

Planet Lockdown – Dr Wolfgang Wodarg

My name is Dr Wolfgang Wodarg and I'm a physician, specialised in internal medicine and hygiene. and I worked a long time as a director of the public health office, and I was working a lot with epidemiologists and being responsible for the northern region in Germany. After that I went into politics. I was in the health committee of Bundestag for fifteen years and afterwards I was in ten years in the council of Europe.

**I was the president of the subcommittee in health and the council of Europe and there I initiated the swine flu examination, the fake pandemic swine flu as a fake pandemic and we examined what was happening in the WHO there in the committee.**

I was not astonished to find out that there is a great dependency on the WHO on sponsors and that those sponsors have influenced the work of WHO a lot. They even have led WHO into making all this do about the swine flu and because I already (inaudible) with the WHO with the bird flu and with (inaudible), they tried before they had some exercise, they had some training for pandemics, smaller outbreaks like SARS or afterwards like MERS this was afterwards, and I learned a lot about PSE.

**So, there were many such smaller periods that were very interesting for someone who's interested in epidemiology and I found out, each time I was in contact with WHO that it became worse and worse and that there were people who were very much very close to the pharmaceutical interest and there were lots of conflicts of interest in this organisation.**

**WHO changed from 1998 about that or 2002 there was the secretary general Mrs Brundtland (inaudible) Mr President, she was going to Davos, she was inviting the industry in Davos where the world economic forum, she was inviting the industry to engage in health problems and solving health problems globally, and the industry that was mainly pharmaceutical companies and they did not hesitate to follow this invitation? So, there is Bill Gates with his foundation, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. There are other big foundations who do it from Great Britain and you have also the sponsorship of WHO by some nations who give extra money for their pharmaceutical industry, so it is washed by the government, but it's following the economic interest primarily This changes the work of the WHO a lot.**

It is a health agency, but you can have a look at health from a different perspective. If you go there as some statesman who says I want to pay as little money and I want the people to stay healthy, so I want a prevention and I want the WHO to tell us how we can do this the best way. Or you can have a look at health as a field of business so you go there and see which new diseases are there worldwide where I perhaps can produce a vaccine, or I can produce some drugs, so that I can earn money. I will do something for health says the pharmaceutical industry but the pharmaceutical industry does something for health because their primary interest is the interest of their investors, the interest of their shareholders and they have to earn money otherwise they will be fired, and so when they go to the WHO they are not primarily interested in public health, but they are interested in selling their products, and this makes the big difference if you let them set the topics and set the fields of the work of the WHO.

**Then they look for fields of work where they can sell vaccinations, and this changes the whole perspective, and you can really easily observe the WHO started speaking about vaccinations all the time since 2000 more and more and they were finding more and more diseases where perhaps you can sell vaccinations, or you can sell anti-viral drugs or something like that.**

I think this has corrupted this institution a lot and it is a very sad thing because we need a world health organisation which is sharing for prevention, which is looking after the people and how they live healthy and that they know themselves how to live healthy without the pharmaceutical industry.

I was working in the last twenty years against corruption, as a parliamentarian, and afterwards I went to an organisation who was fighting corruption and I was responsible for fighting corruption in the health field. **Corruption is defined as “the misuse of entrusted power for private gain or private interests”.** You can have people, you can bribe people when they are corrupt, but you can also change an institution. You can change an institution by sponsoring or giving them money saying please there is a lot of corruption there or there is a lot of thing to do there, so do something there. By setting the topics, by setting the direction of an institution you can influence it and this can go as far as you can say this is institutional corruption. If you buy the whole institution you don't need to bribe any employee or any director anymore because you pay it and you can say what they do.

