

**TO:**

**FROM**

**Name:**

**Address:**

**At Law:  
Criminal Trespass Warning**

**Date:**

---

### Criminal Trespass Warning

This Criminal Trespass Warning requires you along with administrators, agents, employees, associates, to immediately cease and desist compelling people, businesses, churches to perform under force, whether direct or implied, or face full liability both personal and corporate including responsibility to compensate victims for damages incurred; equity will not suffer a wrong without remedy; the following actions including but not limited to:

- crimes against humanity under article 7 of the international criminal code (see attachment 1)
- arbitrary and capricious shutdown orders, denying the people the right to work, worship, freely assemble [see attachment 2 and 3, 3(a), 3(b)]
- Constitutional violations pursuant to recent federal court ruling (see attachment 3)
- Interference with commerce (see attachment 4)
- deprivation of and conspiracy against rights pursuant to 18 US Code ss 241 & 242 (see attachments 5)
- operating under color of law pursuant to Title 42 section 1983 (see attachment 6)
- violation of court-case precedent (see attachment 7)
- harassment, intimidation, coercion, terroristic threats (see attachment 8)
- fraud (see attachment 9 and 10)
- violation of oath of office (see attachment 11)
- forcing people, directly or indirectly, whether by coercion, threats or other means to wear a mask and/or be vaccinated against their will (see attachments 12, 13, 14)

Failure to cease and desist is trespass; trespass requires remedy: 1 silver dollar per second per trespass duration;

Failure to respond to this within 10 days of its tender will be, by acquiescence, evidence of proof that I, \_\_\_\_\_, am injured by loss of rights and interference by corporate/government agents operating under color of law, exceeding their jurisdiction;

Sincerely:

Date:

Witness:

From the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court

The text of the Rome Statute reproduced herein was originally circulated as document A/CONF.183/9 of 17 July 1998 and corrected by procès-verbaux of 10 November 1998, 12 July 1999, 30 November 1999, 8 May 2000, 17 January 2001 and 16 January 2002. The amendments to article 8 reproduce the text contained in depositary notification C.N.651.2010 Treaties-6, while the amendments regarding articles 8 bis, 15 bis and 15 ter replicate the text contained in depositary notification C.N.651.2010 Treaties-8; both depositary communications are dated 29 November 2010. The table of contents is not part of the text of the Rome Statute adopted by the United Nations Diplomatic Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court on 17 July 1998. It has been included in this publication for ease of reference.

Done at Rome on 17 July 1998, in force on 1 July 2002, United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 2187, No. 38544, Depositary: Secretary-General of the United Nations, <http://treaties.un.org>

*Article 7 Crimes against humanity 1. For the purpose of this Statute, "crime against humanity" means any of the following acts when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack: (a) Murder; (b) Extermination; (c) Enslavement; (d) Deportation or forcible transfer of population; (e) Imprisonment or other severe deprivation of physical liberty in violation of fundamental rules of international law; (f) Torture; (g) Rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization, or any other form of sexual violence of comparable gravity; (h) Persecution against any identifiable group or collectivity on political, racial, national, ethnic, cultural, religious, gender as defined in paragraph 3, or other grounds that are universally recognized as impermissible under international law, in connection with any act referred to in this paragraph or any crime within the jurisdiction of the Court; (i) Enforced disappearance of persons; (j) The crime of apartheid; (k) Other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering, or serious injury to body or to mental or physical health.*

Exodus 23: 6 “Do not deny justice to your poor people in their lawsuits.

Leviticus 19:15 “Do not pervert justice; do not show partiality to the poor or favoritism to the great, but judge your neighbor fairly.”

Psalms 9:8 “He rules the world in righteousness and judges the peoples with equity.”

Psalms 75:2 You say, “I choose the appointed time; it is I who judge with equity.”

Proverbs 22:16 “One who oppresses the poor to increase his wealth and one who gives gifts to the rich—both come to poverty.”

**Romans 2:11** “For God does not show favoritism.”

2 Cor 8:13 “Our desire is not that others might be relieved while you are hard pressed, but that there might be equality.”

Ephesians 6:9 “And masters, treat your slaves in the same way. Do not threaten them, since you know that the who is both their Master and yours is in heaven, and there is no favoritism with Him.”

**Colossians 4:1** “Masters, provide your slaves with what is right and fair, because you know that you also have a Master in heaven.”

I Timothy 5:8 “Anyone who does not provide for their relatives, and especially for their own household, has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever.”

**James 2:1** “My brothers and sisters, believers in our glorious Lord Jesus Christ must not show favoritism.”

## **Federal Judge Rules Pennsylvania Lockdown and Business Closure Orders Violate U.S. Constitution**

Article By: Kevin Greenberg, Gregory T. Sturges

---

On Sept. 14, in [\*Butler v. Wolf\*](#), a federal district court in Western Pennsylvania held that certain Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) mitigation measures ordered by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania were unconstitutional. Conceding the efforts were a “well-intentioned effort to protect Pennsylvanians from the virus,” Judge William S. Stickman, IV nevertheless held that the portion of orders issued by Gov. Tom Wolf and Secretary of Health Rachel Levine violated the First Amendment as well as the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. The court found:

- Limits on gatherings of certain sizes – up to 25 people indoors and 250 outdoors – violated the First Amendment;
- Orders closing “non-life-sustaining” businesses – violated both the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses as applied; and
- A stay-at-home order as implemented violated the Due Process Clause.

The Commonwealth has announced it will appeal the decision. If it stands, the ruling will require the Commonwealth to adopt more narrowly tailored, specific standards and then, once adopted, to apply those standards uniformly within similarly situated geographic areas.

Unlike the few earlier cases where judges limited gubernatorial power under state constitutions, Judge Stickman found that Pennsylvania’s virus mitigation efforts violated the U.S. Constitution; thus, his opinion arguably raises issues that could impact COVID-19 mitigation orders nationwide.

Judge Stickman also notably refused to apply a standard of extraordinary deference to these public health measures, a standard which stems from a 1905 U.S. Supreme Court decision. Instead, he relied heavily on Justice Alito’s dissent to the U.S. Supreme Court’s denial of emergency injunctive relief in late July in a case known as *Calvary Chapel Dayton Valley v. Sisolak*. Judge Stickman ruled that because the broad disease mitigation efforts had become the “new normal” he applied normal deference, which differed from that implemented in a May 2020 decision from a different Pennsylvania federal court in *Benner v. Wolf*. Acknowledging the shifting standards, Judge Stickman explained the change was due to the extended duration of these orders and the development of a fuller record.

## **Background**

In May 2020, four Western Pennsylvania counties, a congressman, three state representatives, and the owners of eight businesses, including a salon, a drive-in movie theater, and an appliance store, filed the action under 28 U.S.C. § 1983.

While the suit went through four months of discovery, hearings, and briefing, Gov. Wolf and Secretary Levine lifted most of the orders, but a limitation on gathering sizes remained in effect as of the date of the court's order. The Commonwealth was clear throughout that it believed it could reinstate similar or related orders if the COVID-19 situation in Pennsylvania deteriorated.

## **Gathering Limits**

On July 25, 2020, the Commonwealth issued an order limiting indoor “events and gatherings” to 25 people and outdoor “events and gatherings” to 250 people, an increase from limits earlier in the pandemic. The restriction on events and gatherings applies to public and private property regardless of the gathering's purpose, except it does not apply to normal business operations or to bars or restaurants; however, smaller table limits apply to bars and restaurants, and separate social distancing and other mitigation measures apply to all businesses allowed to operate.

The court pointed to several instances where the Commonwealth's enforcement of the gathering restrictions appeared uneven. Although the orders do not except protests on their face, in deference to First Amendment rights, the Commonwealth has permitted protests. The Commonwealth also made a major exception for “Spring Carlisle,” an auto show and flea market – allowing up to 250 people to gather inside and more than 20,000 outside – but only after the operators of the show sued the Commonwealth and the parties entered into a confidential settlement agreement.

The court found the gathering limits served a purpose unrelated to the content of the expression, and, as a result, held that if the rule was narrowly tailored to serve a significant government interest, leaving open ample alternative channels of communication, it would be legal under the First Amendment. Judge Stickman expressly agreed that the challenged orders served a significant government interest: curbing the COVID-19 pandemic.

But the court found that the orders, including the exceptions for commercial gatherings such as retail stores, were not narrowly tailored for several reasons. The court expressed concern that the Commonwealth's order treated activities “traditionally covered within the ambit of the [First] Amendment – political, social, cultural, educational and other expressive gatherings” – more harshly than routine commerce. The court also found the gathering limits were an unacceptable “one-size fits all approach” to Pennsylvania's many different environments, finding the “statewide approach is broadly, rather than narrowly, tailored.”

## **Stay-at-Home Order**

On March 23, 2020, Gov. Wolf ordered all individuals in the Commonwealth to stay home unless they were accessing, supporting, or providing a “life-sustaining” business, emergency, or government service. The plaintiffs challenged this order, contending it was not a traditional disease-control measure, such as quarantine or isolation. The court focused on how the lockdown orders differed dramatically from past measures, in part because Pennsylvania’s quarantine statute limits itself to persons “exposed to a communicable disease” and a limited time period (“equal to the longest usual incubation period of the disease”).

The court found that the lockdown order was not narrowly tailored to the appropriate governmental purpose, holding: “the stay-at-home order require[d] a *default* of confinement at home, unless the citizen is out for a purpose approved by Defendants’ orders” and such a “broad restructuring of the default concept of liberty of movement in a free society eschews any claim to narrow tailoring.” Because the order was not narrowly tailored, the court held it violated the constitutional right to free movement and travel, originating in the Due Process Clause.

