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Abstract

In the first two segments of our COVID-19 trilogy we examined the failure of the scientists and policy-makers to favorably alter dynamics of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Containment policies such as lockdowns and closure of businesses, which came with great social and economic costs, had no meaningful impact on morbidity or mortality. The mRNA vaccines were an unqualified disaster: they neither halted viral spread nor conferred herd immunity and, in their wake, spawned unacceptably high morbidity and mortality rates: to data there have been approximately 1,183,493 COVID-19 vaccine-related adverse event reports in the US-based Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) including 25,641 deaths. Globally, this translates to about 23.67 million adverse events and about 512,820 deaths. Medical science has unleashed yet another mass casualty event which will likely surpass any of the pharmacologically-induced tragedies of the 20th century.

In this third part we examine the path not taken: a handful of cheap, widely available, home-based therapies—ozone preconditioning, hydroxychloroquine, and light/vitamin treatment—which, had they been implemented early in the pandemic could have reduced morbidity and mortality by 80% or more. We estimate these interventions could have prevented about 4.8 million deaths globally and 768,000 in the US and in the process put an early end to the pandemic. Contrary to claims made by COVID-19 czar Anthony Fauci, there is an abundance of evidence in the medical literature in support of the very treatments he rejected out-of-hand. Moreover, the evidence was present well before the pandemic but was ignored by medical scientists. We conclude by discussing implications of the fraudulent mRNA vaccine scheme and the dark web of manipulation and disinformation promulgated by those who sponsored this dangerous and ill-conceived experiment. The pandemic sounds a clarion call mandating widescale reform of the healthcare system, medical-industrial complex, and their incestuous relationship with governmental and academic oversight bodies.

Introduction

In the first two segments of our COVID-19 trilogy we examined the abysmal failure of the science community and policy-makers to curtail the dynamics of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. Mitigation or containment strategies, which came with great social and economic costs, had no meaningful impact on morbidity or mortality. The mRNA vaccines were an unqualified disaster: they neither halted viral spread nor conferred herd immunity and, in their wake, spawned a laundry list of disabling side effects. In the process, medical science has unleashed yet another mass casualty event which, in all likelihood, will surpass any of the pharmacologically-induced tragedies of the 20th century.

One of the profoundly disturbing aspects of the pandemic was suppression of views that ran contrary to the science narrative. Social media outlets such as YouTube, Facebook and Twitter censored alternative content. News networks like CNN incessantly reported biased pro-vaccine accounts while ignoring the accumulating mass of counterfactual evidence that began to surface in the summer of 2021. As a consequence, they disseminated a fog of disinformation.
Not only did such tactics undermine basic scientific and democratic principles but, as we shall see, greatly amplified the carnage of the pandemic and cost many more lives.

In this third part of the series we examine the path not taken: a handful of cheap, widely available, home-based therapies which, had they been implemented in a timely manner, especially in the early months of the pandemic before vaccines were even available, could have drastically reduced morbidity and mortality—by up to 80% and probably more. Contrary to claims made by authoritative voices, there was and is an abundance of evidence in the medical literature in support of the very treatments that mainstream medicine rejected.

We conclude by discussing implications of the fraudulent mRNA vaccine scheme and the dark web of manipulation and disinformation promulgated by those who sponsored this dangerous and poorly conceived experiment. The hidden subtext revolves around betrayal of public trust. The pandemic sounds a clarion call mandating widespread reform of the healthcare system, medical-industrial complex, and their incestuous relationship with governmental and academic oversight bodies.

**Before the Storm**

We have defined the tendency to become infected with SARS-CoV-2 and to express symptoms as a state of susceptibility or, conversely, lack of resistance. Such susceptibility takes origin in the deficient functions of the immune system as a result of its inability to contain and incapacitate the virus. For most of the 20th century immune protective functions were regarded to be secondary to the synthesis and release of neutralizing antibodies. As we have seen, however, the antibody response is far downstream from the primary locus of function which resides in the phagocytic activity of cells like macrophages and neutrophils. For this reason, early immunologists like Metchnikoff and Bordet conceived immune function as part of an organized internal digestive system.

The ability of the phagocytic system to contain SARS-CoV-2 in the interstitial fluid space is the crucial determinant that distinguishes asymptomatic viral invasion from full-blown infection. Once phagocytic barrier functions have been breached systemic activation of the immune response by the cytokine system ensues along with symptoms like fever, fatigue, weakness, cough, shortness of breath, body aches and more. One observes varying states of susceptibility related to such cellular functions across the age spectrum in the population.

According to a 2021 Centers for Disease Control (CDC) report there is marked age-related risk stratification for death secondary to COVID-19 infection. Data indicate that the mortality rate in the 0–17 year range is only about 0.002% or 20 per million. When infected, children usually have mild symptoms and are more likely to be asymptomatic. This same population typically has lower antibody responses [1–7]. Mortality risk jumps by nearly 25-fold in the 18–49 year range to about 0.05% or 500/million; by 300-fold in the 50–64 year group to 0.6% or 6,000/million; and, astonishingly, by 4500-fold in the 65+ year range to about 9% or 90,000/million [8]. Clearly, risk is not spread evenly across the population.

By the same token across all age groups we observe a markedly heightened risk for severe COVID-19 disease and death in those with pre-existing chronic conditions like diabetes, hypertension, obesity, heart disease, renal disease, cirrhosis, COPD, cancer, and frailty [9–21]. Individuals with such conditions are more likely to require hospitalization, have longer hospital stays, be admitted to the ICU, require mechanical ventilation, and experience various organ failure syndromes. Having a single co-morbidity like diabetes or hypertension raises the risk for adverse COVID-19 outcomes by up to 2–3-fold depending on the study. And as we have seen, those with severe disease tend to express higher antibody levels [22–28].

In part I of the series we provided evidence linking such adverse outcomes to impaired intracellular digestion, i.e., autophagy, which, in reality, represents the basis for what scientists call immunity. Intracellular digestion, a lysosomal function, is a highly conserved activity shared by all cells which has evolved into a specialized function in phagocytic immune cells. Autophagy consists of a series of acid-dependent, energy-driven molecular pathways that evolved for the purpose of degradation and recycling of aged and dysfunctional cellular structures. Impairment of autophagy precedes a plethora of pathologic states like inflammation, aging, metabolic disorders, neurodegenerative, cardiovascular and renal diseases as well as cancers [29–34]. Autophagic function is highly dependent on the continued
availability of aerobic energy substrates like NADPH and ATP and when mitochondrial dysfunction occurs, as during periods of oxidative stress or inflammation, degradative and recycling functions are impaired. Oxidative stress diminishes mitochondrial function leading to buildup of reactive oxygen species and acids, NLRP3 inflammasome formation, and initiation of the so-called cytokine storm [35–45]. All such intracellular stress-related disturbances are present in full-blown COVID-19 infection [46–63].

In part I and in multiple earlier papers, we demonstrated the presence of a blood-borne energy field generated by the systolic and diastolic motions of the heart. Energy substance flows through the blood and interstitial fluid compartment and, ultimately, is transported by ion channel mechanisms across cell membranes into the cytoplasm. Interruption of energy flow triggers mitochondrial dysfunction, oxidative stress, and the inflammatory response. The critical phase of the cardiac cycle is diastole during which magnetic energy is drawn into the blood and produces the outward motion of the ventricles and arterial walls. It is not at all coincidental that diastolic dysfunction is associated with virtually all the same chronic disorders as seen with disturbances in cellular autophagy [64–99].

Clinical phenomena associated with COVID-19 infection are mediated by widespread inflammation originating in the vascular endothelium resulting in impaired diastolic function and energy generation which, in turn, diminishes intracellular digestion by phagocytes. The energy deficit also results in formation of autoantibodies that cross-react with the body's own components to promote cell death with spillage of contents like nucleic acids into the interstitial fluid space. As a consequence, neutrophil extracellular traps, large agglomerates of cellular debris, accumulate which further amplify the spiral of deterioration. Autoimmune mechanisms induce platelets to release clot-promoting substances that induce widespread intravascular thrombosis further compromising organ function. All these events are downstream from a primary energy deficit.