Those institutions they don't have so much money, they have a lot of employees, some a thousand employees all over the world. This is not so important. The member states, the 194 member states of the WHO they give their share, so they pay their contributions annually and this is a basic financial thing, but the earmarked money is for projects and there are only a few people setting those projects. **Those projects are elaborated as a private public health partnership. This is a what they call it – private public health partnership. It is the private who give the money who says what to do and they have an idea what would come out of the project.**

**This was the case with Ebola, which was, for instance, in Africa some time ago, some years ago. I have made an observation that could have been done many things before the WHO started to work there. There was an alarm already (inaudible) when the first cases came up it would have been very easy to do something, but those people there, the local people, said now we have to wait unto the WHO comes, and the UN comes. This took some weeks or months even until this big machine was working there, and many people were infected, and they used it for producing drugs for testing drugs. They used it for new a method of vaccination with mRNA, so this is the first time they tried out genetically modifying the patient and let the patient produce its own antigen, so making people like a bioreactor to produce the vaccine themselves. This is a completely new method, this is what we see now with COVID-19 what they are doing now with us, and with Ebola they tried it out the first time. They got their market allowance the first time for such a drug. This was a field for experiments, and I have the suspicion that they were just misusing a bad situation in Western Africa for their experiments and for preparing the market for a bigger thing we now experience.**

I have a friend who's working in Western Africa and he gave me a phone call in March and he told me there were cases of Ebola in (inaudible) and he wanted to help because he said contacting a laboratory for the diagnosis and if you have the diagnosis you could isolate and you can stop the spread of such a disease easily when you are able to have the diagnosis to find the contaminated people and to teach them how to move and how to prevent the spread of the disease. This could have started in April, but then Ebola peaked up when there were more and more cases, nothing was done like this and it was very bad in late summer and it spread over several countries, and at this time they started Remdesivir and they started with developing vaccinations. I think it was not well done and it could have been done much easier and much earlier and there are people who profit from this bigger outbreak, because with this bigger outbreak they could test the drugs, they could try to find out how to prepare the vaccinations, so they had an economic, they had a profit from this. Then when the outbreak was stopped there was another short outbreak in (inaudible) where already they had the drugs, where they had the vaccination and they tested it there. For me, I have a very big suspicion that the Ebola

case was just managed in a way that the pharmaceutical companies could do their things there and could develop their products there.

**This was a misuse of WHO for drug development, and there is another misuse of WHO for making panic to sell the drugs and this is what we see now. If you can use such an agency to rise fear in the people, then you can use it for any purpose because you paralyse people and what you don't want the people to demonstrate or fight against then you can just paralyse them with fear, say there is a big pandemic, and they will do everything you tell them. They won't oppose.**

**What we have seen last year was a very well-planned thing. The WHO had the role to say to define how the pandemic looks like. WHO just took the test developed by Mr Drosden and colleagues and this test was very quickly, and with this test they defined the virus because there was no, the virus was never cultivated, was never isolated? The virus was from the very beginning defined by the test of Mr Drosden and WHO said this is the virus when the test is positive this is the virus. Afterwards we saw the spreading of the virus, which was the same figures on the maps and what we saw was the spreading of the test. Everywhere the test was used there were positive cases and WHO and everyone who is in the matter knows that each winter there are positive cases with coronaviruses.**

Coronaviruses are there every year, they make five percent of the flu viruses, so you can be sure you will find some coronaviruses, and the coronavirus that are on the wane all those last years they are very similar to SARS viruses.

**There are still the old ones and we have other tests to find them, but most of the viruses now the coronaviruses now are SARS like viruses, and you find them all over the world. They change they have mutations; they change almost every day you find some coronavirus having changed if you look for them intensively, and this is what they started. Showing us this thing as a very very dangerous thing, because they connected us with pictures from hospitals from intensive care units and from coffins, they showed us very frightening pictures and at the same time they told us their test for corona was positive. They did not look for any other virus. There are more than a hundred viruses who could have done, who could have made people die in the same way they would die of coronaviruses, but they were only using this test and saying "oh the test is positive" so this is a very very bad thing spreading.**