## **Defining and Applying ‘Life-Sustaining’**

In the Commonwealth’s early orders, and continuing for almost three months, Pennsylvania permitted “life-sustaining” businesses to operate while ordering “non-life-sustaining” businesses to close temporarily. Because the Commonwealth did not define the term “life-sustaining” in writing, but only in one-off, confidential waiver applications, these standards have been challenged almost from their initial announcement. Eventually, the Commonwealth distinguished between businesses based on the NAICS codes, but not before there was significant confusion and, allegedly, distinctly different treatment for businesses depending on which individual was reviewing the waiver application, which changed at least 10 times over the initial 60-day period. The court found the process by which the Commonwealth “designed, implemented and administered” the “life-sustaining” standard to various businesses to be so arbitrary that it violated Pennsylvania businesses’ substantive due process right to engage in economic activity. The court found that both: (1) the “life-sustaining” business structure created and implemented by Pennsylvania “was so arbitrary in its creation, scope and administration as to fail constitutional scrutiny;” and (2) the closing of the waiver process when it was overwhelmed by applications was unfair to business owners who were denied an opportunity to have their waiver request heard. The court also found that the orders had treated similarly situated businesses differently, intentionally, and without a rational basis, even within the same county, in a manner that violated the Equal Protection Clause.

The court's findings on life-sustaining businesses does not necessarily preclude a future order, but, if they survive appeal, may provide parameters within which governments would have to act, namely by providing a clear and written distinction between businesses that may operate and those that may not and even enforcement of same

©2020 Greenberg Traurig, LLP. All rights reserved.

---

National Law Review, Volume X, Number 260

Source URL: <https://www.natlawreview.com/article/federal-judge-rules-pennsylvanialockdown-and-business-closure-orders-violate-us>

# First Amendment

The First Amendment guarantees freedoms concerning religion, expression, assembly, and the right to petition. It forbids Congress from both [promoting one religion over others](#) and also [restricting an individual's religious practices](#). It guarantees [freedom of expression](#) by prohibiting Congress from restricting the press or the rights of individuals to speak freely. It also guarantees the right of citizens to [assemble peaceably and to petition their government](#).

[https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/first\\_amendment](https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/first_amendment)

## **Specific Articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights**

### Preamble

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,

Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations,

Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

Now, therefore,

The General Assembly,

Proclaims this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

### Article 1

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

### Article 2

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

### Article 3

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and the security of person.

Article 5

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 7

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 12

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 17

1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.
2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Article 19

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers. Article 20

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 23

1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

...

Article 28

Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

Article 30

Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

**Attachment 4, page 1 of 1**

**18 U.S. Code § 1951. Interference with commerce by threats or violence**

(a) Whoever in any way or degree obstructs, delays, or affects [commerce](#) or the movement of any article or commodity in [commerce](#), by [robbery](#) or [extortion](#) or attempts or conspires so to do, or commits or threatens physical violence to any person or property in furtherance of a plan or purpose to do anything in violation of this section shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.

(b) As used in this section—

(1)

The term “[robbery](#)” means the unlawful taking or obtaining of personal property from the person or in the presence of another, against his will, by means of actual or threatened force, or violence, or fear of injury, immediate or future, to his person or property, or property in his custody or possession, or the person or property of a relative or member of his family or of anyone in his company at the time of the taking or obtaining.

(2)

The term “[extortion](#)” means the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear, or under color of official right.

(3)

The term “[commerce](#)” means [commerce](#) within the District of Columbia, or any Territory or Possession of the United States; all [commerce](#) between any point in a State, Territory, Possession, or the District of Columbia and any point outside thereof; all [commerce](#) between points within the same State through any place outside such State; and all other [commerce](#) over which the United States has jurisdiction.

(c) This section shall not be construed to repeal, modify or affect [section 17 of Title 15](#), sections 52, 101–115, 151–166 of Title 29 or sections 151–188 of Title 45.

### **18 U.S. Code § 241 – Conspiracy Against Rights**

If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or

If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured—

They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 645, [62 Stat. 696](#); [Pub. L. 90–284, title I, § 103\(a\)](#), Apr. 11, 1968, [82 Stat. 75](#); [Pub. L. 100–690, title VII, § 7018\(a\)](#), (b)(1), Nov. 18, 1988, [102 Stat. 4396](#); [Pub. L. 103–322, title VI, § 60006\(a\)](#), title XXXII, §§ 320103(a), 320201(a), title XXXIII, § 330016(1)(L), Sept. 13, 1994, [108 Stat. 1970](#), 2109, 2113, 2147; [Pub. L. 104–294, title VI, §§ 604\(b\)\(14\)\(A\), 607\(a\)](#), Oct. 11, 1996, [110 Stat. 3507](#), 3511.)

### **18 U.S. Code § 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law**

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 645, [62 Stat. 696](#); [Pub. L. 90–284, title I, § 103\(b\)](#), Apr. 11, 1968, [82 Stat. 75](#); [Pub. L. 100–690, title VII, § 7019](#), Nov. 18, 1988, [102 Stat. 4396](#); [Pub. L. 103–322, title VI, § 60006\(b\)](#), title XXXII, §§ 320103(b), 320201(b), title XXXIII, § 330016(1)(H), Sept. 13, 1994, [108 Stat. 1970](#), 2109, 2113, 2147; [Pub. L. 104–294, title VI, §§ 604\(b\)\(14\)\(B\), 607\(a\)](#), Oct. 11, 1996, [110 Stat. 3507](#), 3511.)

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/1983>

## **42 U.S. Code § 1983. Civil action for deprivation of rights**

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia.

(R.S. § 1979; [Pub. L. 96-170, § 1](#), Dec. 29, 1979, [93 Stat. 1284](#); [Pub. L. 104-317, title III, § 309\(c\)](#), Oct. 19, 1996, [110 Stat. 3853](#).)

9. PUBLIC OFFICERS — *Powers of Administrative Officers — Legislation by Administrative Officers.* — It is a fundamental principle of our system of government that the rights of men are to be determined by the law itself, and not by the let or leave of administrative officers or bureaus. It is the prerogative of the legislative branch of the government to determine and declare what the law shall be, and the legislative branch may not delegate this function to executive or administrative officers.

10. Public Officers — *Powers of Administrative Officers — Discretion of Administrative Officers.* — The principle that the rights of men are to be determined by the law itself and not by administrative officers does not mean, however, that no discretion can be left to administrative officers in administering the law. Government could not be efficiently carried on if something could not be left to the judgment and discretion of administrative officers to accomplish in detail what is authorized or required by law in general terms. This is particularly true where the discretion to be exercised relates to police regulations. But the reasonable discretion which may be vested in city administrative officers is limited to a discretion in its essence ministerial and not legislative,...

*Thompson v. Smith*, 155 Va. 367, 368-69 (Va. 1930)

20. INJUNCTIONS — *Jurisdiction — Enforcement of Personal Rights — Right to Travel on Highway.* — It has been said that it is beyond the scope of the powers of a court of equity to enforce personal rights as distinguished from property rights, but this distinction is not well made. Fundamental personal rights, such as the right of a person to travel the public highways of the State, are not less sacred and valuable rights, or less subject to the protection of a court of equity, in a proper case, than are property rights. *Thompson v. Smith*, 155 Va. 367, 370-71 (Va. 1930) <https://casetext.com/case/thompson-v-smith-24>

[http://ypdcrime.com/penal.law/article240.htm?zoom\\_highlight=threaten](http://ypdcrime.com/penal.law/article240.htm?zoom_highlight=threaten)

## ***Article 240 - NY Penal Law***

### **S 240.30 Aggravated harassment in the second degree.**

A person is guilty of aggravated harassment in the second degree when:

1. With intent to harass another person, the actor either:

(a) **communicates**, anonymously or otherwise, by telephone, by computer

or any other electronic means, or by mail, or by transmitting or

**delivering any other form of communication, a threat to cause**

physical **unlawful harm to the property of, such person** harm to, or , or

a member

of such person's same family or household as defined in subdivision one of section 530.11 of the criminal procedure law, and the actor knows or reasonably should know that such communication will cause such person to reasonably fear harm to such person's physical safety or property, or to the physical safety or property of a member of such person's same family or household;

## **“Crimes Against Humanity”: The German Corona Investigation. “The PCR Pandemic”**

By [Reiner Fuellmich](#)

Global Research, October 07, 2020

[Dr. Reiner Fuellmich](#) 3 October 2020

*Reiner Fuellmich is admitted to the Bar in Germany and in California for 26 years. Practicing law primarily as a trial lawyer against fraudulent corporations such as Deutsche Bank, formerly one of the world's largest and most respected banks, today one of the most toxic criminal organizations in the world; VW, one of the world's largest and most respected car manufacturers, today notorious for its giant diesel fraud; and Kuehne and Nagel, the world's largest shipping company, suing them in a multi-million-dollar bribery case. The German Corona Investigative Committee has taken testimony from a large number of international scientists and experts since July 10, 2020.*

### **Their conclusions are the following:**

- ✦ **The corona crisis must be renamed the “Corona Scandal”** ✦ It is:
- ✦ The biggest tort case ever
- ✦ The greatest crime against humanity ever committed ✦ **Those responsible must be: Criminally prosecuted for crimes against humanity**
- ✦ **Sued for civil damages**
- ✦ Deaths
- ✦ **There is no excess mortality in any country**
- ✦ **Corona virus mortality equals seasonal flu**
- ✦ 94% of deaths in Bergamo were caused by transferring sick patients to nursing homes where they infected old people with weak immune systems
- ✦ Doctors and hospitals worldwide were paid to declare deceased victims of Covid-19
- ✦ Autopsies showed:
- ✦ Fatalities almost all caused by serious pre-existing conditions
- ✦ Almost all deaths were very old people
- ✦ Sweden (no lockdown) and Britain (strict lockdown) have comparable disease and mortality statistics
- ✦ US states with and without lockdowns have comparable disease and mortality statistics
- ✦ Health
- ✦ Hospitals remain empty and some face bankruptcy
- ✦ Populations have T-cell immunity from previous influenza waves
- ✦ Herd immunity needs only 15-25% population infection and is already achieved
- ✦ Only when a person has symptoms can an infection be contagious

- ✦ Tests:
- ✦ **Many scientists call this a PCR-test pandemic, not a corona pandemic**
- ✦ **Very healthy and non-infectious people may test positive**
- ✦ **Likelihood of false-positives is 89-94% or near certainty**
- ✦ Prof. Drosten developed his PCR test from an old SARS virus without ever having seen the real Wuhan virus from China
- ✦ The PCR test is not based on scientific facts with respect to infections
- ✦ **PCR tests are useless for the detection of infections**
- ✦ **A positive PCR test does not mean an infection is present or that an intact virus has been found**
- ✦ Amplification of samples over 35 cycles is unreliable but WHO recommended 45 cycles
  
