

## **3.7.2023 SHOW NOTES:**

### **WW III CONTINUED – SORTING OUT THE AXIS FORCES**

*(All material is used for educational purposes only)*

**NOTE:** I have tried to make sure that none of the stories in this collection are duplicates, but I am allowing for the possibility that I may have missed cross-over referencing.

**FURTHERMORE:** Many of the articles I have posted here have video links imbedded in them that did not copy over to this page. You might want to reference the original sources for further investigation.

## WALL STREET JOURNAL

### China's Xi Jinping Takes Rare Direct Aim at U.S. in Speech

*Leader blames Washington-led 'containment, encirclement and suppression' for challenges at home*

By [Chun Han Wong](#), [Keith Zhai](#) and [James T. Areddy](#) March 6, 2023

In rare direct criticism of Washington, Chinese leader Xi Jinping blamed what he termed a U.S.-led campaign to contain China **for worsening the troubles and global uncertainties that his country has faced over the past five years.**

“Western countries—led by the U.S.—have implemented all-round containment, encirclement and suppression against us, bringing unprecedentedly severe challenges to our country’s development,” Mr. Xi was quoted by state media as saying on Monday.

Mr. Xi’s comments marked an unusual departure for a leader who has generally refrained from directly criticizing the U.S. in public remarks. **He was speaking at a meeting with members of China’s top political advisory body during an annual legislative session in Beijing,** according to a Chinese-language readout published by the official Xinhua News Agency.

While Mr. Xi has mentioned the U.S. in critical tones during internal speeches, such remarks have often filtered out through subordinates relaying his messages for broader audiences, within the party and beyond. In statements made in public settings or directly reported by state media, Mr. Xi has typically been more measured and vague when describing China’s relationship with the U.S. and other Western countries, referring to them as “certain” countries rather than naming them explicitly.

Now by directly accusing the U.S. of seeking containment, **a term loaded with Cold War meaning,** Mr. Xi appears to be associating himself more closely with nationalist rhetoric—widely used by lower-ranking officials and state media—that attacks Washington, at a time when bilateral tensions continue to simmer over trade, technology, geopolitical influence, and discordant views on Russia’s invasion of Ukraine.

The accusations against the U.S., delivered to an audience that includes politically connected businesspeople, appeared in part to be an effort by Mr. Xi to shift blame away from his own policymaking, including tough Covid controls that have weakened the economy and pressure on technology companies that cost the industry some of its dynamism.

At Monday's meeting, which included representatives from China's state-backed national chamber of commerce, Mr. Xi sought to boost confidence within the private sector—a key driver of growth and supplier of jobs in the world's second-largest economy, but also a community shaken by regulatory crackdowns and harsh pandemic lockdowns in recent years.

The Chinese leader insisted that the Communist Party **“has always regarded private enterprises and private entrepreneurs as our own people,”** and would provide them with support whenever they run into difficulties, Xinhua said.

At the same time, Mr. Xi urged business people to strive for wealth with a sense of responsibility, righteousness and compassion, and to bear in mind his push for “common prosperity”—aimed at redistributing more of China's wealth, amid concerns that the elite classes had benefited disproportionately from the country's economic boom.

According to Xinhua, Mr. Xi also defended his handling of the Covid-19 pandemic and addressed the growing tensions between China and the West. He also urged the business community to work together with the party to overcome difficulties in an uncertain global environment.

“In the coming period of time, the risks and challenges that we face will only increase and intensify ever more,” Mr. Xi was quoted as saying by Xinhua.

Mr. Xi appeared to make a similar point in his November summit with President Biden, according to China's official summary of the meeting, which quoted the Chinese leader as saying, “Suppression and containment will only strengthen the will and boost the morale of the Chinese people.”

China's foreign-policy establishment had already been using the words “suppression and containment” to describe pressure from the U.S., including Mr. Xi's new top international envoy Wang Yi and Foreign Minister Qin Gang.

Official spokespeople for China's Foreign Ministry, who speak to foreign reporters at regular briefings, often in strident tones, have also used the terminology.

In December, Mr. Wang told American banker and co-chair of Asia Society John Thornton, "It is imperative that the U.S. abandon its unreasonable acts of containment and suppression of China, earnestly put President Biden's positive remarks into action, and return to the more positive and practical China policy," according to a Chinese Foreign Ministry summary of the meeting.

