed, rather than the truth or value of his scientific theories, his theories became the way, became the mainstream view on what was possible in agriculture. And unfortunately, what happened is the political. dynamics led to the implementation of some of his theories in the fields, literally in the fields, and it led to the deaths of millions of people because his theories proved to be false.

You can't make autumn wheat spring in the springtime, right? That sort of thing. Um, and, and that was essentially because nobody could voice against him in that system, in that regime. There was such a A chilled environment. You just didn't risk it. You just there was no reason to risk saying anything against the mainstream.

It's already hard enough to say something against the mainstream. You already face social disapprobation, right? Look at Semmelweis, for example, where there was no Soviet regime to prevent people speaking out against the practice of not washing your hands before you give birth to a baby. But Semmelweis said, Hey, when I tell my

physician assistants to wash their hands first, The number of mothers and babies who die goes down and there was plenty of social approbation, you know, against that.

Right. I mean, he would have he had he was rejected from his position. He he died in an insane asylum and and there would have been a lot more mothers and babies who died and continue to die if on top of the social disapprobation. There had also been government control or big company control of speech against anybody who said something, uh, counter to the mainstream during his time.

So, you know, we give those kinds of examples just to try to appeal to people's humanity and their sense that maybe this isn't, you know, today, this, this world we're living in right now isn't completely new. Maybe we can learn a little bit about what's happened to people who have exactly our same nature.

In previous times when similar kinds of power dynamics and concentration of power and propaganda and whatnot have been going on.

Isn't it ironic that, I mean, let's go right back to simple terms. Isn't it ironic that the leaders of our states and our national leadership were castigating people who refused to get vaccinated because they were putting at risk other people who had been vaccinated?

When we would have thought that the vaccine having been promoted as being safe and effective would have made it null and void as to whether the person you were talking to was vaccinated or not because you were protected. So the only people who stood to lose were the unvaccinated. And now we're seeing that the opposite is true.

That, that total illogical, um, scenario is still put forward and still promoted by a mainstream media that's hooked on propaganda. I mean, what does it say about the mentality of the people of this country?

Yeah, I mean, it was I think at the time it was something like we must protect the unprotected with the protection that didn't protect the protected.

There was something, you know, it's just this ridiculous, right? Because otherwise they'll they'll not protect the protected. I mean, it's just logically inconsistent, right? Um, and I think it shows to an extent, honestly, Graham, that people have really been suckered in by it. The messaging of big health over the last 20 to 30 years.

Um, and, and this includes, I mean, I, I myself advocated for my, both my children to get the HPV vaccines when, when they came online, like when was that? I don't know, 10 years ago or something. Um, I, I just, just assumed that that was the right thing. I just, I hadn't even looked into the pharmaceutical complex and all of the various, you know, shoddy incentives that are set up there.

I kind of, just didn't think of it as a big deal. And so you, you kind of are, you grow up with this trust, like we said before, right, this trust. And, and if you really start to question that, for some people, that's just too much. They can't handle it. You know, they can't handle it psychologically. I've, I've spoken to many people who have, like Philip, had a period during the early COVID years when they were going along with stuff and, you know, They thought, yeah, okay, lockdowns, okay, masks, okay, whatever, I guess this is reasonable.

And then, at some point, things, you know, pennies started to drop, as they are for Ben Fordham, I guess. And, at a certain point, they realized, wait a minute, I can't trust anything. And they felt like, however some people put it, like they were just, you know, Floating in outer space, or completely at sea, totally adrift.

No idea how to build their conception of reality. What was up, what was down, they had no idea. And they had to incrementally, step by step, rebuild their sense of what the world was about. That's an incredibly effortful process. And you need strength, you need courage, you need, you need fortitude, you need support from people in your family, and a lot of people just aren't able to do that.

So I think that, I think what we need is, and we've talked about this before Graham, is to reach out to people who are maybe questioning a little bit, but unsure and not able by themselves to make that big step into seeing what all this really might, might look like the reality of the situation, because it's just too painful and too difficult.