- ✦ Illegality:
- ✦ The German government locked down, imposed social-distancing/maskwearing on the basis of a single opinion
- ✦ The lockdown was imposed when the virus was already retreating
- ✦ The lockdowns were based on non-existent infections
- ✦ Former president of the German federal constitutional court doubted the constitutionality of the corona measures
- ✦ Former UK supreme court judge Lord Sumption concluded there was no factual basis for panic and no legal basis for corona measures
- ✦ German RKI (CDC equivalent) recommended no autopsies be performed
- ✦ **Corona measures have no sufficient factual or legal basis, are unconstitutional and must be repealed immediately**
- ✦ **No serious scientist gives any validity to the infamous Neil Ferguson's false computer models warning of millions of deaths**
- ✦ **Mainstream media completely failed to report the true facts of the so-called pandemic**
- ✦ **Democracy is in danger of being replaced by fascist totalitarian models**
- ✦ Drosten (of PCR test), Tedros of WHO, and others have committed crimes against humanity as defined in the International Criminal Code
- ✦ Politicians can avoid going down with the charlatans and criminals by starting the long overdue public scientific discussion

- ✦ Conspiracy:
- ✦ **Politicians and mainstream media deliberately drove populations to panic**
- ✦ Children were calculatedly made to feel responsible “for the painful tortured death of their parents and grandparents if they do not follow Corona rules”
- ✦ The hopeless PCR test is used to create fear and not to diagnose
- ✦ There can be no talk of a second wave ✦ Injury and damage:
- ✦ **Evidence of gigantic health and economic damage to populations ✦**
  - Anti-corona measures have:
  - ✦ Killed innumerable people
  - ✦ Destroyed countless companies and individuals worldwide
  - ✦ Children are being taken away from their parents
  - ✦ Children are traumatized en-masse
  - ✦ **Bankruptcies are expected in small- and medium-sized businesses**
- ✦ Redress:
  - ✦ A class action lawsuit must be filed in the USA or Canada, with all affected parties worldwide having the opportunity to join
  - ✦ **Companies and self-employed people must be compensated for damages**

ATTORNEY REINER FUELLMICH COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT:

*Hello. I am Reiner Fuellmich and I have been admitted to the Bar in Germany and in California for 26 years. I have been practicing law primarily as a trial lawyer against fraudulent corporations such as Deutsche Bank, formerly one of the world's largest and most respected banks, today one of the most toxic criminal organizations in the world; VW, one of the world's largest and most respected car manufacturers, today notorious for its giant diesel fraud; and Kuehne and Nagel, the world's largest shipping company. We're suing them in a multi-million-dollar bribery case.*

I'm also one of four members of the German Corona Investigative Committee. Since July 10, 2020, this Committee has been listening to a large number of international scientists' and experts' testimony to find answers to questions about the corona crisis, which more and more people worldwide are asking. All the above-mentioned cases of corruption and fraud committed by the German corporations pale in comparison in view of the extent of the damage that the corona crisis has caused and continues to cause.

This corona crisis, according to all we know today, must be renamed a "Corona Scandal" and those responsible for it must be criminally prosecuted and sued for civil damages. On a political level, everything must be done to make sure that no one will ever again be in a position of such power as to be able to defraud humanity or to attempt to manipulate us with their corrupt agendas. And for this reason I will now explain to you how and where an international network of lawyers will argue this biggest tort case ever, the corona fraud scandal, which has meanwhile unfolded into probably the greatest crime against humanity ever committed.

Crimes against humanity were first defined in connection with the Nuremberg trials after World War II, that is, when they dealt with the main war criminals of the Third Reich. Crimes against humanity are today regulated in section 7 of the International Criminal Code. The three major questions to be answered in the context of a judicial approach to the corona scandal are: 1. Is there a corona pandemic or is there only a PCR-test pandemic? Specifically, does a positive PCR-test result mean that the person tested is infected with Covid-19, or does it mean absolutely nothing in connection with the Covid-19 infection?

2. Do the so-called anti-corona measures, such as the lockdown, mandatory face masks, social distancing, and quarantine regulations, serve to protect the world's population from corona, or do these measures serve only to make people panic so that they believe – without asking any questions – that their lives are in danger, so that in the end the pharmaceutical and tech industries can generate huge profits from the sale of PCR tests, antigen and antibody tests and vaccines, as well as the harvesting of our genetic fingerprints?
3. Is it true that the German government was massively lobbied, more so than any other country, by the chief protagonists of this so-called corona pandemic, Mr. Drosten, virologist at charity hospital in Berlin; Mr. Wieler, veterinarian and head of the German equivalent of the CDC, the RKI; and Mr. Tedros, Head of the World Health Organization or WHO; because Germany is known as a

particularly disciplined country and was therefore to become a role model for the rest of the world for its strict and, of course, successful adherence to the corona measures?

Answers to these three questions are urgently needed because the allegedly new and highly dangerous coronavirus has not caused any excess mortality anywhere in the world, and certainly not here in Germany. But the anti-corona measures, whose only basis are the PCR-test results, which are in turn all based on the German Drosten test, have, in the meantime, caused the loss of innumerable human lives and have destroyed the economic existence of countless companies and individuals worldwide. In Australia, for example, people are thrown into prison if they do not wear a mask or do not wear it properly, as deemed by the authorities. In the Philippines, people who do not wear a mask or do not wear it properly, in this sense, are getting shot in the head. Let me first give you a summary of the facts as they present themselves today. The most important thing in a lawsuit is to establish the facts – that is, to find out what actually happened. That is because the application of the law always depends on the facts at issue. If I want to prosecute someone for fraud, I cannot do that by presenting the facts of a car accident. So what happened here regarding the alleged corona pandemic?

The facts laid out below are, to a large extent, the result of the work of the Corona Investigative Committee. This Committee was founded on July 10, 2020 by four lawyers in order to determine, through hearing expert testimony of international scientists and other experts:

1. How dangerous is the virus really?
2. What is the significance of a positive PCR test?
3. What collateral damage has been caused by the corona measures, both

with respect to the world population's health, and with respect to the world's economy? Let me start with a little bit of background information. What happened in May 2019 and then in early 2020? And what happened 12 years earlier with the swine flu, which many of you may have forgotten about? In May 2019, the stronger of the two parties which govern Germany in a grand coalition, the CDU, held a Congress on Global Health, apparently at the instigation of important players from the pharmaceutical industry and the tech industry. At this Congress, the usual suspects, you might say, gave their speeches. Angela Merkel was there, and the German Secretary of Health, Jens Spahn. But, some other people, whom one would not necessarily expect to be present at such a gathering, were also there: Professor Drosten, virologist from the Charite hospital in Berlin; Professor Wieler, veterinarian and Head of the RKI, the German equivalent of the CDC; as well as Mr. Tedros, philosopher and Head of the World Health Organization (WHO). They all gave speeches there. Also present and giving speeches were the chief lobbyists of the world's two largest health funds, namely the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Wellcome Trust. Less than a year later, these very people called the shots in the proclamation of the worldwide corona pandemic, made sure that mass PCR tests were used to prove mass infections with Covid-19 all over the world, and are now pushing for vaccines to be invented and sold worldwide.

**These infections, or rather the positive test results that the PCR tests delivered, in turn became the justification for worldwide lockdowns, social distancing and mandatory face masks.** It is important to note at this point that the definition of a pandemic was changed 12 years earlier. Until then, a pandemic was considered to be a disease that spread worldwide and which led to many serious illnesses and deaths. Suddenly, and for reasons never explained, it was supposed to be a *worldwide disease only*. Many serious illnesses and many deaths were not required any more to announce a pandemic. Due to this change, the WHO, which is closely intertwined with the global pharmaceutical industry, was able to declare the swine flu pandemic in 2009, with the result that vaccines were produced and sold worldwide on the basis of contracts that have been kept secret until today.

These vaccines proved to be completely unnecessary because the swine flu eventually turned out to be a mild flu, and never became the horrific plague that the pharmaceutical industry and its affiliated universities kept announcing it would turn into, with millions of deaths certain to happen if people didn't get vaccinated. These vaccines also led to serious health problems. About 700 children in Europe fell incurably ill with narcolepsy and are now forever severely disabled. The vaccines bought with millions of taxpayers' money had to be destroyed with even more taxpayers' money. Already then, during the swine flu, the German virologist Drosten was one of those who stirred up panic in the population, repeating over and over again that the swine flu would claim many hundreds of thousands, even millions of deaths all over the world. In the end, it was mainly thanks to Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg and his efforts as a member of the German Bundestag, and also a member of the Council of Europe, that this hoax was brought to an end before it would lead to even more serious consequences.

Fast forward to March of 2020, when the German Bundestag announced an Epidemic Situation of National Importance, which is the German equivalent of a pandemic in March of 2020 and, based on this, the lockdown with the suspension of all essential constitutional rights for an unforeseeable time, there was only one single opinion on which the Federal Government in Germany based its decision. In an outrageous violation of the universally accepted principle "*audiatur et altera pars*", which means that one must also hear the other side, the only person they listened to was Mr. Drosten.

That is the very person whose horrific, panic-inducing prognoses had proved to be catastrophically false 12 years earlier. We know this because a whistleblower named David Sieber, a member of the Green Party, told us about it. He did so first on August 29, 2020 in Berlin, in the context of an event at which Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. also took part, and at which both men gave speeches. And he did so afterwards in one of the sessions of our Corona Committee.

The reason he did this is that he had become increasingly sceptical about the official narrative propagated by politicians and the mainstream media. He had therefore undertaken an effort to find out about other scientists' opinions and had found them on the Internet. There, he realized that there were a number of highly renowned scientists who held a completely different opinion, which contradicted the horrific prognoses of Mr. Drosten. They assumed – and still do assume – that there was no disease that went beyond the gravity of the seasonal flu, that the population had already acquired cross- or T-cell immunity against this allegedly new virus, and that there was therefore no reason for any special measures, and certainly not for vaccinations.