I tell you something about the WHO and its role as a norm setter. **The WHO has the powers since from 2007 when the international health regulations were published and were in power, the WHO has the power to define in health. They can define what is a pandemic, they can define viruses so the reason why a pandemic spreads, they can define the diseases even and say what is an infection and how to can recognise an infection. So, they have the power of defining anything of infectious diseases that are possibly spreading around the world, and this is what they do. We see, or we have seen, that they defined a pandemic first in 2000, a pandemic was very serious very dangerous with many people getting very ill and dying. You would see them in the streets, you would see them everywhere and you would see the whole population being endangered. This used to be a pandemic spreading rapidly over many countries making many people ill and letting them die. And this changed in 2009 with the swine flu because the swine flu or the mild flu, it was one of the mildest flus ever and they had prepared all those vaccinations (inaudible) and all those contracts worldwide the pharmaceutical industries so they pressed WHO to change the pandemic, the definition of pandemic and they just wiped out that there should be many severe cases and many deaths, they just took disease rapidly spreading over many countries and with a new virus, because a new virus is always new otherwise it cannot spread so you can have a pandemic each year and this is what they did not change. They changed the definition of pandemic again just some months ago when**

**they said we have something like a permanent pandemic, we have an inter-pandemic period and then we have a post-pandemic period, and then we have the pandemic period and they made us think and understand pandemic as a permanent thing with waves coming again and again, and this is the picture now WHO uses and this is also what Bill Gates uses , what the pharmaceutical industry uses, they frighten us with the next wave to come and with new mutations, so it's a very good business model where they, for sure, promise that they can earn a lot of money for many years.**

It came out when there was a press conference that Mr Fecura did. He was the secretary responsible for the swine flu pandemic and he was speaking in front of the public, and he was asked because some countries had opposed, they had found out that there was something happening, that the new definition was used by WHO. Those countries, they had warned WHO to change the pandemic because this would be chaos and there would be lots of doubt, lots of expensive and not very useful methods, and they were afraid that there would be a very big (inaudible). I think it was Japan was among them, I think it was about seven countries, I cannot say it now by heart which countries were involved but Japan was among them, and it was a journalist just citing those questioning countries and WHO said "yes you are right," to the journalist "you are right, but we will think about this matter and we will discuss it again, but they didn't change it they left it like that and they just declared the pandemic. This is when, the trick was in all those contracts with all those states, there was in those secret contracts was a fix that if WHO says this is a pandemic then the contracts for the pharmaceutical industry, between the industry and the states, would be in power so the WHO was at the trigger for this business.

**Since the Bird Flu in 2005 there was a pandemic preparedness, they were all heading for and part of the pandemic preparedness were the contracts between pharmaceutical industry who said they would produce vaccines and the member states of the WHO. There were more than a hundred written and they were all secret, and in those contracts, it was fixed that if WHO should say this is a pandemic those contracts would be in power because with the swine flu it was a mild flu there was no real pandemic, so they had to change the definition of pandemic. When they changed the definition, they could say "oh now we have a pandemic" although it was a mild flu and then the contracts were in power and the pharmaceutical industry earned about \$80 billion dollars with useless vaccines.**

**The WHO changed the definition of a pandemic because they wiped out the condition that there have to be many severe diseases, many cases of severe diseases, many deadly cases, many people dying so they only left that this is a disease that can spread over several countries with a new virus, and this happens every year. So, they had a new definition they could use every year. We have a pandemic, according to this, each year.**

If you would watch a real pandemic as a bus driver, as a teacher, as someone moving in public, you would see that people get ill. You would see people and you would find out that your colleagues at work that they are ill, and you miss them, so you really see something happen. You see people getting ill in your neighbourhood, in your enterprise, so a pandemic is something where you can count the people easily that they get ill. **And now you need a test to find out, you test healthy people, and you find lots of positive tests and now you say this is a pandemic, which is ridiculous. The people are not even sick they just have a positive test, so this is how they changed the definition of a pandemic.**

**I think the WHO was influenced by its sponsors to change this definition because the sponsors they built fabrics, they introduced vaccines, they found out how to produce them cheaply and they were prepared for a pandemic, but there was no pandemic, and they knew there would not be a pandemic, so they just made one by changing the definition, which is very easy for them.**