In an earlier series of papers, we established the existence of a complex body-wide energy field driven by aether, the all-encompassing energetic precursor substance first described by Aristotle nearly 2400 years ago [100–103]. The aether concept was rejected by physicists at the turn of the 20th century but in recent decades has been recognized to be indispensable in explaining a multitude of energy-related phenomena. We described three intertwined and interconvertible primary energy forms in living bodies: the magnetic, taking origin in the vascular system; the radiant, deriving from external sunlight, generated in the interstitial fluid space beneath the skin; and the dielectric, in play at the cellular and molecular level and mediated primarily by electro-ionic mechanisms.

Given the primacy of energy metabolism in the economy of living bodies and the inescapable relation between energy deficiency and the pathologic alterations of COVID-19, i.e., diastolic dysfunction, mitochondrial dysfunction, inflammation, impaired autophagy, immune dysfunction, and hypercoagulability, it is obvious that in all cases the primary therapeutic strategy must be replenishment of the energy debt.

By the same token, the earliest manifestation of the syndrome, constitutional symptoms like fatigue, weakness or fever, are premonitory signs of energy depletion. At this juncture the gap between susceptibility and resistance must be bridged: all subsequent developments of COVID-19 infection are only expressions of a progressive and mounting energy debt.

By the time hospital-based treatments are initiated, often 10–12 days after symptom onset, individuals are in more advanced energy depletion. Customary treatments like anti-coagulants, steroids, immune-suppressives or anti–virals block downstream effects but fail to address the primary energy shortage. Based on such considerations, it is axiomatic that all therapeutic efforts should be initiated as early as possible while individuals still have adequate energy reserves to mount a restorative response. Repletion of energy flow corrects the cellular disturbances, augments autophagy and phagocytosis and, as a consequence, enhances resistance.

**Ozone Preconditioning**

Of the therapeutic approaches intended to augment energy flow and boost resistance ozone has perhaps the most impressive résumé. It ties into a fascinating episode in 20th century molecular biology that highlights yet another failure of the science community to integrate and synthesize its own experimental evidence into a coherent body of knowledge.

In the mid–1980s Charles Murry and colleagues,
seeking to unravel pathologic mechanisms of heart attack, conducted an experiment to determine whether intermittently reopening the coronary arteries to allow for brief return of blood flow altered the course of cellular injury [104]. In a control group of dogs, a coronary artery was clamped for 40 minutes to assess the extent of infarct damage. Another group underwent a series of four 5-minute arterial occlusions interrupted by 5-minute intervals of reperfusion. Afterward the artery was clamped for 40 minutes. To their astonishment, animals that received preconditioning (PC) pulses had only about 25% of damage as the control group.

Preconditioning is now regarded as the most powerful innate form of protection ever discovered. It has game-changing potential and points to novel ways of addressing diseases science has been attempting to solve for decades with little or no success. In over 35 years since its discovery tens of thousands of reports have appeared in the research literature detailing its various aspects and yet, to date, scientists are unable to explain its basis.

The protection afforded by the PC phenomenon has been widely substantiated. When the PC sequence is applied prior to a prolonged ischemic episode a 2–3h period of protection ensues during which ischemia–mediated damage is markedly diminished. Biochemical analysis indicates that PC enhances mitochondrial function and reduces acid formation. Surprisingly, cardiovascular functions like endothelial–dependent vasodilation are preserved and the myocardium becomes resistant to potentially lethal cardiac arrhythmias [105–114].

Some scientists argued that ATP-sensitive potassium channels mediate the effect but studies were inconclusive. Others argued that nitric oxide is a key player while still others pointed at oxygen–derived free radicals. Various substances such as neurotransmitters, erythropoietin, and heat shock proteins have all been proposed but to date no convincing molecular explanation for the PC phenomenon has come to light [115–125].

A 1993 study found that PC pulses applied in one vascular territory of the heart protected the rest of the heart from prolonged arterial occlusion [126]. Researchers hypothesized that protection was induced by factor(s) 'activated, produced, or transported throughout the heart' by brief periods of ischemia. Several years later another study found reduction in myocardial infarct size in rabbits after administration of PC pulses to skeletal muscle [127]. Now called remote preconditioning, it implicates a body-wide causal nexus that, to date, has resisted all explanatory attempts based on molecular and cellular mechanisms.

Reports soon followed describing protection after PC pulses in multiple organs besides the heart, including the brain, liver, intestines, kidneys, stomach and lungs [128–141]. Preconditioning pulses applied to any vascular bed confer body-wide resistance to prolonged ischemia. The PC response, quite clearly, originates in the cardiovascular system and blood and diffuses throughout the body. Reports suggest beneficial effects are transferable from one animal to another by transfusion of blood or bodily fluids [142–144].

In 1996 a study reporting a complex temporal signature to the PC phenomenon confounded matters even more [145]. The initial period of heightened resistance to ischemic injury disappears after about 2–3h but then protective effects recur in echo-like fashion about 24h later and persist for up to 48–72h. Called the second window of protection, effects are associated with the appearance of various mediator substances in the blood and thus is believed to reflect enhanced gene transcription [146, 147]. Such gene activation is driven by an influx of energy into the cell.

Over the years it became recognized that the PC response could be induced by physiologic means such as hyperthermia, exercise, cardiac pacing or, conversely, by pharmacologic substances like ethanol, volatile anesthetics, and various toxins [148–166]. This is where ozone, possibly the most powerful PC agent yet discovered, comes into play. Through the studied effects of ozone, the enigma of the PC phenomenon has finally been resolved. We described the ozone–mediated PC response in greater detail in an earlier piece [167].

Ozone, tri–atomic oxygen (O₃), a toxic environmental gas, was recognized nearly 200 years ago in areas surrounding lightning strikes and referred to as ‘the smell of lightning.’ When in excess in atmospheric air ozone produces difficulty in breathing, cough, nasal congestion, tear formation, chest discomfort and, in susceptible individuals, predisposes to asthma attacks, chest pain and occasional heart attack. A powerful oxidant, ozone diverts energy intended for cellular use resulting in impaired
mitochondrial function, diminished ATP synthesis, production of reactive oxygen species and a host of toxic intermediary compounds.

In the 1970s sporadic reports attributed paradoxical beneficial effects to ozone in various diseases. In the late 1980s studies described beneficial results in HIV patients [168–171]. Later reports described enhanced immune function [172–181]. The list of disorders that responded favorably to ozone treatment grew dramatically: autoimmune conditions, heart disease, peripheral vascular disease, fibromyalgia, neurodegenerative diseases, renal and gastrointestinal disorders, various cancers, healing of wounds chronic pain and more [182–236]. Reports describe beneficial effects in COVID-19 infection [237–254].

PC comprises two opposing aspects: the immediate consequences of the toxic insult followed by the protective response initiated to counteract its noxious influence. Once in contact with body fluids, ozone, 10–15X more soluble in water than diatomic oxygen (O2), immediately solubilizes. Dissolved ozone is anüberenergy sink that draws electron-equivalents from biomolecules leaving them in a depleted (oxidized) state. This results in conversion of lipids in plasma and cell membranes into various oxidation products which, in turn, lead to formation of reactive oxygen species and intracellular injury [255–263]. Such brief insults are then counterpoised by a striking release of energy into the blood that results in the initial 2–3h window of PC protection.

Blood cells, in particular erythrocytes (RBCs), are among the first to experience ozone’s oxidative effects and mount a response. Highly metabolically active, RBCs form a large part of the blood with an estimated mass of up to 5 pounds (2.3kg) in an average adult. Upon contact with ozonated fluid, RBCs undergo a decrease in energy production, in the 5–25% range over about 15–20 minutes, and then respond with a dramatic rebound surge in energy release along with an outpouring of antioxidant compounds. Ozone induces up-regulation of enzymes in RBCs resulting in enhanced production of NADPH and ATP with energy infusion into the blood and neutralization of the detrimental oxidizing effects of ozone [264–268].