It just destroys too much that they've built their whole framework about what life is about. Upon. So we need to reach them with compassion and understanding for their position and try to help them to cope with this horrific reality. And then more than that, move to a position of being optimistic and hopeful about the future so they can figure out how to put their efforts towards something that will actually be productive rather than just continuing to become cynical, run off the rails, get depressed, um, you know, try to just withdraw, um, the kinds of reactions that I've unfortunately also seen amongst some of those people.

Oh, so many times, so many times. So who, who's going to be the arbiter of this bill once it's passed? Who's going to make the decisions on what is misinformation and disinformation? Is it E. Karen?

Well, Philip, how do you see this going?

Well, they're certainly not going to ask me.

The scary thing about this is, is that, um, all the evidence and I mean all the evidence that's been unfolding, uh, raises red flags and it's all leaning in the same direction everywhere. It's so massive. As I've often said to people, If, if these injections for COVID had only a tenth of 1 percent of the problems that most drugs have, it would have rang bells in Canberra, they would have begun their investigations, but there is stone silence, and that speaks very loudly.

Good. A, they tried to hide the data. They tried to do that in the very beginning in the U. S. They tried to hide data for 75 years. I mean, I've never heard of anything like this. How, why would they want to hide data for 75 years? And now, despite everything that we see, there are no questions to the manufacturers.

no investigations. It's, it's easy to do prospective clinical studies, for example, in young kids to monitor their cardiovascular health. Really easy. You, given the data that we've been seeing, you're looking at hundreds of, uh, individuals in each arm of the study, not tens of thousands. And you would see something within months with the biomarkers that they can use.

So, but they're not doing it. That should ring alarm bells for everyone. No matter what you believe. If you believe the government has been telling you the truth or not. Why aren't they responding? And that is really scary. And more to what Gigi has been saying, it undermines your basic

belief in government and truth. What have we been told over the years? It goes further than drugs. It goes to food. It goes to wars. It goes to a lot of things, and, uh, it's not healthy, um, to be living your life thinking that your government is not on your side. I mean, it's, it's been, it's been such a wake up call for so many people, including myself.

It's been just shocking.

Yeah. And just on that point, very briefly, Phil, I've, uh, this is the season when we get students inquiring about doing honors projects next year. So students come and they say, Hey, I'm interested in this area or that area. And I've had several students come to me who have talked previously with other potential supervisors, um, whether here or in other universities.

And, uh, they've said, well, I'm, I was really interested in doing the study on COVID, um, something about the effects of, you know, COVID policy, this, that, but people are saying, oh, there's been plenty of stuff on COVID, you know, it's kind of old news, do something else. And they come to me and they're like, oh, so I was thinking, you know, maybe I should do this other thing, which is obviously less important, less interesting.

We have not had enough research on COVID and people in the academy. In established positions in the academy are actively apparently telling students that they shouldn't do research on it because we've already had enough. So it's not just the bureaucracy or, you know, the politicians or whatever. It's it's people who themselves either sat back and let it happen or were actively promoting it in their own professional lives, including in the academy, who are acting in umpteen little ways to keep this kind of research from happening.

It's scary.

I think to, uh, Philip, in relation to the, to the injuries that you're referring to from the vaccines that, um, you know, in any other era would have been investigated and, and, and stopped. The problem is we've, their voice is so much louder with regard to. But if, if we hadn't have had the vaccine, there would have been millions dying.

And, and, and it's still going on today. I mean, even, even on Ben Fordham's, um, program there today, there was a remark at the end of it where he said, you know, it's not in doubt that these vaccines have saved lives. Uh, but they haven't have that. I mean, it's

no, I'm, I'm waiting for an interviewer, a real journalist to say, upon what data do you make that statement, that statement, everyone who cares to look at it knows where that statement came from.

And it came from modeling.

Exactly. And you

can, you can, you can model something to produce any outcome that you wish. And that's what they did.

And this is exactly the same problem with the projected COVID deaths at the beginning before we even had the vaccine, right? People were saying, here's my model, like Neil Ferguson, right?

Or the Doherty Institute here. Here's my model. Here's this great huge number of people who are going to die if we do nothing. Ergo, we must do something. And that's what prompted lockdowns. Same thing with the vaccines. And of course, the alternative to Doing the modeling and taking the modeling's result as the counterfactual truth is that you look at countries or regions which didn't have the vaccines or didn't have the lockdowns, right?