I'm a doctor because I like to be useful for people and I like people being healthy and loving this, and when I found out that many doctors, they are there in the ward and they are waiting for sick people and they earn more money when they have many people when they are coming and being sick, so they earn money with sicknesses and with ill people, and this I did not like. So, I went to public health. I wanted to be paid for health, I wanted to be paid for prevention, I wanted to be paid to watch for the health of people and so I became the director of a public health institution and I like the work very much, and I made a sentinel to find out whether there comes a flu which is very dangerous, so I have a secretary with a telephone and she was ringing each Monday morning, she was ringing Kindergarten and schools, factories and hospitals and doctors, so within four hours she could tell me whether there was something coming or whether there was nothing.

We had a standardised schedule with the question, and I could easily observe the sentinel whether something extraordinary was approaching, or not. I was responsible for 150,000 people and when there was a flu there were more of them, 10,000 or 20,000, 15,000 people ill at the same time. They were not going to school, they were not at work and you could easily recognise it, so I knew what the flu wave does, and I really know when something serious comes and this is every three or four years. The flu wave is a little bit more serious and in-between you don't feel so much so when they said in Mexico there was big big catastrophe, a big pandemic approaching I saw the numbers and they were 600 cases they had found, not even a thousand cases and they spoke of a pandemic, I was just thinking of what I find normally in my region of 150,000 people, I find 10,000 cases and they had tens of millions of people living there, they only found a thousand and spoke of a pandemic, which was ridiculous so I was doing some research on WHO from that time on and I was suspicious why such things happen.

**I think there is a lot of corruption because there are people earning money with people being in need, and need is a driver for business, and they are looking for people in need. This is why they want our data now. The whole pandemic is used for collecting data about health, health data. The goal of the future, if you know where people are in need and you know where they could be in need, if you know their genes and if you know their weaknesses you can prepare drugs and you can blackmail them. Patented drugs are very expensive, but you need it because we know you are at risk, and such things. There is a big, they find out, they try to trace the viruses and they found out viruses where they can fear monger, where they can just tell us we are in danger because they know, they have the data – no one else, and we have to believe them, we can't know better, we don't have the data and the data are in private hands. They are in Google and other enterprises.**

The PCR test just takes out some samples of your nose or your throat, some cells and tries to find some RNA, some traces of RNA, and there is a suspicion yes there is a suspicion that if you have cells you can sequence the cells and you can find out the genome, the whole genome of the person you tested, and this is a very precious thing if you have all this information about the genome. So, you could have a databank and you could find out your future customers with this, which products to prepare so knowing, having the million data of genome data it's a very valuable thing.

I was speaking out this question, I was asking this question and the answer was *no it is not allowed, we do not*, but the problem is if those big enterprises the laboratories who do the testing for the mass testing. They have the PCR machine here and in the next room they have a sequencer and there is no data protector running around in Germany and watching them. It's very difficult to find out what they do with the material they get from us. The fact is they get material from the whole population now. They collect biological material, they have giant biological databanks now, which are very very valuable and if they have the gold in their fridges it's a very very big temptation to use this gold and I have the question *how do we control that they don't misuse our data?* I don't get an answer and I mis trust.

You know the WHO is just a room where they meet. WHO has many committees and has many sub organisations together with the World Bank and with others, and they make plans on how to change, not only the health but the living conditions of people too? Because WHO is a part of the World Economic, has become a part of the World Economic Forum where there are very different plans that have nothing to do with health, but have to do with shaping new societies. WHO is engaged in this and is misused by those people because those people they pay WHO for its services, so WHO has a good name, still has a good name and is authorised to define health, to define illnesses, and they misuse WHO to define our health, to define the viruses, to define what is a good test, to define which diagnosis you give when the test is positive and then the doctor gets money for the diagnosis, and all these things together this is a big machine where you can pay people for following, most people who follow the WHO follow those plans and proposals, they are rewarded they are paid because if you say *this is COVID-19 you get extra money*. If you say it for someone who just died this is COVID-19 you get more money. If you put them on a ventilator you get much more money, if you put them on an intensive care, it is really a good thing if WHO gives the possibility to say this is COVID-19 with a person who had only contact with someone whose test was positive. They made a number for this and then you can make every patient a COVID-19 case and this is the reason why in some hospitals or many hospitals, 60 percent or 70 percent of the people now are COVID-19 cases, which is impossible and a big big fraud. Nobody cares about this because they need the cases to frighten us.