These scientists include **Professor John Ioannidis** of Stanford University in California, a specialist in statistics and epidemiology, as well as public health, and at the same time the most quoted scientist in the world; **Professor Michael Levitt**, Nobel prize-winner for chemistry and also a biophysicist at Stanford University; the German professors **Kary Mölling**, **Sucharit Bhakti**, **Klud Wittkowski**, as well as **Stefan Homburg**; and now many, many more scientists and doctors worldwide, including Dr. Mike Yeadon. Dr. Mike Yeadon is the former Vice-President and Scientific Director of Pfizer, one of the largest pharmaceutical companies in the world. I will talk some more about him a little later.

### **[The Covid-19 Numbers Game: The "Second Wave" is Based on Fake Statistics](#)**

At the end of March, beginning of April of 2020, Mr. Sieber turned to the leadership of his Green Party with the knowledge he had accumulated, and suggested that they present these other scientific opinions to the public and explain that, contrary to Mr. Drosten's doomsday prophecies, there was no reason for the public to panic. Incidentally, Lord Sumption, who served as a judge at the British supreme court from 2012 to 2018, had done the very same thing at the very same time and had come to the very same conclusion: that there was no factual basis for panic and no legal basis for the corona measures.

Likewise, the former President of the German federal constitutional court expressed – albeit more cautiously – serious doubts that the corona measures were constitutional. But instead of taking note of these other opinions and discussing them with David Sieber, the Green Party leadership declared that Mr. Drosten's panic messages were good enough for the Green Party. Remember, they're not a member of the ruling coalition; they're the opposition. Still, that was enough for them, just as it had been good enough for the Federal Government as a basis for its lockdown decision, they said. They subsequently, the Green Party leadership called David Sieber a conspiracy theorist, without ever having considered the content of his information, and then stripped him of his mandates.

Now let's take a look at the current actual situation regarding the virus's danger, the complete uselessness of PCR tests for the detection of infections, and the lockdowns based on non-existent infections. In the meantime, we know that the health care systems were never in danger of becoming overwhelmed by Covid-19. On the contrary, many hospitals remain empty to this day and some are now facing bankruptcy. The hospital ship *Comfort*, which anchored in New York at the time, and could have accommodated a thousand patients, never accommodated more than some 20 patients. Nowhere was there any excess mortality. Studies carried out by Professor Ioannidis and others have shown that the mortality of corona is equivalent to that of the seasonal flu. Even the pictures from Bergamo and New York that were used to demonstrate to the world that panic was in order proved to be deliberately misleading.

Then, the so-called "Panic Paper" was leaked, which was written by the German Department of the Interior. Its classified content shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that, in fact, the population was deliberately driven to panic by politicians and mainstream media. The accompanying irresponsible statements of the Head of the RKI – remember the [German] CDC – Mr. Wieler, who repeatedly and excitedly announced that the corona measures must be followed unconditionally by the population without them asking any question, shows that that he followed the script verbatim. In his public statements, he kept announcing that the situation was very grave and threatening, although the figures compiled by his own Institute proved the exact opposite. Among other things, the "Panic Paper" calls for children to be made to feel responsible – and I quote – "for the painful tortured death of their parents and grandparents if they do not follow the corona rules", that is, if they do not wash their hands constantly and don't stay away from their grandparents. A word of clarification: in Bergamo, the vast majority of deaths, 94% to be exact, turned out to be the result not of Covid-19, but rather the consequence of the government deciding to transfer sick patients, sick with probably the cold or seasonal flu, from hospitals to nursing homes in order to make room at the hospitals for all the Covid patients, who ultimately never arrived. There, at the nursing homes, they then infected old people with a severely weakened immune system, usually as a result of pre-existing medical conditions. In addition, a flu vaccination, which had previously been administered, had further weakened the immune systems of the people in the nursing homes. In New York, only some, but by far not all hospitals were overwhelmed. Many people, most of whom were again elderly and had serious pre-existing medical conditions, and most of whom, had it not been for the panic-mongering, would have just stayed at home to recover, raced to the hospitals. There, many of them fell victim to healthcare-associated infections (or nosocomial infections) on the one hand, and incidents of malpractice on the other hand, for example, by being put on a respirator rather than receiving oxygen through an oxygen mask. Again, to clarify: Covid-19, this is the current state of affairs, is a dangerous disease, just like the seasonal flu is a dangerous disease. And of course, Covid-19, just like the seasonal flu, may sometimes take a severe clinical course and will sometimes kill patients.

However, as autopsies have shown, which were carried out in Germany in particular, by the forensic scientist Professor Klaus Püschel in Hamburg, the fatalities he examined had almost all been caused by serious pre-existing conditions, and almost all of the people who had died had

died at the very at a very old age, just like in Italy, meaning they had lived beyond their average life expectancy.

In this context, the following should also be mentioned: the German RKI – that is, again the equivalent of the CDC – had initially, strangely enough, recommended that no autopsies be performed. And there are numerous credible reports that doctors and hospitals worldwide had been paid money for declaring a deceased person a victim of Covid-19 rather than writing down the true cause of death on the death certificate, for example a heart attack or a gunshot wound. Without the autopsies, we would never know that the overwhelming majority of the alleged Covid19 victims had died of completely different diseases, but not of Covid-19. The assertion that the lockdown was necessary because there were so many different infections with SARS-COV-2, and because the healthcare systems would be overwhelmed is wrong for three reasons, as we have learned from the hearings we conducted with the Corona Committee, and from other data that has become available in the meantime:

A. The lockdown was imposed when the virus was already retreating. By the time the lockdown was imposed, the alleged infection rates were already dropping again.

B. There's already protection from the virus because of cross- or T-cell immunity. Apart from the above mentioned lockdown being imposed when the infection rates were already dropping, there is also cross- or T-cell immunity in the general population against the corona viruses contained in every flu or influenza wave. This is true, even if this time around, a slightly different strain of the coronavirus was at work. And that is because the body's own immune system remembers every virus it has ever battled in the past, and from this experience, it also recognizes a supposedly new, but still similar, strain of the virus from the corona family. Incidentally, that's how the PCR test for the detection of an infection was invented by now infamous Professor Drosten.

At the beginning of January of 2020, based on this very basic knowledge, Mr. Drosten developed his PCR test, which supposedly detects an infection with SARS-COV-2, without ever having seen the real Wuhan virus from China, only having learned from social media reports that there was something going on in Wuhan, he started tinkering on his computer with what would become *his* corona PCR test. For this, he used an old SARS virus, hoping it would be sufficiently similar to the allegedly new strain of the coronavirus found in Wuhan. Then, he sent the result of his computer tinkering to China to determine whether the victims of the alleged new coronavirus tested positive. They did.

And that was enough for the World Health Organization to sound the pandemic alarm and to recommend the worldwide use of the Drosten PCR test for the detection of infections with the virus now called SARS-COV-2. Drosten's opinion and advice was – this must be emphasized once again – the only source for the German government when it announced the lockdown as well as the rules for social distancing and the mandatory wearing of masks. And – this must also be emphasized once again – Germany apparently became the center of especially massive lobbying by the pharmaceutical and tech industry because the world, with reference to the allegedly disciplined Germans, should do as the Germans do in order to survive the pandemic.

C. And this is the most important part of our fact-finding: **the PCR test is being used on the basis of false statements, NOT based on scientific facts with respect to infections.** In the meantime, we have learned that these PCR tests, contrary to the assertions of Messrs. Drosten, Wieler and the WHO, do NOT give any indication of an infection with any virus, let alone an infection with SARS-COV-2. Not only are PCR tests expressly not approved for diagnostic purposes, as is correctly noted on leaflets coming with these tests, and as the inventor of the PCR test, Kary Mullis, has repeatedly emphasized. Instead, they're simply incapable of diagnosing any disease. That is: contrary to the assertions of Drosten, Wieler and the WHO, which they have been making since the proclamation of the pandemic, a positive PCR-test result does not mean

that an infection is present. If someone tests positive, it does NOT mean that they're infected with anything, let alone with the contagious SARS-COV-2 virus.

Even the United States CDC, even this institution agrees with this, and I quote directly from page 38 of one of its publications on the coronavirus and the PCR tests, dated July 13, 2020. First bullet point says:

*"Detection of viral RNA may not indicate the presence of infectious virus or that 2019 nCoV [novel coronavirus] is the causative agent for clinical symptoms."* Second bullet point says:

*"The performance of this test has not been established for monitoring treatment of 2019 nCoV infection."*

Third bullet point says: *"This test cannot rule out diseases caused by other bacterial or viral pathogens."*

**It is still not clear whether there has ever been a scientifically correct isolation of the Wuhan virus**, so that nobody knows exactly what we're looking for when we test, especially since this virus, just like the flu viruses, mutates quickly. **The PCR swabs take one or two sequences of a molecule that are invisible to the human eye and therefore need to be amplified in many cycles to make it visible.** Everything over 35 cycles is – as reported by the *New York Times* and others – considered completely unreliable and scientifically unjustifiable. However, **the Drosten test, as well as the WHO-recommended tests that followed his example, are set to 45 cycles.** Can that be because of the desire to produce as many positive results as possible and thereby provide the basis for the false assumption that a large number of infections have been detected?

The test cannot distinguish inactive and reproductive matter. **That means that a positive result may happen because the test detects, for example, a piece of debris, a fragment of a molecule, which may signal nothing else than that the immune system of the person tested won a battle with a common cold in the past.** Even Drosten himself declared in an interview with a German business magazine in 2014, at that time concerning the alleged detection of an infection with the MERS virus, allegedly with the help of the PCR test, that these PCR tests are so highly sensitive that even very healthy and non-infectious people *may test positive*. At that time, he also became very much aware of the powerful role of a panic and fear-mongering media, as you'll see at the end of the following quote. He said then, in this interview: *"If, for example, such a pathogen scurries over the nasal mucosa of a nurse for a day or so without her getting sick or noticing anything, then she's suddenly a MERS case. This could also explain the explosion of case numbers in Saudi Arabia. In addition, the media there have made this into an incredible sensation."*

Has he forgotten this? Or is he deliberately concealing this in the corona context because corona is a very lucrative business opportunity for the pharmaceutical industry as a whole? And for Mr. Alford Lund, his co-author in many studies and also a PCR-test producer. In my view, it is completely implausible that he forgot in 2020 what he knew about the PCR tests and told the business magazine in 2014.