Mr. Xi didn't name the U.S. while warning of threats to his country at a Communist Party congress in October, when he said: "External attempts to suppress and contain China may escalate at any time."

## TABLET

### Collapse of the COVID Truth Regime

*California's new misinformation law aims to silence dissenting medical opinions while allowing state-sponsored falsehoods to proliferate unchecked*

By Alex Gutentag March 05, 2023

In 1922, the American political commentator Walter Lippmann coined the term “manufacturing consent.” In Lippmann’s view, the best solutions to complex problems in a democracy could not be determined by the masses; rather, democracy should be managed by a “specialized class” and a “bureau of experts” that could best understand common interests and shape public opinion through the tools of propaganda. Edward Bernays, sometimes called “the father of public relations” expanded upon Lippmann’s thesis in his 1947 essay “The Engineering of Consent.” According to Bernays, the right to free speech and a free press is accompanied by a “right of persuasion,” which is facilitated by mass media.

“All these media provide open doors to the public mind,” Bernays wrote. “Any one of us through these media may influence the attitudes and actions of our fellow citizens.” For much of the 20th century, Lippmann’s specialized class could dominate media and communications in order to guide public opinion for commercial and political purposes. With the advent of social media, however, this dominance was upended and the “doors to the public mind” became more accessible to the average person.

On Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube, the conclusions and assumptions of experts could be challenged both by their credentialed rivals and by uncredentialed laypeople. The election of Donald Trump, a figure who was broadly despised by the specialized class and whose social media presence was [critical to his campaign](#), indicated that the soft, noncoercive style of engineering consent had been outpaced by technology. **In response, the FBI and State Department transitioned toward hard censorship, with full support of the legacy media, using Russiagate as a pretext to [influence](#) and [infiltrate](#) Facebook and [Twitter](#), thus transforming these supposed “private companies” into arms of the state.**

The initial justification for much of the COVID censorship that began in 2020 was that social media users could “cause harm” by discouraging others from taking proper precautions. Even though this censorship was a clear infringement on civil liberties, liberals readily accepted it because they had been primed through the [false narrative](#) that open expression on social media allowed Russian bots to rig the 2016 election. By this time, **Democrats had also normalized the notion that free speech was intrinsically [dangerous](#) and that [words literally cause violence](#).**

**While mainstream media outlets pushed a propagandistic narrative to build popular acceptance of radical and unprecedented measures, government agencies pressured social media companies like Twitter and Facebook to suppress analysis from skeptics.** From the [lab leak](#) hypothesis, to [natural immunity](#), to mask mandates, much of this analysis has turned out to be entirely legitimate. **By skewing the scientific debate, social media “content moderators” allowed state-sponsored misinformation to proliferate unchecked.** Three years later, the alarming trend of [non-COVID excess mortality](#) in Western countries is an indictment of the COVID response and the censorship that accompanied it. If the job of public health officials was to minimize harm, ongoing excess mortality after the peak of COVID is evidence of failure.

As this failure becomes undeniable, we are witnessing the collapse of much of the censorship campaign that helped shield authorities from criticism. **Under Elon Musk, Twitter ended its COVID “misinformation” policy and reinstated many banned accounts.** The [“Twitter files”](#) and the [Missouri v. Biden](#) lawsuit have revealed that the White House, the CDC, and [even Pfizer](#) were all involved in a **coordinated, systematic silencing of dissent around COVID policies and vaccines.**

Against this backdrop, one of the country’s most draconian censorship efforts is facing a major challenge. On Jan. 25, U.S. District Judge William Shubb granted a motion for a [preliminary injunction](#) in the *Hoeg, et al. v. Newsom* lawsuit, temporarily blocking California’s Assembly Bill 2098 (AB 2098). **If AB 2098 is eventually implemented, the law will allow the California Medical Board to disbar doctors who disseminate COVID-related “misinformation” to patients.** Judge Shubb called the state’s definition of misinformation (“false information that is contradicted by contemporary scientific consensus”) “nonsense” and ruled in favor of the injunction on the grounds that the vagueness of the law would violate doctors’ 14th Amendment right to due process.

The state has decided [not to appeal](#) Shubb's decision, but the ultimate fate of the law is still in limbo, in part due to an ongoing separate lawsuit (*McDonald v. Lawson*). Nevertheless, the initial victory of the plaintiffs in *Hoeg, et al. v. Newsom* has highlighted the pernicious nature of speech restrictions and represents a major blow against the far-reaching censorship machine that shaped the COVID era.