An infection is something you feel, an infection is a reaction of your body. There are always viruses and the viruses they are kept at a distance by our immune system. They cannot harm us normally, they are there but they don't harm us, and when you have too little levels of Vitamin D in the winter, for instance, or the doses you just accept from other people that comes to you when somebody coughs or sneezes and you get a big dose of certain viruses, perhaps then you get an infection and then you feel it, you have a sore throat and you have a runny nose or you cough or something like that, so that is an infection that you can spread. If you have an asymptomatic infection you cannot spread a virus because the virus doesn't reproduce itself. There is no real activity of your cells multiplying the virus and so you cannot produce enough viruses to infect someone else. If the virus is creeping somewhere on the mucosa and the test is positive, this is not an infection and you cannot spread the virus because then you need a big dose, so the difference. **A positive test is one thing, a healthy person can have a positive test, a healthy person who cannot spread any virus can have a positive test. A positive test doesn't say anything about the infection and doesn't say anything about the possibility to spread this infection, so this is what was misused all the time last year and was making the big damage.**

For sure you have cases where the virus gets deeper when your immune system is not strong enough, if you are an old person or you take certain drugs to slow down your immune system then you may get really seriously ill, but this may happen also with other viruses, with influenza and human (inaudible) virus and others, and the funny thing is we are shown severe cases of illness and the test is positive so it is COVID-19 and many clinics do not even look for any of the other viruses that could be really responsible, they just look for the positive test and they say then it is COVID-19. What we miss is a differential diagnosis. Said we don't do it anymore, not even if the people have died, they make the test and say COVID-19 and perhaps they die of many other diseases.

It's easy to understand when you say if it's itching somewhere you scratch yourself it may be fleas you have, it may be also lice you have, but you may have both and this is the same with viruses. So I think the virological reality is very different from the pictures by the test. The test is spreading, we have a test pandemic, and we don't have a serious pandemic from a virus.

When I heard about asymptomatic cases I was very curious what they meant, so I started researching and trying to find out how they came to this idea, and I found out at work there was one publication, also by Mr Drosden and his team, and they said there was a case which was asymptomatic where they found where the test was positive and afterwards journalists found out that this first case in Germany it was a woman from China. **She had symptoms she even took pharmaceutical products because she had symptoms before, so this was a misunderstanding and then I'm very happy that there was a Chinese study from Peking where the Chinese population was examined, they examined lots of people. Oh no it was in Wuhan they examined about nine million people there and they made tests with all those people in China, it's possible, and they only find a few cases, less than 100 cases about 300 cases, I don't have the numbers here, but they found out those cases had contacts and they examined the contacts of those cases, they examined about 1,300 contacts and they didn't find any person of those 1,300 that was infected or had symptoms or that had a positive test, so there was no spread from those asymptomatic cases they found in China. This is a very big study, and it is very clear, and the results are very clear, and I think we should not talk anymore about people being asymptomatic and being some threat for others. It's not possible. We know from a big study in China now, we are very sure that there is no such thing as asymptomatic transmission of COVID-19. We don't have it and you don't have to be afraid.**

You can change the definition and you can change the word, and we had this change of definition and with this change of a definition it was the tool how the fear was driven worldwide. **The topic with the new gene vaccine is very interesting because it's no vaccine it's gene therapy. People are changed, there is nuclear (inaudible) injected and the cells of the person who gets this starts producing proteins, and those proteins are spreading in the body and the body produces antibodies against this, so we become a bioreactor because we are genetically modified. We are genetically modified organisms when we get this injection, and this is very cheap for them.** Before they had to have big factories, they had to have bioreactors where they produce the anti-gene, now we do it ourselves. It's very easy to produce the mRNA it's very fast and much cheaper than breeding the anti-gene on eggs or in bioreactors and cleaning all this, so they have less costs, they are faster in production, and we have the risk. This is the new method, and we are genetically modified organisms, which has lots of consequences, illegal consequences, I think.