In short, this test cannot detect any infection, contrary to all false claims stating that it can. An infection, a so-called "hot" infection, requires that the virus, or rather a fragment of a molecule which may be a virus, is not just found somewhere, for example, in the throat of a person without causing any damage – that would be a "cold" infection. Rather, a "hot" infection requires that the virus penetrates into the cells, replicates there and causes symptoms such as headaches or a sore throat. Only then is a person really infected in the sense of a "hot" infection, because only then is a person contagious, that is, able to infect others. Until then, it is completely harmless for both the host and all other people that the host comes into contact with.

**Once again, this means that positive test results, contrary to all other claims by Drosten, Wieler, or the WHO, mean nothing with respect to infections, as even the CDC knows, as quoted above.**

Meanwhile, a number of highly respected scientists worldwide assume that there has never been a corona pandemic, but only a **PCR-test pandemic**. This is the conclusion reached by many German scientists, such as professors Bhakti, Reiss, Mölling, Hockertz, Walach and many others, including the above-mentioned Professor John Ioannidis, and the Nobel laureate, Professor Michael Levitt from Stanford University.

The most recent such opinion is that of the aforementioned **Dr. Mike Yeadon**, a former VicePresident and Chief Science Officer at Pfizer, who held this position for 16 years. He and his coauthors, all well-known scientists, published a scientific paper in September of 2020 and he wrote a corresponding magazine article on September 20, 2020. Among other things, he and they state – and I quote:

“We’re basing our government policy, our economic policy, and the policy of restricting fundamental rights, presumably on completely wrong data and assumptions about the coronavirus. If it weren’t for the test results that are constantly reported in the media, the pandemic would be over because nothing really happened. Of course, there are some serious individual cases of illness, but there are also some in every flu epidemic. There was a real wave of disease in March and April, but since then, everything has gone back to normal. Only the positive results rise and sink wildly again and again, depending on how many tests are carried out. But the real cases of illnesses are over. There can be no talk of a second wave. The allegedly new strain of the coronavirus is ...” – Dr. Yeadon continues

–  
“... only new in that it is a new type of the long-known corona virus. There are at least four coronaviruses that are endemic and cause some of the common colds we experience, especially in winter. They all have a striking sequence similarity to the coronavirus, and because the human immune system recognizes the similarity to the virus that has now allegedly been newly discovered, a T-cell immunity has long existed in this respect. 30 per cent of the population had this before the allegedly new virus even appeared. Therefore, it is sufficient for the so-called herd immunity that 15 to 25 per cent of the population are infected with the allegedly new coronavirus to stop the further spread of the virus. And this has long been the case.”

Regarding the all-important PCR tests, Yeadon writes, in a piece called *“Lies, Damned Lies and Health Statistics: The Deadly Danger of False Positives”*, dated September 20, 2020, and I quote *“The likelihood of an apparently positive case being a false positive is between 89 to 94 per cent, or near certainty.”*

Dr. Yeadon, in agreement with the professors of immunology Kamera from Germany, Kappel from the Netherlands, and Cahill from Ireland, as well as the microbiologist Dr. Arve from Austria, all of whom testified before the German Corona Committee, explicitly points out that a positive test does not mean that an intact virus has been found.

The authors explain that what the PCR test actually measures is – and I quote:

*“Simply the presence of partial RNA sequences present in the intact virus, which could be a piece of dead virus, which cannot make the subject sick, and cannot be transmitted, and cannot make anyone else sick.”*

Because of the complete unsuitability of the test for the detection of infectious diseases – tested positive in goats, sheep, papayas and even chicken wings – Oxford Professor Carl Heneghan, Director of the Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine, writes that the Covid virus would never disappear if this test practice were to be continued, but would always be falsely detected in much of what is tested. Lockdowns, as Yeadon and his colleagues found out, do not work. Sweden, with its laissez-faire approach, and Great Britain, with its strict lockdown, for example, have completely comparable disease and mortality statistics. The same was found by US scientists concerning the different US states. It makes no difference to the incidence of disease whether a state implements a lockdown or not.

With regard to the now infamous Imperial College of London's Professor Neil Ferguson and his completely false computer models warning of millions of deaths, he says that – and I quote: “*No serious scientist gives any validity to Ferguson's model.*” He points out with thinly veiled contempt – again I quote:

“*It's important that you know, most scientists don't accept that it ...*” – that is, Ferguson's model – “*was even faintly right. But the government is still wedded to the model.*” Ferguson predicted 40 thousand corona deaths in Sweden by May and 100 thousand by June, but it remained at 5,800 which, according to the Swedish authorities, is equivalent to a mild flu. If the PCR tests had not been used as a diagnostic tool for corona infections, there would not be a pandemic and there would be no lockdowns, but everything would have been perceived as just a medium or light wave of influenza, these scientists conclude. Dr. Yeadon in his piece, “*Lies, Damned Lies and Health Statistics: The Deadly Danger of False Positives*,” writes: “*This test is fatally flawed and must immediately be withdrawn and never used again in this setting, unless shown to be fixed.*” And, towards the end of that article, “*I have explained how a hopelessly performing diagnostic test has been, and continues to be used, not for diagnosis of disease, but it seems solely to create fear*”.

Now let's take a look at the current actual situation regarding the severe damage caused by the lockdowns and other measures. Another detailed paper, written by a German official in the Department of the Interior, who is responsible for risk assessment and the protection of the population against risks, was leaked recently. It is now called the “False Alarm” paper. This paper comes to the conclusion that there was that there was and is no sufficient evidence for serious health risks for the population as claimed by Drosten, Wieler and the WHO, but – the author says – there's very much evidence of the corona measures causing gigantic health and economic damage to the population, which he then describes in detail in this paper. This, he concludes, will lead to very high claims for damages, which the government will be held responsible for. This has now become reality, but the paper's author was suspended.

More and more scientists, but also lawyers, recognize that, as a result of the deliberate panicmongering, and the corona measures enabled by this panic, democracy is in great danger of being replaced by fascist totalitarian models. As I already mentioned above, in Australia, people who do not wear the masks, which more and more studies show, are hazardous to health, or who allegedly do not wear them correctly, are arrested, handcuffed and thrown into jail. In the Philippines, they run the risk of getting shot, but even in Germany and in other previously civilized countries, children are taken away from their parents if they do not comply with quarantine regulations, distance regulations, and mask-wearing regulations. According to psychologists and psychotherapists who testified before the Corona Committee, children are traumatized en masse, with the worst psychological consequences yet to be expected in the medium- and long-term. In Germany alone, to bankruptcies are expected in the fall to strike small- and medium-sized businesses, which form the backbone of the economy. This will result in incalculable tax losses and incalculably high and long-term social security money transfers for – among other things – unemployment benefits.

Since, in the meantime, pretty much everybody is beginning to understand the full devastating impact of the completely unfounded corona measures, I will refrain from detailing this any further. Let me now give you a summary of the legal consequences. The most difficult part of a lawyer's work is always to establish the true facts, not the application of the legal rules to these facts. Unfortunately, a German lawyer does not learn this at law school but his Anglo-American counterparts do get the necessary training for this at *their* law schools. And probably for this reason, but also because of the much more pronounced independence of the Anglo-American judiciary, the Anglo-American law of evidence is much more effective in practice than the German one. A court of law can only decide a legal dispute correctly if it has previously determined the facts correctly, which is not possible without looking at all the evidence. And that's why the law of evidence is so important.

On the basis of the facts summarized above, in particular those established with the help of the work of the German Corona Committee, the legal evaluation is actually simple. It is simple for all civilized legal systems, regardless of whether these legal systems are based on civil law, which follows the Roman law more closely, or whether they are based on Anglo-American common law, which is only loosely connected to Roman law.

Let's first take a look at the unconstitutionality of the measures. A number of German law professors, including professors Kingreen, Morswig, Jungbluth and Vosgerau have stated, either in written expert opinions or in interviews, in line with the serious doubts expressed by the former president of the federal constitutional court with respect to the constitutionality of the corona measures, that these measures – the corona measures – are without a sufficient factual basis, and also without a sufficient legal basis, and are therefore unconstitutional and must be repealed immediately. Very recently, a judge, Thorsten Schleif is his name, declared publicly that the German judiciary, just like the general public, has been so panic-stricken that it was no longer able to administer justice properly. He says that the courts of law – and I quote – “have all too quickly waved through coercive measures which, for millions of people all over Germany, represent massive suspensions of their constitutional rights. He points out that German citizens – again I quote – “are currently experiencing the most serious encroachment on their constitutional rights since the founding of the federal republic of Germany in 1949”. In order to contain the corona pandemic, federal and state governments have intervened, he says, massively, and in part threatening the very existence of the country as it is guaranteed by the constitutional rights of the people.

What about fraud, intentional infliction of damage and crimes against humanity?

Based on the rules of criminal law, **asserting false facts concerning the PCR tests or intentional misrepresentation**, as it was committed by Messrs. Drosten, Wieler and WHO, as well as the WHO, can *only* be assessed as fraud. Based on the rules of civil tort law, this translates into intentional infliction of damage. The German professor of civil law, Martin Schwab, supports this finding in public interviews. In a comprehensive legal opinion of around 180 pages, he has familiarized himself with the subject matter like no other legal scholar has done thus far and, in particular, has provided a detailed account of the complete failure of the mainstream media to report on the true facts of this so-called pandemic. Messrs. Drosten, Wieler and Tedros of the WHO all knew, based on their own expertise or the expertise of their institutions, that the PCR tests cannot provide any information about infections, but asserted over and over again to the general public that they can, with their counterparts all over the world repeating this. And they all knew and accepted that, on the basis of their recommendations, the governments of the world would decide on lockdowns, the rules for social distancing, and mandatory wearing of masks, the latter representing a *very serious health hazard*, as more and more independent studies and expert statements show. Under the rules of civil tort law, all those who have been harmed by these PCRtest-induced lockdowns are entitled to receive full compensation for their losses. In particular, there is a duty to compensate – that is, a duty to pay damages for the loss of profits suffered by companies and self-employed employed persons as a result of the lockdown and other measures. In the meantime, however, the anti-corona measures have caused, and continue to cause, such devastating damage to the world population's health and economy that the crimes committed by Messrs. Drosten, Wieler and the WHO *must be legally qualified as actual crimes against humanity*, as defined in section 7 of the International Criminal Code.