"The corollary to the First Amendment right to speak is a First Amendment right to receive information," Jenin Younes, an attorney from the New Civil Liberties Alliance who is representing the plaintiffs, said. **The battle over AB 2098 illustrates why medical censorship was about much more than doctors' and scientists' speech rights—it was also about the public's fundamental right to informed consent for lockdowns, masks, and vaccines. As the COVID censorship campaign is increasingly questioned, it becomes clear that suppressing scientific dialogue was not just a free speech issue, but was a catastrophic violation of bioethics that harmed, injured, and killed people.**

***Medical censorship was about much more than doctors' and scientists' speech rights—it was also about the public's fundamental right to informed consent.***

The doctors challenging AB 2098 in court are primarily concerned about how this law would impact patients. Doctors' ability to speak frankly is essential to medical care and medical ethics. As doctors have an obligation to act as fiduciaries for their individual patients, a law forcing them to push a one-size-fits-all approach would undermine this obligation.

"When you are no longer telling the patient what you really think, you are no longer acting in the patient's best interest," Dr. Azadeh Khatibi, a plaintiff in *Hoeg, et al. v. Newsom* said. "So you are then, by definition, acting unethically."

Dr. Aaron Kheriaty, another plaintiff and former director of medical ethics at the University of California, Irvine, echoed this sentiment. "Clinical care needs to be individualized to the particular needs of each specific patient," he said. "AB 2098 is a law that says doctors' primary duty is not to the sick patient in front of them, but to a social program that's been basically determined by the California Department of Public Health." This turns physicians into agents of a broad political agenda, but patients need to be able to trust that physicians are acting in their individual interests. "Without that, medicine collapses," Kheriaty explained.

The law's intent to use doctors for a larger social and political purpose is characteristic of the entire COVID censorship crusade, which often prevented scientists and medical professionals from engaging in open inquiry or offering the public a "second opinion" on COVID prevention and treatment. This did not just penalize those who were prevented from speaking; it caused a societywide inversion of medical ethics in which every member of the public was instrumentalized for a "greater good" that could not be questioned. This inversion—the idea that your health as an individual only matters in service of collective ends—is the logic behind eugenics, organ harvesting, and nonconsensual medical experiments.

The advocacy group that pushed for AB 2098, No License for Disinformation, was originally focused on California doctors' social media posts (since this would not be legally defensible, the group shifted its focus to doctor-patient interactions). "I think this shows what the real intent of the bill was, which was to silence political opponents," Younes said. This effort was often personal. Dr. Tracy Beth Hoeg, for instance, has received dozens of messages from one of the members of No License for Disinformation threatening that the law would be used to attack her license. Dr. Hoeg's scientific work was crucial in [reopening](#) schools, [unmasking children](#), and raising awareness about vaccine-associated [myocarditis](#) in young men.

"It's the patients who pay the biggest price when their doctors can't give them accurate information," Hoeg said. The attempt to target her has been disconcerting. "The really sad part is that there are doctors from all over who read this. Most will stay quiet, even about issues they really care about, because they don't want to risk losing their job or medical license," she explained. "That's also how it stifles the scientific debate."

Former State Sen. Dr. Richard Pan, a co-sponsor of AB 2098 and author of California's [strictest](#) pre-COVID vaccine laws, has called anti-vaccine protesters "[domestic terrorists](#)" and has made [disparaging comments](#) about doctors who disagree with his legislative efforts, calling them "Covid minimizers" and "unlicensed pundits" (as if one needs a license for punditry in this country). "This is supposed to be a law about the public's best interest, and yet it's a law about personalities," Dr. Ram Duriseti, another plaintiff in the lawsuit, explained. "It's a political law. It's not a scientific or medical law."



The law itself contains multiple debatable claims, including the assertion that “unvaccinated individuals are at a risk of dying from COVID-19 that is 11 times greater than those who are fully vaccinated.” As Hoeg pointed out [on her substack](#), the estimate of an elevenfold higher risk is inaccurate: This number has changed over time and continues to change. More importantly, it is based on confounded data from the CDC, not randomized controlled trials. This demonstrates the problem that arises when a central authority is entrusted with determining and enforcing a singular scientific truth.

“It’s not a crisis of misinformation. It’s a crisis of institutional credibility,” Laura Powell, another attorney representing the plaintiffs, explained. Powell filed the original complaint and motion for the injunction. “The whole point is to scare doctors into keeping their mouths shut, and that will be achieved even if they never bring up any disciplinary action,” she said.