Heightened energy output by the RBC mass translates directly into increased blood flow and energy delivery to peripheral tissues. RBCs release large amounts of nitric oxide (NO) in response to oxidative stress that not only increases RBC hardiness and deformability but interacts with the vascular endothelium to maintain active arterial dilation which, as we know, is a reliable proxy for blood energy content [269–280].

It is apparent that the first phase of the PC response, aimed at augmenting blood energy levels, is responsible for orchestrating subsequent cellular events. Energy currents, carried in the interstitial fluid space, enter cells via ion channels, enhance mitochondrial function and intracellular energy metabolism and thereby induce a plethora of genes that actively counteract oxidative stress. The second window of protection is clearly driven by gene induction: critical response pathways include nuclear factor erythroid 2–related factor 2 (Nrf2) and the heme oxygenase–1 enzyme (HO–1) system [281].

The powerful antioxidant and anti-inflammatory effects unleashed throughout the body by low dose ozone administration are mediated through activation of the transcription factor Nrf2. Nrf2, master regulator of redox balance, binds to over 200 different genes, known as the antioxidant response element (ARE), and effects transcription of cytoprotective substances like heat shock proteins, antioxidant and detoxification molecules, enzymes involved in synthesis of glutathione, a host of growth factors like vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), erythropoietin (EPO) and more. The Nrf2–driven battery of gene products also effects breakdown and/or refolding of misfolded proteins, DNA repair, mitochondrial rebuilding, autophagy regulation, as well as intracellular metabolism. Impaired Nrf2 function is a hallmark of many chronic disease conditions [282–288].

Ozone is cheap and easily generated by passing oxygen across a voltage gradient simulating a lightning strike. Various routes of administration are employed: autohemotherapy, which involves removing a small aliquot of venous blood, exposing it to ozone, and reinjecting it into the vein; rectal or vaginal insufflation of ozone gas; direct intravenous (IV) injection of ozone gas; IV infusion of ozonated saline solution; topical administration of ozonated oil preparations.

All of the various approaches are safe and side effects virtually non–existent. Water–based approaches are hampered by instability and volatility and must be administered straight away. We developed an infusion method for a drinkable preparation in which stability is preserved for at least 4 weeks. We have used the oral
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route exclusively since June, 2021 and have observed no significant differences compared with the intravenous infusion route.

We have treated several hundred COVID–19 patients with ozone in the outpatient setting. Many individuals had multiple comorbidities and presented with moderate-to-advanced disease including respiratory difficulty and low oxygen saturations; some had radiologic evidence of COVID–19 pneumonia. Ozone combined with other adjuvant therapies relieved symptoms, shortened the course of disease, and appeared to decrease morbidity especially in those who sought treatment early in the course of the infection.

Enhancing Dielectric Capacitance

The second strategy for augmenting the body’s energy economy involves boosting cellular metabolism and mitigating inflammation. The archetypal substances for this are the aminooquinolines, i.e., chloroquine (CQ) and hydroxychloroquine (HCQ), derivatives of quinine, which have been used for centuries to interrupt the inflammatory cycle [289–291].

Anthony Fauci claimed there was no evidence to support HCQ in COVID–19 infection but he was flat out wrong. Fauci overlooked a nearly 400-year history of quinine-related compounds and their striking capacity to modulate all kinds of inflammation. Well before the COVID–19 pandemic multiple studies showed efficacy of CQ against the original SARS coronavirus infections and later against Middle East Respiratory Syndrome virus which is also a coronavirus [292–294]. Based on the mediocre clinical track record of remdesivir our COVID–19 czar would have been well-served sticking with this time-honored strategy.

The aminooquinoline issue has split the science community and, ultimately, begs the question, ‘what is science?’ [295]. Multiple meta–analyses from across the globe failed to find beneficial effects from these substances in COVID–19–infected individuals [296–301]. End of story? No. The majority of studies were in hospitalized subjects with or without multiple co–morbidities, who may or may not have been on mechanical ventilation, who may or may not have received other treatments and in whom dosages varied across the spectrum. But medicine is a science of individuals and not an amorphous mass of statistical data. Trends and outcomes do not always align.

We failed to identify a single pooled–data study that methodically examined the interactions between timely HCQ administration, dosing considerations and pre-existing co–morbidities on clinical outcomes. COVID–19 infection is an energy deficient state the severity of which is directly proportional to the energy debt. It goes without saying that outcomes of all individuals in more advanced states of disease will be worse regardless of the therapy employed. Studies point to lack of beneficial outcomes with all conventional therapies including antiviral agents [302].

More troubling is the bias of the academic science community [303]. According to one meta–analysis, there was stark variation in CQ/HCQ outcome studies between the US and the rest of the world. Of 68 studies originating in the US, 39 (57.4%) were unfavorable while only 7 (10.3%) reported favorable results. Of 199 studies originating elsewhere, 66 (33.2%) were unfavorable, 69 (34.7%) favorable and 64 (32.2%) indeterminate. Studies with at least one US main author were 20.4% (P < 0.05) more likely to report unfavorable results than non–US studies. Study authors concluded that such bias contributed to dissemination of unfavorable results, i.e., misinformation, regarding CQ/HCQ. Science, it seems, is not immune to the dramatic cultural polarization which has taken place during the pandemic.

Then there is the notorious meta–analysis of 96,000 hospitalized COVID–19 patients from 671 hospitals across the globe by Harvard cardiologist Mandeep Mehra published in Lancet in May, 2020 which found no benefits from CQ/HQ therapy and was supposedly associated with increased risk of cardiac arrhythmias and death. The article was cited by Fauci to support his claim that these substances were ineffective. Mehra’s study was later found to be fraudulent and subsequently retracted by Lancet [304].

Multiple studies conducted during the pandemic both in COVID–19 hospitalized subjects or outpatients found benefits with HCQ either alone or in combination with other agents such as zinc and azithromycin [305–313]. Hospital–based studies found shorter length of stay, decreased likelihood of ICU transfer and death, as well as shortened period of viral shedding. One large Italian study found a 30% lower death rate in hospitalized patients...
given HCQ [314]. In a study of 2541 hospitalized patients, HCQ alone had a 13.5% death rate, HCQ + azithromycin 20%, azithromycin alone 22% versus 26.4% with standard treatments [315]. Another hospital-based study of 8075 subjects found death rates of 17.7% in HCQ-treated subjects versus 27.1% in the no–HCQ limb [316]. These results are impressive results by any measure.

In a 2020 American outpatient study, 144 COVID-19-infected subjects treated with HCQ + zinc + azithromycin were compared with 377 untreated controls. Of the treated subjects only 4 (2.8%) required hospitalization versus 58 (15.4%) of the untreated group. There was one death in the treated group (0.7%) versus 13 (3.4%) of untreated subjects [317]. In an intriguing 2020 Brazilian epidemiologic study data was tracked weekly for six months on COVID-19 caseloads, hospitalizations, deaths, social isolation practices and sales of CQ/HQC in the state of Santa Catarina. Sales of CQ/HQC were significant predictors of all outcomes while social isolation indices had no bearing. Some have suggested that lower caseloads and mortality rates in Africa are related to widespread HCQ use for malarial prophylaxis. These correlations suggest that CQ/HQC affect transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 which is more than can be said for the mRNA vaccines [318].

In the early 17th century Jesuit missionaries, while traveling in the Andean forest region, observed that natives used a substance to control shivering during cold temperatures. The bark of the ‘fever tree,’ when dried and made into a powder, was also highly effective in ameliorating fevers. In following centuries ‘cinchona’ became widely used throughout Europe as the first effective anti-malarial agent, reducing fevers, as a tonic for gastrointestinal ailments, soothing muscle cramps, and calming nerves.