We are modified by gene technology and how long this lasts and how long the effects in our body are detectable, this is not very clear. It may be for only some weeks, it may be for only some months, and it may be, in some cases, that something is lasting lifelong or is even passed in your family, but we don't know it. **It's a new method, we don't have any hard data on this, so it's a very big experiment and it's a human experiment and I think the risk is too big to allow such things.**

**About changing the definition, WHO is adjusting definitions, adjusting the definitions according to the needs of its sponsors. WHO has changed the definition of a pandemic during the swine flu and they took away the many sick people and the deaths, the victims as the criteria, and then they changed it again and now they have some definition which is defined as something like waves. They have periods of pandemics, then they have inter-pandemic periods, they have the pandemic going away and coming again, so they have all those phases of a wave they use to describe what a pandemic is and we can expect that those waves come every year and the pandemic is something according to the definition of WHO we shall experience each year, which is a very good business model for vaccine producers.**

There is another thing which is very interesting at Christmas, it was just at Christmas WHO published a news and they spoke about the herd immunity. You know most of the people are immune to viruses because they come each year and we know them, and they don't hurt us and only some

people have to refresh their immunity getting a little bit ill. This is the normal thing, so we have herd immunity against all of the respirator viruses, and WHO suddenly defined you cannot have a natural herd immunity, herd immunity is only existing when the herd is vaccinated, so herd immunity is something you can only reach by vaccination, you have to vaccinate a certain part of the population to have this herd immunity, so they just deny the natural herd immunity and they just make it a thing of marketing. Herd immunity, immunity is just something that is shown in your vaccination passport, and not in your immune system anymore, which is ridiculous, and which is criminal at the same time.

I think we lost the politics in public health; you cannot trust them anymore now. They are just misusing all those tools we normally use in public health, and paying scientists to do the wrong thing and to betray us, and I think there is a lot of corruption and it's not that single people are corrupted it's the system corrupt, the system is following the money and not the truth, and this is why we cannot trust it anymore, and this is very sad because we are without orientation, but the good thing is that if there is really a pandemic coming we would see it, we would feel it, we would hear it from our neighbours, so we don't need the test.

If you have such an interest if you want to control people you can find scientists who can give you the informations you need and who can spread the informations you need for it, so if you are a sponsor if you have lots of money you can even found a laboratory and you can buy a whole university now and make a private science and only pay the results you need, so there is no science anymore they produce money they produce power, but they don't produce knowledge and this is a very bad development.

When you think how it could go on, you have to just remember that we live in a democracy and we are governing, it's us it's all the billions of people who are the ones who elect the politicians and the politicians do what we want them to do, this is how in a democracy normally it functions, but I think we have forgotten that we are living in a democracy and it's our fault things have developed as they did and it's our fault that we didn't watch what is happening with the laws and what is happening with the independence of science, with the independence of justice, with the independence of many many institutions and organisations we have to rely on, we entrust them because they are a specialist organisations we entrust them certain functions and we pay them for that, and if we don't watch them and someone else pays more they do what the other one wants. They follow the money, and this is what we observe now, and I think we have to do something that we have to rely again and that our trust is reasonable, and for that there is a lot of things to do. We have to engage in politics.