Whatever the measure is. And you say, well, what happened there? Right? And use that as a counterfactual. That's what I did in my lockdown cost benefit analysis for Australia, which I actually happened to have here, which I'll just show because I have it. Um, and you could do the same thing for the vaccines, right?

Instead of, you know, Using a simulation, you know, which into which you can bake all manner of unvalidable assumptions, right? Which are, I mean, every model is wrong. So, you know, you're getting a wrong result. It's just a question of whether it's useful, certainly is useful for those pushing the vaccines. Um, but instead of that, you could look at regions or states or countries that didn't have as high vaccination rates, but had the circulation of the COVID virus and say, right, how many did they lose?

I mean, maybe that should be my next book, but I've got too many other things going on. That would be a great honors thesis.

Yeah, it would be. Philip, I want to, I want to refer to you because I know your experience of over 40 years has been heavily involved in working with Australia's TGA and, excuse me, prior to you, um, uh, departing employment and going into this blissful retirement you're now, you're now living in.

Um, Retirement isn't what it's cracked up to be. It's not, I can tell you, I agree with you, but you spoke in glowing terms about the professionalism of that organization. You really did. Now, I want to put this to you. Corruption in organization can take many forms. It can be a financial corruption. In other words, some form of bribery.

It can be a corrupted idea or thought that permeates through the thought processes of that organization. It can be corrupted by stupidity. It can be corrupted by policy or government interference or interference from elsewhere. I want to ask you straight up. Is Australia's TGA corrupted?

Look, I, I've worked very closely with the TGA my whole career, my whole professional career.

I, I don't, I don't believe there are brown paper bags filled with money crossing over desks and things like that, right? I think it's, it takes the form more like, uh, do you care about your career advancement? Um, how far do you want to go? Um, we as a country, um, Have not until recently seeing the, uh, revolving door, uh, type situation that the U.

S. F. D. A. has, where lowly paid commissioners of the U. S. F. D. A. Um, suddenly depart after approving a drug and they end up on the board of a company, which produces that drug. Um, there's no law against that and it happens over and over again. And. And up until recently, we, we didn't see that, um, but it happened, actually, in, in one form, uh, just recently, where the head of the TGA, uh, departed to join the peak, uh, lobbying body of, uh, the pharmaceutical industry in Australia.

And I was really surprised at that, but surprised and not surprised. So it's beginning to happen here. So are they corrupt? I think they're more scared than corrupt. Um, I don't believe it's, it's money in Swiss bank accounts. But, uh, there is probably an understanding within the walls of the TGA that this is the narrative and, um, people need to support the narrative for one reason or the other.

Um, and the, the bottom line though, Johnny and Graham, is that There's no doubt now that we shouldn't be trusting the TGA. Uh, you, you just cannot trust what they're saying. I, I cut them slack in the beginning because it was a matter of national defense and the U. S. Department of Defense was involved and so forth.

And, and there were secrets and things going on behind the scenes that, that, that no one like me could even imagine. So. So I did cut them some slack, but, uh, we knew more than two years ago, maybe three years ago, what the truth was, and they have not changed their narrative. They have not chosen to investigate the harm.

That's being done and thousands and thousands of Australians have died needlessly and this is very serious and whether or not you think that they knew in the beginning where they didn't know in the beginning, I, I can't get into their heads. All I know is that everyone knows now, all the data is consistent.

We, we, we've been post data for more than two years now. It is so, so clear. Wherever you look, whatever metric you look at, it is so incredible. You cannot deny what's going on. And yet the TGA has taken no action. So that's why I say I have no faith in them. And I don't think that anyone else should have faith in our TGA.

Well, I, I have, uh, I have it on my heart every program that we do to bring up Infected Bloods Australia. And I'm doing that right now because the scandal that is Infected Bloods Australia, that for 30 or more years. Innocent people have been dying in their hundreds without any recognition at all is a, is a clear indictment on the health system and the bureaucracy of this country.