In the 1890s English physician Joseph Payne reported the benefits of quinine in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE). During World War II incidental beneficial effects with skin rashes and joint pain were observed in soldiers placed on anti-malarial prophylaxis. Later studies confirmed the efficacy of these compounds in SLE and rheumatoid arthritis. General effects include anti-inflammatory, anti-infective, immunomodulatory, anti-thrombotic as well as metabolic. But how such widespread effects are mediated remains unclear.

CO/HQC are beneficial in autoimmune conditions like Sjögren’s syndrome, the iron-related disorder porphyria cutanea tarda, and the curious entity known as polymorphic light eruptions. In addition, they are effective in a variety of bacterial, viral and parasitic infections, and have shown efficacy as adjuvants in various cancers. The broad range of applications suggests effects are mediated not solely by turning on or off specific molecular pathways but rather as a non-specific amplifier of cellular metabolism and cellular digestive functions. Downstream effects are seen in the blood, arterial wall, interstitial fluid space, and the intracellular compartment [319-321].

In 1984 blood glucose-lowering effects of CQ/HQC were discovered in type II diabetics. These agents improve insulin resistance implicating a shift in glucose metabolism at the cellular level [322-324]. They improve lipid profiles by decreasing serum triglyceride and cholesterol levels which are also likely related to metabolic alterations at the cellular level [325-327]. Treatment with HCQ is protective against thrombosis in SLE patients with anti-phospholipid autoantibodies [328-332]. But how to understand such a broad range of effects?

The term 'dielectric' was coined in the mid-19th century by physicists to designate a set of properties observed in relation to externally applied electrical currents. While substances like copper or silver conduct electricity, and insulators like glass, oils or rubber repel it, dielectric substances, instead, undergo internal polarization, i.e., separation of positive and negative charges, which amounts to creation of an internal field, i.e., the dielectric field. Cells are tiny dielectric capacitors.

When a strong electrical potential is applied to ferrous objects like iron their nuclei resonate, realign internally, and expel intra-atomic magnetism giving rise to an external magnetic field. The same dynamics are at play in the cardiovascular system when a magnetic field is generated in the blood to produce the outward diastolic motion of the heart and arterial walls.

With dielectricity, on the other hand, force lines are directed inwardly and radially as seen during contraction of the ventricles. The dielectric, the primary energy field, lies at the aether boundary, i.e., the inertial plane, and, when activated, produces torque thereby inducing energy flow. In reality, magnetism arises from the dielectric and the two always coexist in a single conjoined and inseparable field.

Dielectric materials possess high polarizability, expressed numerically as the dielectric constant, an indicator of
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energy storing ability or capacitance. But capacitance doesn’t simply indicate passive energy storage. In capacitance the dielectric field draws conductors into tighter spatial apposition thus increasing the counter spatial torque and activating aether flux. In living bodies the dielectric force originates in water, which has one of the highest dielectric constants, i.e., polarizability, of all substances indicating its ability to generate energy through the conjoined magneto–dielectric field and aether.

The intracellular dielectric field can be conceived as possessing two opposing poles, the cathode, the source of magnetic–dominant aerobic energy which maintains the surrounding fluid space in the alkaline pH range, and the anode through which energy is drawn out and around which the cell water is energy depleted and acidic. Inflammation, the result of mitochondrial dysfunction and deficient energy flux, employs less efficient acid–producing pathways and, as such, represents a shift toward the anodic pole and loss of intracellular capacitance. This is where the aminoquinolines come into play.

CQ/HCQ actively accumulate in cells and many researchers believe their effects are mediated intracellularly. In both immune and non–immune cells, the primary effect of CQ/HCQ is to shift cytoplasmic pH into the alkaline range, in other words, from the anode towards the cathodic pole of the dielectric field. Alkalinization causes mitochondrial metabolism to shift from catabolic to anabolic processes thereby inducing protein synthesis, repair of membranes, and stabilization of DNA [333]. Such effects impair entry of viral pathogens into the cell as well as inhibiting their replication. It goes without saying that these effects are energy-dependent.

Researchers claim CQ/HCQ induce alkalinization by their accumulation in cells but this doesn’t make sense. These compounds are weak bases but the magnitude of the effect is much greater than can be explained by their physical presence alone. They more likely act on the basis of field effects by enhancing dielectric capacitance in cells thereby inducing aether flux and flow of negatively-charged ion currents.

CQ/HCQ decrease pro-inflammatory cytokine release by macrophages while at the same time promoting phagocytosis; they block pro-inflammatory T-cell proliferation and shift immune cell balance toward anti-inflammatory subsets. This is directly related to alterations in WBC metabolism toward a more efficient energy-generating mode [334-343].

During the pandemic we employed HCQ in two ways. Due to its accumulation in cells HCQ has an extremely long half-life, by most estimations in the 3-4 week range. In older individuals and in those with comorbidities we used 200–400 mg per week for prophylaxis, about the same as for malaria prevention. During active infection we increased the amount to 200–400 mg/day over 5–7 days. In both cases, evidence suggests that HCQ boosts intracellular energy flow thereby enhancing resistance and producing less severe infections while still allowing for development of natural immunity. We had no side effects with such low doses. At a cost of about $0.25 per tablet it is mind-boggling why this simple and effective strategy was not employed in all high-risk individuals during the pandemic.

**Catching the Light**

Having recognized all inflammatory disorders including COVID-19 as primary energy deficiency states, we examine a third strategy to boost energy flow and enhance resistance: modulation of radiant light energy and vitamin D. Radiant light, the third primary energy form, functions as an intermediary between the blood–borne magnetic field generated by the heart and the cell-based dielectric field. Radiant light interacts with water in the subdermal fluid space to generate current flows that, through the vitamin D–related system of enzymes and membrane receptors, amplify cell function. A flood of evidence has surfaced during the pandemic affirming the import of this alternate energy pathway.

Multiple studies link vitamin D deficiency (VDD) with severity of COVID-19 infection, hospitalization, length of stay, ICU admission, pulmonary complications, need for mechanical ventilation, and death [344–358]. In one study 82% of COVID-19 cases had VDD compared with 47% of control subjects. Severely symptomatic COVID-19 patients have lower vitamin D levels than mildly-symptomatic or non-infected subjects. In another study, death rate in VDD patients was 46.5%, 29.5% in vitamin D insufficient subjects, and only 5.5% in those with normal vitamin D levels. Yet another study found that patients with vitamin D levels less than 30 ng/ml had a 25% mortality while those greater than 30 ng/ml were only 9%. There is solid science behind such clinical trends.
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Vitamin D is a surrogate for available light energy. Both autoimmune and infectious disorders tend to cluster in seasonal and geographic patterns related to the quantity and quality of ambient sunlight reaching the earth’s surface. At the 45th parallels, for example, available light energy gradually decreases from about 12 hours per day near the autumnal and vernal equinoxes to about 9 hours at the winter solstice. During this period the quality of light is markedly attenuated due to the incident angle of solar rays.

The energy deficiency syndromes tend to express themselves more commonly at high latitudes or in winter and spring months after sustained periods of light deprivation. Chronological patterns have been reported in various autoimmune disorders, MS being the most well documented, as well as infectious diseases like tuberculosis [359-363]. Since the early 20th century there have been five pandemics including the recent COVID-19 outbreak which have all shown similar temporal predispositions [364]. Neoplastic conditions like breast cancer also show seasonal behaviors that appear to influence survival patterns [365-367].

Studies affirm that blood vitamin D levels correlate with ambient light exposure and serve as a reliable proxy by which to gauge its effects. Many reports chronicle the relationship between VDD and the various autoimmune diseases [368-401]. At the north 45th parallel there is a null period between November and February during which sunlight is insufficient to trigger vitamin D synthesis. Such fluctuations roughly correlate with seasonal variations in disease incidence and activity [402-407].