How can we do something? What can we do? Well, the class action is the best route to compensatory damages and to political consequences. The so-called class action lawsuit is based on English law and exists today in the USA and in Canada. It enables a court of law to allow a complaint for damages to be tried as a class action lawsuit at the request of a plaintiff if:

1. As a result of a damage-inducing event ...
2. A large number of people suffer the same type of damage.

Phrased differently, a judge can allow a class-action lawsuit to go forward if common questions of law and fact make up the vital component of the lawsuit. Here, the common questions of law and fact revolve around the worldwide PCR-test-based lockdowns and its consequences. Just like the VW diesel passenger cars were functioning products, but they were defective due to a so-called defeat device because they didn't comply with the emissions standards, so too the PCR tests – which are perfectly good products in other settings – are defective products when it comes to the diagnosis of infections. Now, if an American or Canadian company or an American or Canadian individual decides to sue these persons in the United States or Canada for damages, then the court called upon to resolve this dispute may, upon request, allow this complaint to be tried as a class action lawsuit.

If this happens, all affected parties worldwide will be informed about this through publications in the mainstream media and will thus have the opportunity to join this class action within a certain period of time, to be determined by the court. It should be emphasized that nobody *must* join the class action, but every injured party *can* join the class.

The advantage of the class action is that *only one trial is needed*, namely to try the complaint of a representative plaintiff who is affected in a manner typical of everyone else in the class. This is, firstly, cheaper, and secondly, faster than hundreds of thousands or more individual lawsuits. And thirdly, it imposes less of a burden on the courts. Fourthly, as a rule it allows a much more precise examination of the accusations than would be possible in the context of hundreds of thousands, or more likely in this corona setting, even millions of individual lawsuits.

In particular, the well-established and proven Anglo-American law of evidence, with its pre-trial discovery, is applicable. This requires that all evidence relevant for the determination of the lawsuit is put on the table. In contrast to the typical situation in German lawsuits with structural imbalance, that is, lawsuits involving on the one hand a consumer, and on the other hand a powerful corporation, the withholding or even destruction of evidence is not without consequence; rather the party withholding or even destroying evidence loses the case under these evidence rules.

Here in Germany, a group of tort lawyers have banded together to help their clients with recovery of damages. They have provided all relevant information and forms for German plaintiffs to both estimate how much damage they have suffered and join the group or class of plaintiffs who will later join the class action when it goes forward either in Canada or the US. Initially, this group of lawyers had considered to also collect and manage the claims for damages of other, non-German plaintiffs, but this proved to be unmanageable.

However, through an international lawyers' network, which is growing larger by the day, the German group of attorneys provides to all of their colleagues in all other countries, free of charge, all relevant information, including expert opinions and testimonies of experts showing that the PCR tests cannot detect infections. And they also provide them with all relevant information as to how they can prepare and bundle the claims for damages of their clients so that, they too, can assert their clients' claims for damages, either in their home country's courts of law, or within the framework of the class action, as explained above.

These scandalous corona facts, gathered mostly by the Corona Committee and summarized above, are the very same facts that will soon be proven to be true either in one court of law, or in many courts of law all over the world.

These are the facts that will pull the masks off the faces of all those responsible for these crimes. To the politicians who believe those corrupt people, these facts are hereby offered as a lifeline that can help you readjust your course of action, and start the long overdue public scientific discussion, and not go down with those charlatans and criminals. Thank you.

\*

*Featured image is from Pixabay*

The original source of this article is [Dr. Reiner Fuellmich](#)

Copyright © [Reiner Fuellmich](#), [Dr. Reiner Fuellmich](#), 2020

---

**Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page**

**Become a Member of Global Research**

<https://www.globalresearch.ca/video-crimes-against-humanity-the-german-coronainvestigation/5725795>

## Conclusion Regarding Masks They Do Not Work

By Dr. Sherri Tenpenny, DO, AOBNMM, ABIHM [www.Vaxxter.com](http://www.Vaxxter.com)  
[www.Courses4Mastery.com](http://www.Courses4Mastery.com)

There are NO randomized, controlled trials (RCT) with verified outcomes that show a benefit to healthcare workers or community members for wearing a mask or a respirator. **There is no such definitive study.** Likewise, no study exists that shows a benefit from a broad policy to wear masks in public (documented below).

Furthermore, if there were any benefit to wearing a mask, because of the blocking power against droplets and aerosol particles, then there should be more benefit from wearing a respirator (N95) compared to a surgical mask. There is not. Neither masks nor respirators protect; cloth coverings are essentially worthless.

It should be noted that the surgical masks are primarily designed to protect the environment from the wearer, whereas the respirators are supposed to protect the wearer from the environment. (Balazy, et al).

Coronavirus are <0.125 microns in size. Masks and respirators filter particles 0.30 to 0.80 microns in size. Masks cannot possibly work. No bias-free study has ever found a benefit from wearing a mask or respirator in this application.

### o Public Health Experts Keep Changing: Mask vs No Mask

- **March 15, 2020 - Medical Science News** “Reusing masks may increase your risk of coronavirus infection.” <https://www.news-medical.net/news/20200315/Reusing-masks-may-increase-your-risk-of-coronavirus-infection-expert-says.aspx>
  - ✦ Dr. Jenny Harries, England's deputy chief medical officer, has warned that it was **not a good idea for the public to wear facemasks** as the virus can get trapped in the material and causes infection when the wearer breathes in. "For the average member of the public walking down a street, it is not a good idea," Dr. Harries said.
  - ✦ **March 30, 2020:** WHO Emergencies Press Conference on coronavirus disease [https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/transcripts/who-audioemergenciescoronavirus-press-conference-full-30mar2020.pdf?sfvrsn=6b68bc4a\\_2](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/transcripts/who-audioemergenciescoronavirus-press-conference-full-30mar2020.pdf?sfvrsn=6b68bc4a_2)
  - ✦ at 00:22:39) “We **don't generally recommend the wearing to masks in public by otherwise well individuals** because it has not been up to now associated with any particular benefit...It does have **benefit psychologically**, socially and there are social norms around that and we don't criticize the wearing of masks and have not done so but **there is no specific evidence to suggest that the wearing of masks by the mass population has any particular benefit.** In fact, there's some evidence to suggest the opposite in the misuse of wearing a mask properly or fitting it properly or taking it off and all the other risks that are otherwise associated with that.

- ✦ **March 31, 2020:** <https://www.newsmax.com/us/surgeon-generaladamsmasks/2020/03/31/id/960679/>
- ✦ “You can increase your risk of getting COVID19 by wearing a mask if you are not a health care provider. Folks who don't know how to wear them properly tend to touch their faces a lot and actually **can increase the spread of coronavirus.**”  
-Dr. Jerome Adams, US Surgeon General
- **April 3, 2020:** <https://time.com/5794729/coronavirus-face-masks/>
  - ✦ According to the CDC, wearing a surgical mask **won't stop the wearer from inhaling small airborne particles, which can cause infection.** Nor do these masks form a snug seal around the face.
  - ✦ The CDC recommends surgical masks **only for people who \*already show symptoms\*** of coronavirus and must go outside. Wearing a mask can help prevent spreading the virus by protecting others nearby when you cough or sneeze.
- **May 1, 2020:** Illinois issued an order that a mask will be required in public when social distancing isn't an option.
- **May 27, 2020:** Virginia announced a statewide mask mandate.
- .....and many more states have followed suit.

#### o Healthy persons do not spread illness

- **Leung, Nancy., et al. (2020)** “Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks.” *Nature Medicine* 26, 676-680. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-0200843-2>
  - ✦ “...Among the samples collected without a face mask, we found that the majority of participants with influenza virus and coronavirus infection **did not shed detectable virus in respiratory droplets or aerosols...** given that each exhaled breath collection was conducted for 30 min, this might imply that **prolonged close contact would be required for transmission to occur,** even if transmission was primarily via aerosols..”
- **Gao, Ming. et al.** “A Study of infectivity of asymptomatic SARS-CoV2 carriers.” *Respiratory Medicine*. 2020. Aug: 169:106026 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32513410/> ✦  
455 contacts who were exposed to the asymptomatic COVID-19 virus carrier: 35 patients, 196 family members and 224 hospital staffs. **NONE of the 455 contacts contracted the SARS-CoV-2 infection**

#### o Mask Mandates as Public Policy is a Disaster

- **Klompas, Michael., et al. (2020)** “Universal Masking in Hospitals in the COVID-19 Era.” *NEJM* 2020; 382:e63 <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMp2006372?>
  - ✦ **We know that wearing a mask outside health care facilities offers little,** if any, protection from infection. Public health authorities define a significant exposure to Covid-19 as face-to-face contact within 6 feet with a patient with

symptomatic Covid-19 that is sustained for at least a few minutes (and some say more than 10 minutes or even 30 minutes). **The chance of catching Covid-19 from a passing interaction in a public space is therefore minimal.** In many cases, the desire for widespread masking is a reflexive reaction to anxiety over the pandemic.