Over the past three years, COVID censorship has worked by making examples out of nonconformists and labeling them as heretics in order to discredit them. Censorship is not just about preventing access to certain perspectives, but about defining an in-group and warning observers that they might also be isolated and gagged if they stray too far from accepted narratives.

When these accepted narratives are actually false, reality is warped, and people are forced to participate in a bizarre and damaging theater in which they fight to defend ideas that are wrong. The alternative would mean risking association with those labeled as “covidiot,” “anti-maskers,” and “anti-vaxxers.” In response to policies that marked certain positions as off-limits, many people in medicine, science, law, academia, and journalism responded by self-censoring for fear of excommunication. AB 2098 seeks to make this chilling effect permanent. The preliminary injunction against it, however, suggests that we have entered a new phase in which the COVID truth regime may be finally losing much of its immense power.

***The law’s intent to use doctors for a larger social and political purpose is characteristic of the entire COVID censorship crusade.***

Central to COVID censorship was the notion that people simply cannot be trusted to evaluate evidence on their own and make health decisions for themselves. “Part

of the censorship movement is so elitist,” Powell said. The assumption behind COVID “content moderation” was that a small cadre of anointed experts deserved disproportionate sway over public opinion because their views were objectively correct, but this has proven to be far from the case.

YouTube, for instance, [suspended users](#) for statements that disputed the efficacy of face masks; these statements have now been vindicated by a landmark [Cochrane review](#) of 78 randomized controlled trials, which found that masks made “little or no difference” in preventing the transmission of COVID-19. Resulting mandates negatively impacted [deaf and hard-of-hearing](#) people, affected the [learning and development](#) of young children, and impaired the [social cognition](#) of elderly dementia patients. Because they disallowed open public discussion of their favored policies, social media companies should be considered partially responsible for the collateral damage that ensued.

During school closures in 2020, for example, fatal teen drug overdoses [doubled](#), the child homicide rate [increased by 28%](#), confirmed evidence of child abuse [rose by 30%](#), and there was a [31% increase](#) in the number of child sexual images online. Clearly a critical assessment of the COVID restrictions placed on children was morally imperative, yet Twitter [blacklisted](#) a prominent advocate for school reopening, Stanford’s Dr. Jay Bhattacharya, as soon as he opened his account. As Dr. Bhattacharya [recently argued](#) in Tablet, this move and similar actions hampered the conversation around ongoing masking, testing, and quarantining protocols in schools, and these protocols continued in many states without evidence-based deliberation.

Social media companies often removed accurate estimates of [COVID’s infection fatality rate](#) (IFR) or labeled them as misleading because low figures might prompt users to reject the rationale behind social distancing, stay-home orders, and mandates. Would the public have consented to the prolonged mass quarantining of young people and children (as well as the massive [upward wealth transfer](#), infringements on human rights, and social costs that accompanied it) if they had been exposed to correct data about the risk the virus posed?

At the behest of the Biden administration, censorship escalated dramatically in 2021. In an effort to boost vaccine uptake at all costs, Facebook told officials that it was censoring “[often-true content](#)” that did not contain misinformation but which might dissuade people from getting vaccinated. Many prohibited claims on

social media pertaining to topics like natural immunity, breakthrough infections, and myocarditis proved to be true.

On Jan. 11, 2023, Dr. Anthony Fauci co-authored [a paper](#) in the journal *Cell*, arguing that viruses like SARS-CoV-2, which replicate in the respiratory mucosa, cannot be effectively controlled through vaccines that create systemic immunity, such as the current mRNA vaccines. Anyone making similar assertions on social media before 2023 may have been deplatformed, or their post might have been removed. Today it is worth asking how many people would have declined vaccines or boosters if this kind of commentary had been widely available.

One of the key problems with AB 2098, Hoeg explained, is that its vagueness “puts us all at risk of ‘misinformation’ not being defined using scientific data but by the beliefs of the dominant political party.” Throughout 2020, 2021, and 2022 “misinformation” and “settled science” were not determined through objective criteria—they were determined by the political preferences of those wielding power in state bureaucracies, tech companies, and mainstream media. In consequence, we are facing a snowballing economic crisis, children have been plunged into an academic and mental health catastrophe, and the country has seen [non-COVID excess deaths](#) of tens of thousands of people under 45. The bureau of experts has inflicted bottomless stress on the population as a whole and has shown a total disregard for basic civil rights and human dignity.