A host of factors including ethnicity and cultural factors like mode of dress play into the picture. Dark-skinned peoples require up 6-fold greater sunlight exposure to get the same blood levels of vitamin D as light-skinned people. In the northern US dark-skinned people are predisposed year-round to VDD but especially in winter [408-412]. This must certainly play a permissive role in the worse outcomes seen in such individuals during the COVID-19 pandemic. Anything that affects transmission of radiant energy affects vitamin D synthesis, the so-called sunshine hormone.

Through photosynthesis-like mechanisms, light rays induce formation of cholecalciferol which is subsequently transformed to 25(OH)D₃ and, finally, to the highly-active 1,25(OH)₂D₃ form. Vitamin D receptors at the cell membrane mediate the effects of highly-active vitamin D. Such receptors are present throughout the body including immune cells. Activated vitamin D influences at least 500 different gene activities through receptor-mediated epigenetic mechanisms [413].

Given such biological potency one would expect vitamin D to be a panacea for COVID-19-related inflammation but clinical studies are inconsistent. A small number of studies showed no relation between vitamin D levels and outcomes in COVID-19 infection [414-418]. Others found no benefit with administration of vitamin D in hospitalized COVID-19 patients [419]. Why are effects so mixed? It would appear that the rate-limiting step lies not only in the synthesis of the vitamin D precursor but in its energy-dependent conversion into the biologically potent form. Studies in individuals with autoimmune disease suggest that light plays the active role in conferral of benefits.

Studies indicate that water is sensitive to the effects of light. Researcher Gerald Pollack discovered that radiant light energy induces water to undergo spontaneous structural reorganization into two different forms, one, which he calls exclusion zone (EZ) water based upon its tendency to exclude particles, and the other, called bulk water, which forms adjacent to EZ water [423]. Such effects occur on the basis of energy transfer between light and water which, in turn, provides energy equivalents for proteins and various enzyme systems to carry out their designated functions.
resultant current flow between them. Water is unique among substances in possessing both high dielectric capacitance as well as an ability to conduct alternating electrical currents.

By the same token it is recognized that all physiological functions in the body are affected by conformational changes in proteins (which represent states of polarization and depolarization). All proteins are surrounded by a mantle of water, called the hydration layer, which corresponds to Pollack's EZ water and tends to form around hydrophilic surfaces. Technologies such as NMR spectroscopy and x-ray crystallography affirm the primary role played by tissue water in protein-related dynamics \([424-428]\). The hydration shell appears to be instrumental in determining not only 3D protein structure but the folding process itself. Changes in water state have been recognized to be at play in a host of protein misfolding disorders \([429-433]\). It seems likely that light-induced charge separation in the interstitial water compartment provides energy to transform vitamin D into its active form.

Light-induced effects are mediated by the ubiquitous superfamily of enzymes known as the cytochrome p450 system which, evidence shows, is also activated by externally applied light pulses \([434-437]\). Skin keratinocytes, which are capable of effecting the whole vitamin D synthesis sequence, contain \(\alpha-1\)-hydroxylase, the enzyme that transforms vitamin D into its highly potent form \([438-441]\). It appears this enzyme system plays a key role in protecting the lungs from COVID-19-related complications as well.

The primary mode of entry of SARS-CoV-2 into the body is through the lungs. Multiple studies confirm VDD is associated with a higher incidence of upper airway infections secondary to rhinoviruses, respiratory syncytial virus as well as coronavirus. Epithelial cells throughout the lung and upper airway express high levels of \(\alpha-1\)-hydroxylase and continuously generate highly-active \(1,25(OH)_2D\) which, through vitamin D receptors, turns on genes that release antimicrobial substances like defensins and cathelicidins as well as enhancing phagocytic activity \([442-445]\).

Studies found VDD was associated with elevated cytokine storm markers like TNF-\(\alpha\), IL-1, IL-6, IL-10, and IL-21 \([446-450]\). In one study the prevalence of VDD in severely ill COVID-19 patients was 97.8% compared with 32.9% in asymptomatic COVID-19–positive subjects. Mortality rate was higher (21%) in VDD subjects versus those with normal vitamin D levels (3.1%). Not surprisingly inflammatory markers such as IL-6 and TNF-\(\alpha\) were elevated. Macrophages play a key role in the evolution of COVID-19 associated respiratory distress syndrome and possess vitamin D receptors \([451-454]\). Multiple articles thus recommend widescale vitamin D supplementation to modulate the inflammatory response in COVID-19 infections \([455-458]\).

We employed high-dose vitamin D, light treatments and HCQ prophylactically and in early COVID-19 infections in dozens of individuals without encountering a single serious COVID-19 infection or hospitalization. Academic pundits would argue our numbers were far too small to draw substantive conclusions but treatment on the basis of established principles trumps random (and flawed) experimentation as in the case of the mRNA vaccines.

**License to Kill**

In previous sections we established the efficacy of three cheap and widely available therapeutic approaches—ozone PC, HCQ, and light/vitamin D—which, had they been implemented in either a preventive role or early in the course of COVID-19 infection, could have markedly improved outcomes and decreased morbidity and mortality. Evidence in support of their effectiveness had been in the medical literature years before the pandemic but was roundly ignored by the science community and policy makers at the public’s expense.

We saw that when PC pulses are applied prior to a sub-lethal period of ischemia release of energy into the blood by RBCs results in about 75% reduction in tissue damage. While this degree of protection would not be expected in the elderly or in those with comorbidities it nonetheless remains quite substantial. There were significant reductions in disease severity and death rate in subjects treated with HCQ alone or in combination with other agents. Mortality rates in hospitalized patients with VDD were at least 2-3X higher than in subjects with normal vitamin D levels. Based on such considerations we conclude that the three modalities in combination, either before or shortly after symptom onset, could have reduced pandemic-related morbidity and mortality by at least 80%.
At the time of this writing, March 17, 2022, there had been 462,758,117 total COVID-19 cases globally, 6,056,725 deaths, with an overall mortality rate of 1.3% [459]. In the US there were 78,891,488 reported cases cumulatively with 960,194 deaths equating to a 1.2% mortality rate. It is generally accepted that 80–85% of confirmed cases are mild, 10–15% moderate, and about 5% severe. Clinical criteria are established for each of these categories [460–465]. For convenience we will use 85%, 10%, and 5% to approximate this distribution. It goes without saying that most deaths are associated with severe cases.

Based on such figures the global burden of severe cases during the pandemic so far approximates 23 million with about 7.9 million in the US. Had ozone PC, HCQ, and light/vitamin D treatment been implemented either preventively or at the time of symptom onset we estimate that about 4.8 million deaths globally and 768,000 in the US could have been prevented. By the same token, had these modalities been utilized broadly on a population scale instead of the failed vaccines there would have been a generalized downgrading of severity across the spectrum resulting in fewer morbid complications and hospitalizations. Given the superiority of natural immunity compared with the vaccines, this would have been a safer and quicker path to herd immunity than that afforded by vaccines.

To date during the pandemic around 879,000 individuals in the US have required hospitalization with average length of stay about 5–6 days; complicated cases involving ICU admission can extend for weeks [466]. According to one study, costs for uncomplicated admissions averaged about $50,000 while complicated admissions were in the $200–300,000 range [467]. Hospitalization costs in the US alone will run into the tens of billions of dollars if not more. Despite improvements in survival rates during the pandemic ICU mortality remains in the 20–30% range [468–472]. Much of this carnage could have been averted had COVID–19 been treated properly.

In what will likely go down as the greatest public health disaster in medical history, Fauci and policy-makers failed to establish home-based therapeutic protocols. Instead, COVID–19–positive individuals were sent home to manage for themselves while continuing to spread the virus among close contacts. Many eventually developed severe symptoms requiring hospitalization. Treating an early, mild condition has a markedly greater likelihood of success than the far–advanced, energy–depleted state. 'The strategy from the outset,' claims cardiologist Peter McCullough, 'should have been implementing protocols to stop hospitalizations through early treatment of Americans who tested positive for COVID but were still asymptomatic' [473].