People are being made afraid of viruses and they are being made afraid of being controlled by an authoritarian system, and what we see is people do not need to be afraid that they are endangered by a virus, but they need to be afraid that they might be controlled by an authoritarian system in the future, and I think they are few and we are many so let's organise, let's say no and let's open again, let's just neglect the lies. If we plan our lives on the basis of lies, we cannot be successful, we cannot live happily together. We have to find the truth and if there is not even any discussion allowed, if those people are cut down who have a different opinion there is no discussion, so those people who cut down the channels on YouTube and those people who burn the books, the digital books, they are the ones who want to hide something and we are governing, we are the people and we have to ask them *why do you do this, show us the evidence*, and if they don't answer we have to go to court, we have to defend ourselves.

**Part 2 – Dr Wolfgang Wodarg**



How to swim if you jump into deep water and I learnt how to swim so I am not afraid, and it is very good to have people with whom you can discuss, and I was with Reiner Fuellmich and with Vivienne Fischer and with the Corona Committee, the truth committee, and I was founding with them and inventing this instrument, and I am accompanying the lawyers working in this group and I find out we get stronger and stronger and we learn a lot. If you are not alone, if you are working like this it's not so difficult to say the truth, it's not so difficult to come out, you have to look for partners, you have to look for mates with whom you can go this way. It's hard, but it's okay, you feel good when you do it and you feel free if you stick to the truth, what you think is the truth, and be open for discussion.

The most important thing when you look for solutions is to find the right questions, so you could have good questions and good questions are the most important thing. What has changed with this pandemic in the life of people and when did it change, why did it change all over the world with all people, if it's a pandemic? Why can't you just switch the problem off like in China when you stop for some time making the tests? There are many good questions you can ask, and you can try to find out what is the answer, but you know in this situation we are not allowed to ask some questions because we would touch some power, we would destroy some business and this is the problem today. We cannot ask questions and cannot discuss about them because there is big power, there is big money, and if we had the same money to pay for science and to pay more, if we had institutes that only live from our taxes and not from some Bill and Melinda Gate Foundation and such things, I think life would be easier, we could easily find out what is good for us. We don't have it. We gave up. We left it over.

Different the world now is that the self-organisation of the people in society that it has been taken over like it was in the medieval times by some people who are more powerful than others. We try to exploit them, people who collected our money all of those years, like Amazon like Google, like I don't know Facebook and they get richer and richer and they sell us things and we say oh we need it we need it we need it, so we are devoted, we are just bowing down, we are just getting dependent and what happens is that we get slaves like that, that we don't do it ourselves anymore, that they make us dependent like a drug dealer makes his customers dependent when you see all those people looking at their mobile phones all the time, all day, there is such an interface between brain and the electronic world. This interface exists, it's not in our brain, the only difference if you have a brain interface that you don't have to have your mobile phone in your hand any longer, you have it in your brain, so you have your hands free, this the only difference. But we have already the interface between our brain and internet. It's the mobile phone, and they use it, they programme us with their apps and with their software with their questions, it's their questions we answer, and we are eager to answer, and we are happy to fund you, it's not the questions we ourselves develop, it's not our problem.

I think we need smaller things we can understand, and not big things we can never understand. The very very big things like the Googles system, for instance, it's not possible to find out where they betray us and where not. I think we have to organise our life in a way that is easy, there is transparency, we need transparency to understand what's going on so that we can say "oh no this is wrong this will be dangerous", but we cannot just say "okay they do it, I don't know why I don't have the means to look through, so I just follow them". They make us dependent like this. It's too big for humans. It's too big for normal society to live together. They just dominate it. They tell us and they are not consequently planning to do it still stronger, to have power as to collect our data and to educate us. I don't know why Mr Zuckerberg shall educate my children or educate me, no I don't want it. I think he's not the one to educate my children and the Google ones are not the ones to educate my children. They learnt how to make money and how to dominate. It's not what my children should learn, there are so many nicer things to learn.