- **Brainard, Julii Suzanne, et al.(2020)** “Facemasks and similar barriers to prevent respiratory illness such as COVID-19: A rapid systematic review.” medRxiv 2020.04.01.20049528 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.01.20049528v1>
  - ✦ “There were 31 eligible studies (including 12 RCTs). Based on the RCTs we would conclude that wearing facemasks can be very slightly protective against primary infection from casual community contact, and modestly protective against household infections when both infected and uninfected members wear facemasks. **The evidence is not sufficiently strong to support widespread use of facemasks as a protective measure against COVID-19.**
- **Chandrasekaran, Baskaran. (2020)** “Exercise with facemask: Are we handling a devil’s sword?” – a physiological hypothesis. *Med Hypotheses*. Nov; 144:11002. 2020 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7306735/>
  - ✦ Exercising with facemasks may reduce available Oxygen and increase air trapping preventing substantial carbon dioxide exchange. The hypercapnic hypoxia may potentially increase acidic environment, cardiac overload, anaerobic metabolism and renal overload, which may substantially aggravate the underlying pathology of established chronic diseases. Further contrary to the earlier thought, **no evidence exists to claim the facemasks during exercise offer additional protection from the droplet transfer of the virus.**
- **Tam, Victor CW et al (2020)** “A reality check on the use of face masks during the COVID 19 outbreak in Hong Kong.” *EClinicalMedicine*. 2020 May; 22:100356
  - ✦ In our study, 94.8% wore masks of which 83.7% wore disposable surgical masks. However, 13.0% wore them incorrectly: with 35.5% worn ‘inside-out’ or ‘upside-down’; and 42.5% worn too low, exposing the nostrils or mouth. Packaging of different brands of surgical mask sold locally were examined; very few provided instructions on correct usage. **[NOTE: IF NOT worn correctly, there are doing nothing and should not be worn at all.]**

#### o Particle Size: The Key to it All

- **Zhu, Na, et al. (2020).** “A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019” *N Engl J Med* 2020; 382:727-733. <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/nejmoa2001017>
  - ✦ Scientists were at a consensus that the diameter of the 2019-nCoV particles were **0.06 to 0.14 microns in size.** Most N95 and N99 face masks can filter out 0.30 microns. **Airborne coronavirus particle (<0.125 micron) will pass directly through a N95 face mask.**

- **Balazy, Anna, et al. (2006).** “Do N95 respirators provide 95% protection level against airborne viruses, and how adequate are surgical masks?” *Am J Infect Control*. 2006 Mar;34(2):51-7.
  - ✦ The N95 filtering face piece respirators may not provide the expected protection level **against small virions**. As anticipated, the tested surgical masks showed a much higher particle penetration because they are known to be less efficient than the N95 respirators. **Some surgical masks may let a significant fraction of airborne viruses penetrate through their filters**, providing very low protection against aerosolized infectious agents in the size range of 10 to 80 nm.
- **Isaacs, David, et al. (2020)** “Do Facemasks protect against COVID-19?” *J. of Pediatric and Child Health*, June. 56(6): 976-977.  
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7323223/>
  - § “The **questionable benefits** arguably **do not justify health-care staff wearing surgical masks** when treating low-risk patients and may impede the normal caring relationship between patients, parents and staff. We counsel against such practice, at least at present.”
- **Jacobs, J. L. et al. (2009)** “Use of **surgical face masks** to reduce the incidence of the common cold among health care workers in Japan: A randomized controlled trial,” *American Journal of Infection Control*, Volume 37, Issue 5, 417-419. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19216002>
  - § N95-masked health-care workers (HCW) were significantly more likely to experience headaches. **Face mask use in HCW was not demonstrated to provide benefit in terms of cold symptoms or getting colds.**
- **Smith, J.D. et al. (2016)** “Effectiveness of N95 respirators versus surgical masks in protecting health care workers from acute respiratory infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis,” *CMAJ* Mar 2016 <https://www.cmaj.ca/content/188/8/567>
  - § “We identified six clinical studies ...we found **no significant difference** between N95 respirators and surgical masks in associated risk of (a) laboratory-confirmed respiratory infection, (b) influenza-like illness, or (c) reported work-place absenteeism.”
- **Balazy, Anna, et al. (2006).** “Do N95 respirators provide 95% protection level against airborne viruses, and how adequate are surgical masks?” *Am J Infect Control*. 2006 Mar;34(2):51-7.
  - § The N95 filtering face piece respirators may not provide the expected protection level **against small virions**. As anticipated, the tested surgical masks showed a much higher particle penetration because they are known to be less efficient than the N95 respirators. **Some surgical masks may let a significant fraction of airborne viruses penetrate through their filters**, providing very low protection against aerosolized infectious agents in the size range of 10 to 80 nm.

o Cloth masks

- **MacIntyre, C Raina, et al.** “A cluster randomized trial of cloth masks compared with medical masks in healthcare workers.” *BMJ Open* 2015; 5:e006577.  
<https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/5/4/e006577.full>
  - ✦ “Cloth masks also had significantly higher rates of influenza-like illness. Penetration of **viral particles through a cloth mask was almost 97%**”
- **Rengasamy, Samy, et al.** “Simple Respiratory Protection – Evaluation of the filtration performance of cloth masks and common fabric materials against 20-1000nm size particles”  
*The Annals of Occupational Hygiene*, Vol 54, Issue 7, Oct 2010. Pg 789-798  
<https://academic.oup.com/annweh/article/54/7/789/202744>
  - ✦ Results obtained show that common fabric materials provide **marginal protection** against nanoparticles including those in the size ranges of viruscontaining particles in exhaled breath.
- **Shakya, Kabindra M, et al.** “Evaluating the efficacy of cloth facemasks in reducing particulate matter exposure.” *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol.* 2017;27(3):352-357.  
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27531371/>
  - ✦ “Our results suggest that cloth masks are only marginally beneficial in protecting individuals from particles <2.5 µm (**Note: coronaviruses are between .05 and 0.2 microns**)
- **MMWR: Weekly** / July 17, 2020 / 69(28);930-932  
[https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6928e2.htm?s\\_cid=mm6928e2\\_w](https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6928e2.htm?s_cid=mm6928e2_w)
  - ✦ At salon X in Springfield, Missouri, two stylists with COVID-19 symptoms worked closely with 139 clients before receiving diagnoses of COVID-19, and **none** of their clients developed COVID-19 symptoms. 67 were tested; 67 specimens were positive. Close contacts because ill; apparently everyone recovered uneventfully. **CONCLUSION:** 1) Exposure isn't illness and 2) positive tests isn't illness

o Wearing a mask blocks oxygen

- Wearing a mask is hazardous to your health.  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZqRL1GXu5DE>
- **Kao, Tze-Wah, et al. (2004).** The physiological impact of wearing an N95 mask during hemodialysis as a precaution against SARS in patients with end-stage renal disease.” *J Formos Med Asso.* 2004 Aug;103(8):624-8

- ✦ Thirty-nine patients (mean age, 57.2 yrs) in the study. 70% showed a reduction in partial pressure of oxygen (PaO<sub>2</sub>), and 19% developed various degrees of hypoxemia. Wearing an N95 mask significantly **reduced the PaO<sub>2</sub> level, increased the respiratory rate, increased chest discomfort, and respiratory distress**. Wearing an N95 mask for **4 hours** during HD significantly reduced PaO<sub>2</sub> and increased respiratory adverse effects in ESRD patients. **[DOES THIS DO THE SAME IN OTHER PATIENTS WITH HEALTH CONDITIONS?]**
- **OSHA documents:** <https://www.osha.gov/laws-regs/standardinterpretations/2007-04-02-0>
  - ✦ “People begin to suffer adverse health effects when the oxygen level of their breathing air drops below 19.5 percent oxygen. The rule-making record for the Respiratory Protection Standard clearly justifies adopting the requirement that air breathed by employees must have an **oxygen content of at least 19.5 percent**.
- **Beder, A et al. (2008)** “Preliminary report on surgical mask induced deoxygenation during major surgery.” *Neurocirugia (Astur)* 2008 Apr;19(2):121-6. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18500410/>
  - ✦ A study on 53 surgeons using a pulse oximeter pre and postoperatively. **Pulse rates increased and SpO<sub>2</sub> decrease after the first hour**. Since a very small decrease in saturation at this level, reflects a large decrease in PaO<sub>2</sub>, our findings may have a clinical value for the health workers and the surgeons. **[NOTE: SpO<sub>2</sub> {O<sub>2</sub> sat} is the saturation of hemoglobin with oxygen measured with a pulse oximeter. PaO<sub>2</sub> is amount of oxygen in the blood, determined by an arterial blood sample. Once the O<sub>2</sub> sat falls below 90%, the PaO<sub>2</sub> drops quickly into the dangerously hypoxic.**

o Wearing a mask increases CO<sub>2</sub> – leading to cognitive dysfunction

- **Zheng, Guo-ying, et al. (2008)** “Chronic hypoxia-hypercapnia influences cognitive function: a possible new model of cognitive dysfunction in COPD.” *Med Hypotheses*. 2008;71(1):111-3 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18331781/> o “We propose that cognitive impairment is strongly related to combination of chronic hypoxia and hypercapnia.”

o The psychological impact of mask wearing

- **TIME MAGAZINE (2020)** “Public Health Experts Keep Changing Their Guidance on Whether or Not to Wear Face Masks for Coronavirus.” <https://time.com/5794729/coronavirus-face-masks/>
  - ✦ Lynn Bufka, a clinical psychologist and senior director for practice, research and policy at the American Psychological Association, suspects that people are clinging to masks for the same reason they knock on wood or avoid walking under ladders. **“Even if experts are saying it’s really not going to make a difference, a little [part of] people’s brains is thinking, well, it’s not going to hurt. Maybe it’ll cut my risk just a little bit, so it’s worth it to wear a**

mask,” she says. In that sense, **wearing a mask is a “superstitious behavior.”**  
<https://time.com/5794729/coronavirus-face-masks/>

- **Potts, Susan Claire.** “The Cult of the Mask.”  
<https://remnantnewspaper.com/web/index.php/articles/item/4927-the-cult-of-the-mask>
  - ✦ When people hide their faces, they feel they *belong* to something. They can show their solidarity with the whole human race. They can feel *good about themselves*. They can keep people *safe*. They can *make a difference*. **The freedom of the open-faced is seen as a threat to their safety and, more significantly, to their sense of commitment to a great cause.** Currently, the weapons are psychological—shame, ostracism.
- **Klompas, Michael., et al. (2020)** “Universal Masking in Hospitals in the COVID-19 Era.” NEJM 2020; 382:e63 <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMp2006372>
- § One might argue that fear and anxiety are better countered with data and education than with **a marginally beneficial mask**, particularly in light of the worldwide mask shortage, but it is difficult to get clinicians to hear this message in the heat of the current crisis. **Expanded masking protocols’ greatest contribution may be to reduce the transmission of anxiety**, over and above whatever role they may play in reducing transmission of Covid-19.