Early in the pandemic McCullough reflected on the absurdity of doing nothing for a year or more while vaccines were still in the pipeline. Chinese physicians had already published an early treatment regimen in March, 2020 resulting in a dramatic decrease in caseload by May, 2020 [474, 475]. Searching the medical literature McCullough compiled the first US COVID–19 protocol which was published in July, 2020 in the American Journal of Medicine [476, 477]. The regimen was administered to over 800 people in the Dallas area with a resultant 85% decrease in hospitalization and mortality. 'We could have dramatically reduced COVID fatalities and hospitalizations,' McCullough argues, 'using early treatment protocols and repurposed drugs including ivermectin and hydroxychloroquine and many, many others.' He claims the COVID–19 pandemic in the US could have been ended as early as May, 2020 [478].

Pierre Kory, pulmonary medicine and critical care specialist St Luke's Medical Center, Milwaukee, and president of Front Line COVID–19 Critical Care Alliance agrees: 'the efficacy of some of these drugs as prophylaxis is almost miraculous'. Early intervention after exposure, he added, stops viral replication and prevents development of the cytokine storm and pulmonary complications. 'Dr. Fauci's suppression of early treatments,' Kory claimed, 'will go down in history as having caused the death of a half a million Americans in the ICU' [479]. Our estimates suggest the numbers will be quite a bit larger. Like McCullough, Kory argues that early treatment could have stopped the pandemic in the spring of 2020. Fauci's deliberate and premeditated policies represent the highest form of malpractice.

Ryan Cole, clinical pathologist and medical director of Cole Diagnostics, the largest independent medical lab in Idaho, also became a strong proponent of early intervention after observing numerous striking turnarounds in COVID–19–infected persons: 'Early treatment of COVID–19, plain and simple, saves lives'. He argues that if the medical community had been pro-active, the early multi–drug approach would have saved hundreds of thousands of lives in the US. 'Never in the history of medicine has early treatment . . . been so overtly neglected by the medical profession on such a massive scale'. In the case
of COVID–19, ’not to treat is to do harm’. And Cole adds: ’The sacred doctor–patient relationship needs to be wrenched away from Anthony Fauci and the government/pharmaceutical industrial complex . . . Doctors need to return to their oaths’. The pandemic has laid bare the irredeemable flaws of a healthcare system that ’has lost its direction and soul’ [480].

Medical internist Deborah Viglione is more blunt: ’The pandemic was not managed by real science but by political science’. Real science, she argues, showed that masks and lockdowns were useless. These measures were implemented, says Viglione, to manipulate the population through fear to submit to the vaccine agenda. After diagnosis patients were sent home to quarantine and return only if they couldn’t breathe, ’but what kind of strategy is that?’ The focus, she continued, should have been on early treatment to reduce viral loads, boost the immune response, and reduce oxidative stress.

Physicians who spoke out against Fauci’s catastrophic policy, says Viglione, were labelled as spreading misinformation and threatened with revocation of licensure or board certification. Meanwhile, she continued, authorities attempted to suppress life-saving medications by pressuring pharmacists not to fill prescriptions or insurance companies not to reimburse claims. This assertion has been echoed by numerous frontline physicians in the battle against COVID–19.

Viglione has treated over 500 patients from her office using ozone PC and a variety of other modalities including HCQ, quercetin, ivermectin, vitamins B, C, D, and zinc depending on severity of symptoms or existing comorbidities. ’The vast majority of our patients did extremely well with reduction of their symptoms and duration of illness. We had a high severity of illness. Most of our patients presented a week or more into their illness and were already in cytokine storm. They simply refused to go into the hospital. In spite of this we still had an extremely low death rate’. In fact, Viglione added, ’nurses in the local EDs were telling patients to come to us instead of staying there’. This is quite a different narrative from that which health care systems are trumpeting.

In his 2021 book The Real Anthony Fauci, Robert F. Kennedy Jr traces the web of distortion to Fauci, whose obsession with the mRNA vaccines and remdesivir led him to ignore and suppress other effective treatments. He engaged in ’blatant and relentless manipulation of data to serve the vaccine agenda’. Fauci’s policies, says Kennedy, ’were so grotesquely ill-conceived, so unfounded in science, so tethered to financial interests, that they caused hundreds of thousands of wholly unnecessary deaths’. Instead of adhering to science-based data Fauci relied on arbitrary dictates from the CDC and WHO while urging the public to ’trust the experts’ even though the experts were often wrong. Throughout the pandemic there was a ’shockingly low quality of virtually all data pertinent to COVID–19’ [481].

Instead of supporting the work of McCullough, Kory and others, federal agencies and public media began actively censoring information on effective remedies. ’Dr. Fauci refused to promote any of these interventions,’ Kory claimed. ’It’s not just that he made no effort to find effective off–the–shelf cures—he aggressively suppressed them’. McCullough agrees: ’It shocks the conscience that there is still no official protocol’. Anyone who tries to publish a protocol, he claims, ’will find themselves airtight blocked by the journals that are all under Fauci’s control’. McCullough was fired from the staff of Baylor Medical Center. Cole’s laboratory was dropped by one Idaho’s largest healthcare networks [482]. Numerous other physicians paid a steep price for breaking line against Fauci’s ruinous policy.

**Not Ready for Prime Time**

The human cost in terms of morbidity and mortality also includes adverse effects related to the mRNA vaccines. To date there have been approximately 1,183,493 COVID–19 vaccine–related adverse event reports, including 25,641 deaths, reported to VAERS since the beginning of the pandemic. As we discussed in part II of the paper VAERS data is difficult to quantify the true magnitude due to under-reporting however when we compared available data to the number of administered vaccines, we found an adverse event rate about 40–fold higher compared with 2010 influenza vaccine event rates.

To date about 10,783,650,787 COVID–19 vaccine doses had been administered globally and 537,567,013 vaccine doses in the US with US representing 4.98% of total vaccines administered or a 20:1 ratio [483]. If we apply this ratio to the VAERS data we estimate the number of adverse events globally to be 23.67 million with about 512,820 deaths over about a 15–month period. The total number of influenza-related vaccine deaths reported in VAERS over the past 30 years was only 9,357.

Hyperlink to 1,366 references for COVID-19 vaccine associated complications:
https://www.thegms.co/publichealth/pubheal-rw-22042302-references.pdf

https://www.doi.org/10.46766/thegms.pubheal.22042302
In part II of this series, we showed that when 2021 VAERS COVID-19 deaths were compared to that of 2010 influenza vaccines, there was a 40-fold higher risk with the mRNA vaccines. When odds ratios were calculated from COVID-19 vaccine deaths relative to other vaccine-related deaths in 2021 we obtained even more striking inequalities: 354-fold higher than meningococcal vaccine; 200-fold higher than varicella vaccine; 157-fold higher than influenza vaccines; 120-fold greater than that of the Tdap/DTaP vaccines; 86-fold higher than the MMR vaccines and; 23-fold greater than the hepatitis B vaccine as depicted in Figure 1. Such disparities are mind-boggling.

Figure 1. Odds ratios for COVID-19 vaccine deaths compared to that of six other vaccines and the year 2021. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals are depicted. All odds ratios are statistically significant (P<0.0001).
We recently compared peer-reviewed medical journal publication of adverse events (AE’s) for COVID-19 vaccines since rollout (only 16 months) to that of six other vaccines ranging from 436 – 784 months (Appendix 1).

Appendix 1. All 1,366 references for COVID-19 vaccine associated complications are listed by subject matter. All 1,366 references are hyperlinked here and are all published in peer-reviewed medical journals from the onset of the COVID-19 vaccinations on December 15, 2020 to March 15, 2022 (16 months) [495].