And, um, and we're seeing, we're seeing how inextricably linked all these things are. There's a medical tyranny that keeps protecting the authority. And that has to change. We see it with APRA and the way that they are crucifying doctors for speaking out in truth. And all these things must change. And when we can join all these, all these list of victims together and see one common thread, and that's medical tyranny through the whole thing, then we can bring this whole thing to light and to truth and get this thing cleared up.

Because people are dying from COVID vaccines. People are dying from malfeasance in hospitals because the hospitals are so poorly structured and they're dying from malfeasance from medical, medical tyranny where the top level health bureaucrats have been covering their backsides to protect the decisions that were made and hide the truth.

And that's been going on for decades and we have to stop that. We have to, we have to do everything we can to stop that. Um, so I bring that up. I want anybody who's at all empathetic to those people who are dying now, the hemophiliacs, hemophiliacs that are dying and people are getting all these values in their health because of what happened.

I urge any of you to go to the Infected Bloods Australia, um, Facebook page and join up to show your support. Let them know that we're with you on this. And, um, and I strongly urge everyone to do that. So a bit more on that as we keep going, every program, we're going to mention it because I think it's important.

I know that you guys have to go soon. Um, Gigi, we can't let you go profit without asking you about the, the months left in the year 2024. There's a lot going on around the world. Um, everything hinges on November 5, or so it would appear. But with everything that's happening in the world now, how do you see this playing out?

And where do you see our greatest challenges are going to be in the global sense?

Hmm. Well, um, let me, let me cover a few things first that are a little more local and then move up to the global. So first on Phillip's point and the point of broader corruption, I totally agree. And, uh, certainly agree with what you were just saying, Bear Graham.

And I would encourage your readers or your listeners to, uh, pick up the book RIGGED, R I G G E D, which is all about corruption in Australia, covering corruption, not just in healthcare, but many other industries. So if you're not sure how it works. That shows you how corruption works in Australia networks of favor exchange.

Basically the revolving door is one example, but there's plenty of other ones as well on the point of, uh, seeing the health corruption and wanting to push against it, obviously, yes, but do not underestimate the extent of the incentives amongst those who are currently in power to keep the system going for as long as possible.

They will only jump ship when they really think that they, they can't. Parasite off of the, the body of the host any longer. And it still has a lot of blood left to give. So I think what we should do, I hate to give that analogy, but that's how I see it. I think what we should do with our, with our efforts is actually build alternative structures, build alternative ways ourselves, because those in power are not going to give us the power The time of day.

I mean, we do. We did put a submission in against this bill. We're playing in the game. You know, do I think that ASF submission or anybody's submission to that bill is really going to move the dial on it. If you ask me, honestly, after a drink. No, um, you know, I think it's important to be seen to be doing it.

We have an historical record of how Australia went down. Yeah. In order to actually help it come up again, what we need to do is build something new. So in the area of new health systems, for example, at the, uh, second annual progress through science and freedom conference at which you're going to be attending, I think Graham, um, we are going to have workshops on how to start a new health system that circumnavigates opera.

And in particular, we need offshore servicing because to be out of opera's reach, you need to be out of Australia. So we need to work out a way to put together an insurance system for Australians that they can buy into and a network of doctors, maybe using some of the modern technology in a better way to help people than it's used at the moment and enable prescriptions and procedures to happen possibly on a boat in international waters.

That's the kind of thing I have in mind and that we are, we are going to brainstorm and sort of work on as the blueprint to try to develop an alternative. Because at the moment, just beating our heads against the wall and decrying opera is, is, I mean, we're going to have years and years and years still of that before those people will let go of control.

Um, and a Royal commission is not the answer either. It's going to be incremental. You see what happens after Royal commissions, nothing really changes much. Maybe there's an incremental type of, but I want to start something new that will actually help people. So in health, that's one. In education as well, I'm doing the same.

So there's a new education initiative called Nova Academia. Novacad. org. I'm running a boot camp for it in December, uh, up in a farm in Tenterfield, New South Wales, uh, and just inviting young people, age 18 to 30, to come along, learn about a different way of understanding your world. Different way of understanding economics and history, anthropology, sociology, psychology, all the bits that connect to it, the way that I do economics, and also health, real public health.

not the fake public health that we've been exposed to the last many years. Um, and also what really makes a healthy person, you know, all the different inputs at the societal level, at the, at the human level, at the micro level. So trying to kind of resuscitate, um, the way that higher education should be critical thought aiming towards pro social actions by the graduates after they get out, based on their understanding and empathy of the human condition.