Free speech is rarely just about free speech for its own sake; it is about placing checks and balances on the ability of an authority to shape reality. “Nobody has a monopoly on the truth,” Younes explained. Ending the COVID truth regime is not only a matter of correcting the record on misguided policies. The underlying set of assumptions that led to mass censorship and rule-by-technocrat must be dismantled as well.

## PharmaFiles by Aussie17

### Did the S@!t just hit the fan in Singapore?

The most damning real world evidence yet!

#### Update/Correction March 3rd 2023

(I need to correct the Stillbirth data. A new law in Singapore [broadened the definition of Stillbirth](#) in 2022. As a result, it VOIDS the comparison between 2021 and 2022).

The decline in Live Births is still valid - a decline of over 3000 (or 7.62% of live births post vaccination).

Live Births			
Period	Total		
	2019	39,279	
2020*	38,590	-1.75%	
2021	38,672	0.21%	
2022	35,724	-7.62%	

---

#### ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Singapore just released the raw numbers on Perinatal Mortality and Stillbirths. Perinatal mortality went up by 44.7%, and stillbirths shot up by 70.5% compared to the previous year.

## PERINATAL MORTALITY


Period	All Ethnic Groups		
	Total	Males	Females
2019	97	44	53
2020	103	55	46
2021	114	56	57
2022	165	77	82

## STILLBIRTHS

Period	All Ethnic Groups		
	Total	Males	Females
2019	73	36	37
2020	78	41	36
2021	78	37	40
2022	133	60	67


We are now a full year after the entire population was double vaccinated. This completely debunks the narrative that COVID caused Perinatal Mortality and Stillbirth because if that were so, the numbers would have shot up one year after the pandemic started in 2020. Instead, we see the numbers shoot up in 2022, **one year after 87% of the population was double vaccinated!**

## Progress of COVID-19 vaccination



As you can see below, almost 90% of the population of childbearing age are double vaccinated and boosted (minimum protection).

## Vaccination Status by Age Group



---

The Singapore Government has been battling low birth rates for many years. I don't buy into the narrative that the Singapore Government is deliberately depopulating their population. To encourage higher birth rates, the Government have offered Cash Bonuses and tax incentives to citizens to have more children.

Singapore's Marriage and Parenthood Package

Type of Incentives (for first & second child)	Benefits
Baby Bonus (Cash Gift)	S\$8,000 for first two children, \$10,000 for third and subsequent child
Baby Bonus (First Step Grant)	S\$3,000 for all children
Baby Bonus (CDA co-savings)	S\$3,000 for first child, \$6,000 for second child, \$9,000 for third and fourth child, \$15,000 for fifth and subsequent child
Parenthood Tax Rebate (PTR)	S\$5,000 for first child, \$10,000 for second child, \$20,000 for third and subsequent child
Maternity Leave per child (paid)	16 weeks of which 4 weeks can be shared by the father
Paternity Leave per child (paid)	2 weeks
Paid Child Care Leave per year per parent	6 days until both children turn 7 or 2 days when children ages 7–12.

The country is one of the least corrupt countries in the world (although many Singaporean friends will disagree), in my opinion and experience, both from professional and personal experience.

Transparency International ranks Singapore [as the 5th least corrupt country](#) globally. However, much of it has been attributed to paying politicians and ministers salary equivalent to the private sector. But then again, greed seems to be a societal norm these days.

The Health Minister of Singapore makes [at least US\\$800K](#) annually, more than the President of the United States. [[SOURCE](#)]

According to PSD, as of 2023, the benchmark level of a minister's monthly salary stands at S\$55,000, working out to an annual salary of S\$1.1 million.

I don't believe that the politicians took money from Big Pharma. But, I think they are highly advised by local medical professors who are in bed with Big Pharma. For example, the National University of Singapore, Singapore's premier university, is in a strong partnership with EcoHealth Alliance. We know how the Covid fiasco started with these people who are hell-bent on making Gain of Function research on coronaviruses.