### Appendix 1. Subject-wise segregation of 1,366 references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COVID-19 Vaccine Published Complications</th>
<th>Number of Publication(s)</th>
<th>Reference Numbers in the Hyperlink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaphylaxis</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1 - 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiphospholipid Antibodies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial &amp; Venous Thromboembolism</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>51 - 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>211 - 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto-Immune Disorders</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>213 - 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autopsy Findings</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>234 - 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood Disorders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>245 - 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>255 - 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac Disease (Myocarditis / Pericarditis)</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>262 - 597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac Disease (other)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>598 - 612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dementia / Alzheimer’s / Delirium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>613 - 614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encephalopathy &amp; Neurological Injury</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>615 - 660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Diseases</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>661 - 671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial Nerve Palsy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>672 – 699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastroparesis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillain Barre Syndrome</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>701 – 751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Loss / Tinnitus</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>752 – 764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemolytic Uremic Syndrome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemorrhage</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>766 – 803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatitis</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>804 – 822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immune and DNA Impacts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>823 - 829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney / Urinary Disorders</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>830 - 852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung Disease</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>853 - 855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphadenopathy</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>856 - 915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Sclerosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscle Disorders</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>917 - 921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prion Disease</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Recall Syndrome</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>923 - 927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhabdomyolysis</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>928 - 939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seizure Disorder</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>940 - 945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder / Musculoskeletal / Bursitis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>946 - 952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin Reactions</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>953 - 993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyroid Disease</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>994 - 1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine-Induced Thrombotic Thrombocytopenia</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1027 - 1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varicella Zoster (Shingles) / Herpes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1236 - 1262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasculitis</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1263 - 1310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1311 – 1366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1366</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 - 1366</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When odds ratios for published AE’s were calculated (COVID-19 vaccine vs six other vaccines) there were again stunning inequalities. COVID-19 vaccinations had a 23,682-fold greater number of peer-reviewed publications of AE’s than that of meningococcal vaccine; 12,721-fold higher than varicella vaccine; 1,712-fold higher than influenza vaccine; 6,190-fold greater than that of the Tdap/DTaP vaccines; 6,559-fold greater than MMR vaccines; and, 5,154-fold greater than Hepatitis B vaccine as depicted (Figure 2). Such irregularities are troubling given that COVID-19 vaccine AE’s are less likely to be reported due the healthcare system and social media influences.

Figure 2. Odds ratios for COVID-19 vaccine published adverse events (AE’s) compared to that of other vaccines. The duration of time was only 16 months for the COVID-19 vaccine while that of the other vaccines ranged from 436 to 784 months. The duration of time was not controlled in this graph. All odds ratios are statistically significant (P<0.0001).
Add to these irregularities that swirled around the clinical trials and rollout of the mRNA vaccines and one’s skepticism of this science-based initiative is further piqued. In October 2020 the FDA urged Pfizer and Moderna to use a clinical trial design that would preserve the integrity of data collection. To this end Fauci endorsed a blinded crossover study to enable ongoing assessment of efficacy and safety. The companies argued the crossover design was ‘onerous’ and overly complicated and that it would be unethical to withhold the vaccines from study participants. Both companies granted individuals access to their study data [484, 485].

Why did the FDA permit this breach of protocol? Diana Zuckerman, president of the National Center for Health Research, argues that the FDA could have demanded that the companies adhere to the guidelines to receive approval. Failure to implement the recommended study design resulted in loss of valuable data. She was also concerned about inadequate numbers of elderly subjects in the trial which, she claimed, makes it impossible to determine how effective the vaccine is for frail, elderly subjects.

Consumer representative Sheldon Toubman, lawyer and member of the FDA advisory panel, cited a paucity of evidence as to whether the vaccine is effective in preventing severe COVID–19 infections. And based on other vaccine trials, he raised concerns as to whether the six–week follow–up period was sufficient to reliably assess the safety of these novel and untested preparations. Such flaws in the planning and design of the vaccine trials, beyond constituting a breach of established experimental protocol, raise ethical concerns.

If the planning stage of the vaccine trials was shaky then the clinical phase should have raised even more eyebrows. As we describe in part II, a shocking whistleblower exposé in BMJ in November, 2021 alleged improprieties involving Pfizer vaccine trials including not only unblinding of subjects but falsification of data, using inadequately trained personnel, and unacceptable delays in follow–up of adverse event reports [486].

Data obtained through a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) indicate AE’s far exceeded original estimates. The Pfizer data of patients vaccinated from December 15, 2020 to February 28, 2021 had 1,223 deaths noted. A total of 274 pregnant women received the vaccine and 75 (27.4%) suffered ‘serious’ AE’s while another 49 (17.9%) had “non-serious” AE’s (page 12 on Pfizer document) [487, 488]. See these published court-ordered documents entitled ‘5.3.6 post marketing experience’ on Public Health and Medical Professionals for Transparency website, phmpt.org. In late April 2021 this data was sent to both the FDA and CDC which, nonetheless, continued to issue glowing safety reports. This leads us to question the propriety, if not legality, of conferring Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) to the vaccine manufacturers.

Under federal law new medicines and vaccines do not qualify for EUA if there are existing FDA–approved substances that are also effective against the disease: ‘there must be no adequate, approved and available alternatives to the candidate product for diagnosing, preventing, or treating the disease or condition . . .’. Before the pandemic, as we have seen, there was abundant evidence in the research literature supporting the efficacy of modalities like ozone PC, HCQ, and vitamin D and others for the treatment of inflammatory conditions. Add to this the self–serving agenda of the vaccine manufacturers in both setting up the trials and carrying them out and one begins to suspect a trail of collusion leading back to the very powers that issued the EUA. This brings to mind the age–old quandary quis custodiet ipsos custodes: who guards the guards?

And beyond granting EUA under potentially fraudulent circumstances one is confronted by lapses in oversight. By the time the Delta variant surfaced in the summer of 2021 and spread across the globe there was ample data to suggest primary vaccine failure. We cited multiple studies showing a high percentage of Delta–variant infections in previously vaccinated persons. By late July the CDC was aware of these trends and formulated a policy to downplay the magnitude of breakthrough infections and focus on the role of the unvaccinated population in the Delta surge [489].

By mid–August the Whitehouse Coronavirus Task Force had reams of data from across the US and the world showing no relationship between emergent Delta spread patterns and vaccination rates [490]. And yet President Biden continued for the rest of 2021 and into 2022 to promote vaccination and booster jabs while at the same time publicly wearing a mask as if upholding an established, time–honored principle. Even presidents bow down to science. The gap between spin and reality has never been more obvious.
Why were the COVID-19 vaccines approved and recommended by the FDA and CDC when there were so many unanswered questions regarding safety and propriety? Why did the American Board of Medical Specialties (ABMS), the American Board of Obstetrics & Gynecology (ABOG) and the Federation of State Medical Boards (FSMB) threaten all physicians in the United States with loss of licensures and board certifications if “COVID-19 misinformation” was spread? [488]. ABOG, ABMS and FSMB documents show that “COVID-19 misinformation” is used as a euphemism purposed to gaslight and eliminate vaccine hesitancy [488]. As of this publication ABOG is still pushing the vaccine in pregnant women and women of reproductive age despite the grave concerns expressed.

Why wasn’t the mRNA vaccine experiment terminated in the summer of 2021? And, as if in defiance of this lapse, the very same trends repeated themselves in the autumn with the Omicron variant. Why wasn’t the vaccine program stopped in late fall? Certainly, the evidence was compelling. And by January 1, 2022, daily COVID-19 caseloads across the globe were over double as compared to January 1, 2021 as the vaccines were being rolled out. And yet governments and healthcare systems continued to hawk the mRNA vaccines while blaming the unvaccinated for soaring hospitalization costs [491].

Why wasn’t there more public and scientific debate about spiraling caseloads in late 2021 and early 2022 or the escalating number of adverse event reports? Why were the 1,366 peer-reviewed publications of AE’s over 16 months since the vaccine rollout summarily ignored? [495]. And why were early treatment protocols never established? Instead the number of infections along with their attendant morbidity and mortality continued to surge throughout the winter of 2021-22. If one seeks to make a case for failure of oversight look no further.