So those kinds of things for me are where I want to spend most of my effort and where I think it's optimal for people in the resistance and restoration movement to focus their time more so than just fighting the current entrenched, incompetent slash power drunk, um, bureaucrats and, and politicians, right?

It's great to try to enter politics if you can, but a lot of people just get sucked dry in that sort of situation. So in my life, anyway, for the rest of my working life, I think I'm probably going to be just working on new ways, new ways of doing things that we can then present to Australia when Australia is ready.

And it's not yet ready, probably, and you know, as Philip said, only maybe 15 percent of us are really awake to what's happening, but Geez, you know, that's that's not too bad. It's better than the 1 percent back in March 2020. Right. So now in terms of the global crisis, of course, it's, it's horrific to see so much blood loss overseas and see the escalation of violence and, and you know, the West is in decay.

And at a time when your enemy is looking weak, that's when that's when you know you get attacked. So I think that's likely to happen more. I do. I'm expecting more violence, unfortunately, and I think even potentially in domestic situations, we may see more violence because we are in a period of decline right now in the West.

And it pains me to say this. I mean, as a child of the West and, you know, an Australian, I mean, I don't, I don't want that to be the case, but we have to do what we can to turn that around. And we have to remember what it used to be like when we were kids, right? We had a strong society. We have to bring that back for our own kids.

Sorry.

Yeah, I would agree with that. You know, we're, we're both doing this, not for ourselves, but for our kids, our grandkids. Yeah.

It's that serious.

It is to me, definitely. And I think, I think, unfortunately, history will prove it to have been a pivotal time for our country and for the West in general.

I've got to say your ideas about solutions moving forward, by the way, I live in the Tenterfield Shire, so I would love to come along and drop in.

We'd love to have you, Graeme. That would be an incredible treat for us. Absolutely.

Let me know the dates because it's just up the road for me, but, um, I want to, I want to say this, that in the last couple of weeks in particular, with the visit John and I made to New Zealand, we've identified groups in Canada,

the UK, The United States, Australia and New Zealand that are desperate to bring about a solution based, um, program going forward, where we bring integrative medicine and natural solutions to the fore, not only for the climate, for our immune system, but for our soil and our agriculture as well.

And I think there's some great inroads going to be making, uh, taking place there. We're going to be involving people like Dr. Tess Lorry, uh, Dr. Paul Maric and others, In this, and Professor Ian Brighthope from Australia, so I think there's some really good initiatives being set up at the moment, and there's some strong support behind it from people who want to back it financially, so we're going to continue to work on that, and we want to include you guys both in that initiative as well.

That sounds wonderful.

That's very heartening. Thank you, Graeme.

It is great to hear, and we need to let you both go. I'll let you go. I know, John, you've got to go back to court to fight to save the world again. And Prof, you're going to back to the lecture halls to try and bring some common sense into education.

And Phil, you're going to be pounding the keys on Substack as you do. And a quick prayer for me, if you don't mind before you go. Father in heaven, we thank you so much for bringing integrity to this screen this afternoon. The last hour Has been palpable in its delivery, uh, of, of grace and mercy and of compassion, Father God.

And we need to work on these things more than ever. Help us to bathe in the light of your truth is our prayer in Jesus name. Amen. Johnny, final comment. You just couldn't make this stuff up. You couldn't, uh, Professor Gigi Foster, always a pleasure. You're an absolute delight. You cry every time on this program and you always bring us to tears and, and, uh, and that's what it's all about.

This should demonstrate our motive, everybody. These are our methods. Our methods are based in the love of our country and the love of all of its people, whether they hate us or not. Thank you, Dr. Phil Altman for your tireless work. Uh, I know you're enjoying your retirement as I am. Johnny's got to face that one yet as Gigi does, but we thank you all for joining us.

Don't forget what you did yesterday. Got you to today. Let's do this one day at a time, folks. We've got beautiful countries that we're living in. Let's make the most of it. And we'll see you next time on Club Grubbery. Stay out of the trees and bye for now.