#### o Masks dehumanize us

- **Foley, Gretchen N, et al. (2010)** “Nonverbal Communication in Psychotherapy.” *Psychiatry* (Edgmont). June 7(6):38-44  
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2898840/> ✦ An estimated 60 to 65 percent of interpersonal communication is **conveyed via nonverbal behaviors.**
  - ✦ Masks distort the structure of the face. The lower part of their face is disguised. Identity is concealed. No non-verbal cues or emotion is communicated to a fellow human being can be discerned; **all facial communication is hidden under the mask.**

+++++

### Four Key Reasons Why People Choose to Not Wear a Mask

<https://www.medicalnewstoday.com/articles/covid-19-and-face-masks-to-wear-or-not-to-wear#1.Masks-offer-no-protection-to-the-wearer>

1. Masks offer no protection to the wearer
  - a. *Masks are not an effective way of protection from the new coronavirus, only N95 are, and masks have disclaimers saying they cannot prevent someone from acquiring the new coronavirus*
2. Evidence is lacking that masks protect anyone: the wearer or the public
  - a. *See the references above*
3. Masks increase the risk of contracting an infection: COVID19 or others
  - a. *Masks can become contaminated very quickly, and every time the wearer breathes in, they inhale contaminants*
4. Masks might harm the wearer
  - a. *Masks limit oxygen intake and increase carbon dioxide (CO2)*
  - b. *Masks are dangerous for people with certain health conditions (COPD, asthma), as they may restrict breathing*
    - i. The WHO acknowledge that people living with asthma, chronic respiratory conditions, or breathing problems may experience difficulties when wearing face masks.
    - ii. The CDC recommend that anyone who has trouble breathing should not wear a face covering.

+++++

#### BEST REFERENCES:

1. "No one has died of coronavirus." <https://www.globalresearch.ca/no-one-has-died-coronavirus/5717668>
2. "Masks don't work." <https://www.rcreader.com/commentary/masks-dont-work-covid-areview-of-science-relevant-to-covide-19-social-policy>
3. "Asymptomatic carriers don't spread infection." <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7219423/>
4. "Exposure doesn't mean death; doesn't even mean illness." [https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6928e2.htm?s\\_cid=mm6928e2\\_w](https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/mm6928e2.htm?s_cid=mm6928e2_w)
5. "Masks for all not based on sound data." <https://www.cidrap.umn.edu/newsperspective/2020/04/commentary-masks-all-covid-19-not-based-sound-data>
6. "COVID19- PCR testing is Scientifically Meaningless" <https://offguardian.org/2020/06/27/covid19-pcr-tests-are-scientifically-meaningless/>



Division of Corporations, State Records and Uniform Commercial Code

New York State Department of State DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, STATE RECORDS AND UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE One Commerce Plaza 99 Washington Ave. Albany, NY 12231-0001 www.dos.ny.gov

State Employee Oath/Affirmation

(TYPE ALL INFORMATION -- SIGN IN BLACK INK)

Name of Appointee: (Last Name) (First Name) (Middle Initial) STATE OF NEW YORK ) COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_ ) ss.:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the constitution of the United States, and the constitution of the State of New York, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of

Title of Position: \_\_\_\_\_

Agency Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Agency Code: \_\_\_\_\_

according to the best of my ability. X

(Signature of Appointee)

Sworn (or affirmed) before me this day of \_\_\_\_\_, in the year, 20

Notary Public

PUBLIC OFFICERS LAW §78 CERTIFICATE

I, the Appointee named above, hereby acknowledge receipt of a copy of sections 73, 73-a, 74, 75, 76, 77 and 78 of the Public Officers Law, together with such other material related thereto as may have been prepared by the Secretary of State, and I acknowledge that I have read the same and that I undertake to conform to the provisions, purposes and intent thereof and to the norms of conduct for members, officers and employees of the legislature and state agencies.

X (Signature of Appointee) (Date)

(Appointee must sign both the State Employee Oath/Affirmation and the Public Officer's Law §78 Certificate)

## SUMMARY OF THE LEGAL BASIS FOR FACE MASK MANDATES IN NEW YORK

1. The CDC guidelines expressly state that people with breathing problems should NOT wear a mask:

### Who Should Not Wear a Mask

Masks should not be worn by:

- Children younger than 2 years old
- Anyone who has trouble breathing
- Anyone who is unconscious, incapacitated, or otherwise unable to remove the mask without assistance

See: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/cloth-facecover-guidance.html>

2. Governor Cuomo's executive order 202.17, as amended and extended through Executive Order No. 202.34, states as follows:

*"NOW, THEREFORE, I, Andrew M. Cuomo, Governor of the State of New York, by virtue of the authority vested in me by Section 29-a of Article 2-B of the Executive Law to issue any directive during a disaster emergency necessary to cope with the disaster, I hereby issue the following directives for the period from the date of this Executive Order through June 27, 2020:*

*Business operators and building owners, and those authorized on their behalf shall have the discretion to ensure compliance with the directive in Executive Order 202.17 (requiring any individual over age two, and able to medically tolerate a face-covering, be required to cover their nose and mouth with a mask or cloth face-covering when in a public place), including the discretion to deny admittance to individuals who fail to comply with the directive in Executive Order 202.17 or to require or compel their removal if they fail to adhere to such directive, and such owner or operator shall not be subject to a claim of violation of the covenant of quiet enjoyment, or frustration of purpose, solely due to their enforcement of such directive. Nothing in this directive shall prohibit or limit the right of State and local enforcement authorities from imposing fines or other penalties for any violation of the directive in Executive Order 202.17. This directive shall be applied in a manner consistent with the American with Disabilities Act or any provision of either New York State or New York City Human Rights Law, or any other provision of law."*

Based on the above, the executive order only applies to those “able to medically tolerate a face-covering.” In addition, the executive order must be applied in a manner consistent with applicable law, and with ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) .

Therefore, it cannot be applied in a manner that discriminates against an individual with a medical disability, i.e. it cannot be used to mandate an individual to wear a face covering, if he/she cannot medically tolerate a face covering.

**3. Face coverings include cloth masks and any other type of covering, including a face shield.**

The NY Department of Health’s Interim Guidance on **Executive Order 202.16 Requiring Face Coverings for Public and Private Employees Interacting with the Public** During the COVID-19 Outbreak, dated April 14, 2020 states as follows:

- Face coverings include, but are not limited to, cloth (e.g. homemade sewn, quick cut, bandana), surgical masks, N-95 respirators, and face shields. Please visit the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s “Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)” [website](#) for [information](#) on cloth face covers and other types of personal protective equipment (PPE), as well as instructions on use and cleaning.

See also, Interim Guidance on Executive Orders 202.17 and 202.18 Requiring Face Coverings in Public

During the COVID-19 Outbreak dated April 17, 2020

([https://coronavirus.health.ny.gov/system/files/documents/2020/04/doh\\_covid19\\_eo2021720218publicfacecovering\\_041720.pdf](https://coronavirus.health.ny.gov/system/files/documents/2020/04/doh_covid19_eo2021720218publicfacecovering_041720.pdf)) also states that masks include face shields:

*“Face coverings include, but are not limited to cloth (e.g. homemade sewn , quick cut, bandana), surgical masks, N-95 respirators, and face shields.”*

**4. No one has the right to request any medical information from an individual explaining his/her medical conditions that preclude her from wearing a mask. A customer entering a store without a mask must be allowed to enter if the customer states that they have a medical condition that precludes them from wearing a mask.**

Interim Guidance on **Executive Orders 202.17 and 202.18** Requiring Face Coverings in Public During the COVID-19 Outbreak dated April 17, 2020 states that:

***“... essential business operators and enforcement authorities are prohibited from Requesting or requiring medical or other documentation from an individual who declines to wear a face covering due to a medical or other health condition that prevents such usage.”***

**The NY DOH’s guidance also states that:**

“Employers are prohibited from requesting or requiring medical or other documentation from an employee who declines to wear a face covering due to a medical or other health condition that prevents such usage.”

- 5. Based on the above, there is no legal basis to apply a facial covering mandate that goes beyond the CDC’s own recommendations and is not supported by Governor Cuomo’s executive orders in that it forces an individual that is unable to medically tolerate a facial covering, to wear a facial covering.**

## The Nuremberg Code (1949)

### 1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.

This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved, as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This latter element requires that, before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject, there should be made known to him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person, which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment. The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon each individual who initiates, directs or engages in the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated to another with impunity.

2. The experiment should be such as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, unprocurable by other methods or means of study, and not random and unnecessary in nature.
3. The experiment should be so designed and based on the results of animal experimentation and a knowledge of the natural history of the disease or other problem under study, that the anticipated results will justify the performance of the experiment.
4. The experiment should be so conducted as to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering and injury.
5. No experiment should be conducted, where there is an *a priori* reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur; except, perhaps, in those experiments where the experimental physicians also serve as subjects.
6. The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment.
7. Proper preparations should be made and adequate facilities provided to protect the experimental subject against even remote possibilities of injury, disability, or death.
8. The experiment should be conducted only by scientifically qualified persons. The highest degree of skill and care should be required through all stages of the experiment of those who conduct or engage in the experiment.
9. During the course of the experiment, the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment to an end, if he has reached the physical or mental state, where continuation of the experiment seemed to him to be impossible.
10. During the course of the experiment, the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the experiment at any stage, if he has probable cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior skill and careful judgement required of him, that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.

## **Don't be a slave to the mask/mark**

You will know the truth and the truth will set you free **John 8:32**

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; abridging the freedom of speech, or the press: or the right of the people to peacefully assemble, and to petition the government for redress of grievances. ~**1st Amendment United States Constitution**

My religion prohibits me from wearing a mask because it is a satanic ritual and may cause a slow suicide which is also against my beliefs. "We are all created in the image and likeness of God," and therefore I do not cover my face. ~**Genesis 1:26**

**My healthcare decisions are between me and the medical professional I choose; NOT the government.** I will not jeopardize my health or my family's health because **evidence shows the following risks:**

**Hypoxia: When body tissue does not get enough oxygen and**

**Hypercapnia: Elevated levels of carbon dioxide in the blood that can cause dizziness, shortness of breath, headache and, in extreme cases, hyperventilation, seizures and possible death. ~OSHA**

**Galatians 5:1** It is for freedom that Christ has set us free. Stand firm, then, and do not let yourselves be burdened again by a yoke of slavery

**Luke 10:19** I saw satan fall like lightning from heaven, I have given you authority to trample on snakes and scorpions and to overcome the power of the enemy: nothing will harm you.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW GROUP: 888-983-461

<https://www.constitutionallawgroup.us/files/don-t-be-a-slave-to-the-mask.pdf>