As the saying goes, 'denial ain’t just a river in Egypt'. No matter how the academic science community attempts to twist the narrative to its own ends, the fact remains that herd immunity can and will be reached only through the unvaccinated and breakthrough infections in the vaccinated. The mRNA vaccines weren’t the free ticket into the Promised Land as scientists claimed. And in their wake, they left a wide swath of devastation.

Science in Crisis

The problems we cite concerning suppression of early treatment protocols and corruption of vaccine trials is not peculiar to the US. Multiple instances of such aberrations came to light in the UK: internal documents withheld from the public, officials ordered not to discuss certain matters, publication of fraudulent research; other research smothered or censored. In a November 2020 editorial in BMJ entitled ‘COVID-19: politicization, 'corruption,’ and suppression of science,’ executive editor and physician Kamran Abbasi argues that science was manipulated for political and financial gain [492].

During the COVID-19 pandemic era the concept of evidence-based medicine has become an anachronism and the more pertinent concern now is ‘who’s evidence?’ and ‘to what end?’ In the US, Operation Warp Speed was used to justify hasty shoddily-designed vaccine trials while suppressing widely available alternative medicines. At the same time the culture was inundated by a flood of misinformation and disinformation by those who held the reins of power. The pandemic unleashed scales of opportunism by politicians, industry, academic scientists and healthcare systems while, at the same time, revealing just how easily the common perception of reality can be purposefully distorted during times of crisis.

'Politicization of science,' writes Abbasi, 'was enthusiastically deployed by some of history’s worst autocrats and dictators, and it is now regrettably commonplace in democracies. The medical-political complex tends towards suppression of science to aggrandize and enrich those in power. And, as the powerful become more successful, richer, and further intoxicated with power, the inconvenient truths of science are suppressed. When good science is suppressed, people die'. This precise tactic was employed by the CDC, FDA, ABMS, ABOG and FSMB. This echoes the timeless axiom 'power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely.'

In a March 2022 Opinion piece published in the BMJ, Jon Jureidini and Leemon McHenry, authors of The Illusion of Evidence-Based Medicine: Exposing the Crisis of Credibility in Clinical Research (2020), up the ante and argue that evidence based medicine has been thoroughly corrupted by corporate interests, lack of oversight, and rife with special interest among influential academic scientists [493].
Evidence based medicine seeks to provide a solid fact-based foundation for the practice of medicine. Its effectiveness depends on reliable data gathered from well-conducted clinical trials but how can this occur when the trials are controlled by the industry itself? Cui bono? The whistleblower article and data obtained through the FOIA request reveal the degree to which industry sponsored trials were manipulated and how vulnerable the evidence-based process truly is. 'Until this problem is corrected,' write Jureidini and McHenry, 'evidence-based medicine will remain an illusion.'

The scientific ideal of impartiality and strict adherence to evidence, i.e., objectivity, allows perpetuation of a legitimate fact-based science; absent this and science becomes little more than a polyglot jumble of unsubstantiated claims. Never in recent centuries has the gap between science and religion been so razor-thin. The scientific ideal is threatened by corporations in which financial interests prevail over objectivity. 'Patients die', Jureidini and McHenry argue, 'because of the adverse impact of commercial interests on the research agenda, universities, and regulators'.

Corporations are not accountable to the public but to shareholders. Fierce corporate tribalism, brand loyalty and public perception inevitably triumph over scientific truth. Universities have become pawns of corporations which exercise undue influence over research agendas, journal content and medical education. In recent decades the corporate culture has insinuated itself throughout all layers of the university.

Academic deans have been replaced by profit-driven 'managers' who cultivate affiliations with the industrial sector to enhance revenues. Based on their affiliations with prestigious universities, published academics are actively courted by corporate 'sponsors' to influence practice patterns and enhance brand identity. Such 'key opinion leaders' become paid members of corporate advisory boards and 'product champions' at medical conferences and continuing medical education programs. And, in the process, they compromise their impartial point-of-view while continuing to reap all the benefits as university faculty members.

This dynamic, wholly pervasive during the pandemic, created an uneven playing field: corporations and universities enacted their one-sided vaccine agenda while critics faced consequences ranging from rejection of intellectual work by journals, ostracization in their professional community, legal threats, and loss of licensure, accreditation or ability to earn a livelihood. For this reason, we have increasingly come to regard the medical-industrial complex as little more than a cartel. We define a cartel as a group of independent producers who band together to control the production, distribution, and pricing of a commonly shared commodity.

Peter McCullough confronted this organized wall of resistance when attempting to establish early treatment protocols for COVID-19 infected individuals. The universities that rely on hundreds of millions of dollars in annual funding from Fauci and the NIH were unmoved: 'We didn't have a single academic institution come up with a single protocol', he claims. 'They didn't even try. Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Duke, you name it. Not a single medical center set up even a tent to try to treat patients and prevent hospitalization and death. There wasn't one ounce of original research coming out of America to fight COVID—other than the vaccines' [494]. Is this at all surprising?

Finally, we harken back to the very raison d’etre of experimental science which, ostensibly, is to cultivate understanding and insight. Experiments are performed to establish the factuality of phenomena and to aid in making critical discriminations; at some point, however, facts must be incorporated into an overarching intellectual framework, i.e., a causal theory. It is at this juncture that molecular and cellular scientists have completely missed the boat. The pandemic has laid bare the limitations of the experimental method not to mention the failure of academic scientists to integrate valid facts into a coherent theoretical framework.

The pandemic revealed grave flaws in current immune theory which, as we showed in part I, can be traced back to the turn of the 20th century, over 120 years ago, involving questions that were never resolved by academics despite the fact that the correct interpretation had been advanced in the 1880s. This hardly instills confidence in either science or the experimental method. In the majority of instances one can draw the same conclusions by careful observation. The experimental method has been used as a shibboleth by academics to control public opinion and the arbitrary knowledge content of their science. One might argue that it has far outlived its purpose and intent.

In part III we encountered the PC phenomenon, now...
regarded as the most powerful innate form of protection in living bodies, discovered accidentally in 1986 by molecular biologists, which has been the focus of tens of thousands of experiments over the past 35 years and yet, remains a complete enigma. Molecular science is long on description and detail but woefully short on explanation. In earlier publications we showed that the PC phenomenon is generated by a blood-borne energy field. To date no one has refuted our claim.

In part I we showed on the basis of credible experimental evidence that all pathophysiologic phenomena associated with COVID-19 infection are referable to diffuse endothelial inflammation and, in turn, that such inflammation is secondary to diastolic dysfunction and deficient energy generation in the vascular system. The primacy of the diastolic phase of the cardiac cycle has been recognized by medical science since the mid-1980s and, like the PC phenomenon, has been the subject of innumerable clinical studies. And yet, to our knowledge, not a single academic publication has pointed out the inescapable link between diastolic function and energy generation. Apparently, academics believe they can cherry-pick evidence that suits their own purposes.

Had timely adjudications been made on these critical issues by the academic community it would have been readily apparent to all that early treatment protocols advanced by McCullough, Kory, Cole, Viglione, and numerous others were not only fitting and proper but, in fact, the most important therapeutic approach to COVID-19 infection. Had this path been taken many, many deaths would have been prevented. The conclusion is unavoidable that the self-serving academic community played a major role in the pandemic tragedy.

Such developments not only sing the swan song of molecular and cellular medicine but point to the failure of academics to perform their designated function, i.e., to maintain a vibrant and evolving science. If the academics can’t keep their own house in order who will step in to fill the void? The pandemic has shown quite clearly that intelligent and motivated physicians are fully capable of making necessary clinical adjudications and choosing effective treatments and, in fact, do not need the kind of patronistic babysitting afforded by the academic cartel. East is East, West is West, and never the twain shall meet. There must be a parting of ways between the two, a reconciliation through separation so to speak, that will permit the emergence and evolution of a vital new integrated and functionally based system of medicine. We develop this theme further in future articles.
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