**DukeNUS**  
Medical School

Emerging Infectious  
Diseases

**SARS-related CoVs provide a unique test-case of a global strategy to predict & prevent pandemics**

**DATE:**  
01 Oct 2021 09:30 – 10:30 AM  
Singapore Time (SGT)

**ABSTRACT:**  
Our research has shown that the origins of pandemics can be traced to environmental and socio-economic changes that lead to increased spillover of zoonotic pathogens across the wildlife-livestock-human interface. We have combined ecological approaches with field sampling, viral discovery and characterization, economics, behavioral surveys and mathematical modeling to analyze and map viral spillover hotspots, identify the diversity of 'unknown' zoonoses, target surveillance, and work with communi-



**SPEAKER:**  
**Dr. Peter Daszak**  
President of EcoHealth Alliance,  
New York, USA.

**BIOGRAPHY:** **LOL!!**  
Dr. Peter Daszak is President of EcoHealth Alliance, a US-based

Anyway, right now, Singapore is in a Catch-22 situation, with lots of evidence that the Vaccines are causing infant mortalities. With their Real World Data showing, the Government has a few options left.





1. Take responsibility, be the first country to recall the mRNA product, and stop the vaccination campaign to reduce further harm to the population. Begin looking at vaccination detoxification. **(highly unlikely)**
2. Wait for Pfizer or another country to recall the product and risk further harm to the population (but 90% of the population is already harmed). **(maybe)**
3. Blame it on Long COVID or create other narratives (i.e. Parents with Long Covid, Parents contracted Covid during pregnancy, etc.). Although this will be a huge gamble, they are simply kicking the can down the road. **(maybe)**
4. Pretend nothing happened and perform the UK and France backpedalling dance (i.e. end vaccination and booster campaigns for those under 50, citing other reasons). **(most likely)**

And finally, don't forget these are only infant deaths and stillbirths. They still need to explain the highest record of deaths ever and also why Live Births dropped 7.6% post vaccination. How many of these were due to miscarriages?

Live Births			
Period		Total	
2019		39,279	
2020*		38,590	-1.75%
2021		38,672	0.21%
2022		35,724	-7.62%

There are many downstream effects due to miscarriages and stillbirths. For example, almost one in three women develop post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) after early pregnancy loss. [[SOURCE](#)]

# Posttraumatic stress, anxiety and depression following miscarriage and ectopic pregnancy: a multicenter, prospective, cohort study

Jessica Farren, PhD • Maria Jalmbrant, DClInPsy • Nora Falconieri, MSc • ... Laure Wynants, PhD • Dirk Timmerman, PhD • Tom Bourne, PhD   • [Show all authors](#)

Published: December 13, 2019 • DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2019.10.102> •



This is a **s@!t-hitting fan moment**, and its coming to a country near you!



[aussie17 @\\_aussie17](#)

[HOLY MOLY! Singapore data dropped - HiGHEST DEATH RATE recorded in 62 years \(since record keeping started!!\) On top of that, a staggering 58.6% increase in PRENATAL DEATHS over previous year! Babies born to vaccinated parents in trouble??? Read here: \[pharmafiles.substack.com/p/singapores-2...\]\(http://pharmafiles.substack.com/p/singapores-2...\)](#)

Data Series	Crude Death Rate (Per Thousand Residents )	Perinatal Mortality Rate (Per Thousand Live-Births And Still-Births)	Total Deaths (Number)	Total-Death Change over previous year
2022	6.3	4.6	26,829	10.4%
2021	5.8	2.9	24,292	10.1%
2020	5.2	2.7	22,054	2.8%
2019	5	2.5	21,446	0.8%
2018	5	3.2	21,282	1.8%
2017	5	3.4	20,905	4.4%
2016	4.8	3	20,017	0.8%
2015	4.8	2.8	19,852	2.4%
2014	4.7	2.9	19,393	2.4%
2013	4.6	2.8	18,938	2.5%
2012	4.5	3.6	18,481	2.5%
2011	4.5	3.9	18,027	2.4%
2010	4.4	3.5	17,610	3.0%
2009	4.3	3.2	17,101	-0.7%
2008	4.4	3.1	17,222	0.5%
2007	4.5	3.1	17,140	4.6%
2006	4.4	3.8	16,393	1.1%
2005	4.4	3.8	16,215	2.2%
2004	4.4	3.8	15,850	-1.1%
2003	4.5	3.6	16,036	1.4%
2002	4.4	3.9	15,820	2.9%
2001	4.3	3.5	15,367	-2.1%

Highest Perinatal deaths in 20 years (Still-births and deaths of persons under 7 days of age)

Highest in 62 years (since record keeping began)

10:59 PM · Feb 24, 2023

6,189Likes4,088Retweets

Signing off for now,  
-Aussie17

**PS: To correct some numbers in the video above from Dr Tina Peers, it's not 58% miscarriage rate but 16% (still more than double the normal).**



[Dr Tina Peers @DrTinaPeers](#)

[@DocAhmadMalik @LozzaFox @GBNEWS @Ofcom](#) I want to correct this. It was my mistake-taken from a paper that has just been revised. The rate is double what we would expect- still a tragedy in anyones book. [@LozzaFox](#)

[@DocAhmadMalik](#) [@DrTinaPeers](#) [@LozzaFox](#) [@GBNEWS](#) [@Ofcom](#) Dear Ahmad - not 58%, however higher than is reported. In both the V-SAFE and the Pfizer PSUR prospective cohorts we are looking at a 16% miscarriage rate in the first trimester exposures. This is more than double normal. Easy to hide. [@sonia\\_elijah\\_arkmedic.substack.com/p/breaking-igo...](#)

Pregnancy outcome	Prospective cases 144 (94.7% of pregnancy cases)				
	Timing of exposure in pregnancy				
	Before conception	1 <sup>st</sup> trimester	After 1 <sup>st</sup> trimester	During all pregnancy	Unknown
Ectopic pregnancy	0	0	0	0	0
Spontaneous abortion	0	12	0	0	5
Elective termination (foetal defects)	0	0	0	0	0
Elective termination (no foetal defects or unknown)	0	9	0	0	3
Stillbirth with foetal defects	0	0	0	0	0
Stillbirth without foetal defects	0	0	0	0	0
Live birth with congenital anomaly	0	1	5	0	0
Live birth without congenital anomaly	0	51	4	0	54
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>62</b>

## NOT THE BEE

### New Zealand, which cut itself off from the world for three years to avoid Covid, is now seeing its largest increase in registered deaths in 100 years

[Edward Teach](#) · · Mar 6, 2023

Hey Kiwis, good thing you gave the government totalitarian power to lock you in your homes for years on end!

***New Zealand has recorded the largest increase in the number of registered deaths since the 1918 influenza pandemic, new data from Stats NZ shows.***

***The births and deaths figures, for the year ending December 2022, show there were 38,574 deaths in 2022, 10.4 per cent (3642) more than in 2021.***

***This increase - attributed to Covid-19 and an ageing population - is the biggest year-on-year jump since the 55.4 per cent (5835) spike in deaths following the 1918 flu pandemic.***

***Most of the increase in deaths occurred in older age groups where Covid-19 poses an increased mortality risk.***

Some of us were saying in April 2022 that the best approach to Covid was to isolate the elderly and vulnerable and have the rest of us get sick to develop as much natural immunity as possible.

Then, we said, it was still likely that the elderly would get Covid and that many would die from it.

We were told to shut up because Covid definitely came from a wet market and *not* the Fauci-funded virus research lab a few hundred yards away that was studying bat coronaviruses with U.S. money.

Then we were told that total lockdowns were smart because look at the low death rates in places like New Zealand.

**[Here's New Zealand's Prime Minister Granting Citizens The Right To Use The Bathroom Inside Their Friends' Homes. Seriously.](#)**

***New Zealand's Prime Minister, or Empress, Jacinda Arden, has made a very exciting announcement for Kiwis who are cowering in fear over the Coronavirus.***

Then we were told forced vaccinations were the way because New Zealand had such a low case count with its forced vaccines.

**[New Zealand PM Says "There's Not Gonna Be An End Point To This Vaccination Program" And She'll Never "Be Satisfied" Till Everyone Is Jabbed](#)**

***New Zealand, with Prime Minister and wannabe dictator Jacinda Arden, continues to lead the world in insane overreaction to the Covid-19 pandemic.***

But the experts are still patting themselves on the back!

***[A]n expert says this increase would have been higher and sooner in the pandemic had it not been for New Zealand's initial pandemic response.***

***University of Otago epidemiologist Michael Baker said, unlike other OECD countries, New Zealand had not recorded any excess mortality (deaths above and beyond the "normal" rate) over the initial years of the pandemic.***

***However, as the virus spread more widely in New Zealand in 2022 with the arrival of Omicron, Covid-19 deaths increased, with just under 2400 fatalities attributed to the virus last year.***

(Yo experts, remember how the vaccine was supposed to stop transmission?)

Anyway, I'm glad the individuals who have recently died got a few more years of life.

**What the cost to the rest of society is (particularly children who have been isolated for so long) has yet to be seen.**