**Planet Lockdown Interviewer:** How would you describe briefly the first step for people to take?

**Dr Wolfgang Wodarg:** I experienced first steps in our society. I experienced, for instance, a region where the Lord Mayor was going to the health insurance companies to say “how much did you spend on my citizens for caring for psychiatric diseases? How much did you spend last year?” And they calculated and they calculated for 100 – 80,000 people and they said so-and-so millions we spend for psychiatric diseases. The Lord Mayor said “okay give me the budget. You will give ten percent and I, with this budget, will prevent psychiatric diseases, so I will care for the people so they don’t get crazy and that they don’t drink, and they don’t do such things that divert them, and you will save money with it because you don’t need expensive hospital care and such things. We will make prevention and we earn money with prevention.” And it works in Germany. There are regions working like this. I was so much happy to see this, it’s not only one there are several regions who do it like this and you could not do it only for psychiatric diseases, you could do it just like the Scandinavians did it for many many years, they always did it like this. I am coming from the Scandinavian border of Germany, so I know what our neighbours did, and they just had small budgets for the community, and they cared for the old people, and when the care was not good, they were ashamed because they experienced, it was their responsibility they got the money, and they were responsible for their old people. This is the ideal way.

Why should there be a shareholder company organising the care in Germany and promising a profit of ten percent revenue? It’s horrible what happens. It’s our responsibility for our neighbours, for our families, and we can organise such things. We can organise care, we can organise healthcare. Okay, the state can help us to find out which products work against which not. We can learn from each other what is the best way to care, so the principal of subsidiarity is very important if we want a new society. We have to follow the principals of subsidiarity. Let the people solve the problems themselves as long as it is possible, and only if they ask for help then the bigger thing can help the smaller things, so such things we have to find out and I think it will be very very nice to do it. I think there is this big problem with the money. I think we are all dependent on this medium of exchange. We all use money – dollars, euros, and they can do us a lot of harm with money. They can even take away the money, so we have to think what we can do. If we do this normal exchange between people – one wants to sell something the other want to buy something and we exchange services, so we have to find out what means of exchange we can use, what media we can use for trade in a smaller regions, and how we can connect this with other regions. So we have to start again, I think we have to start again and there will be a little bit of, okay it won’t be possible to buy a Tesla in Northern Germany for some time, perhaps, because the economics of connections is no longer working, and you won’t get a credit for buying a big big factory from your bank, perhaps, so it will be slower everything.

But in this field the great reset should be very content, there is some, but the only difference between the great reset from Davos and the other great reset I think of is that we ourselves struggle for our great reset, and that (inaudible) some billionaires just tell us what to do and control us. This is the difference. This is the only thing we have to care. It’s our thing, it’s not easy, we share this (inaudible). There will still be problems, as always, but I think we don’t get slaves then, we keep our dignity as single individuals, we keep our dignity, and this is so important. Nobody shall become the means of somebody else. Then we are lost. We have to fight.

If one person, one human being does something as he thinks he should do it and the other human being is just some instrument for him, it is no longer his brother, there is a dependency and the one who is exploited is used as an instrument, he will lose his dignity if he cannot say what he wants, if he does not have the same rights. We discuss so many centuries about such things, we elaborated such good laws, we have fundamental laws everywhere, and we are fond of them. It’s two years ago and every politician was telling us about human rights, about dignity and the greens in Germany were

travelling to China, oh no you don't care you don't watch the dignity; you are putting people to prison you are controlling them, and now they want to do it as the Chinese people do. Something in their head changed. They follow the money, they follow the power, they make it easy. It's not easy.

I think they have too much money. We take away their things, they are things they cannot even use them. They now try to exchange the money they have – hundreds of billions they try to exchange against power. They buy power, and I think we should not allow this. In a democracy it's our power. We should not sell it for money, which isn't a big bubble. They can print money as much as they want, they can bribe all of us with money which is worthless. This is what they just do, they pay everyone who follows, they pay all the doctors who give the jobs, they pay the laboratories, they pay all people that follow that say yes, and then they get money. Well, this money is of no value in the long run, and they know it.

They have lots of it so they would exchange this money against power, because when they have the power, they can do what they want. When they have the power, when they have the data it's power you can influence, and if you have the media, the information media, the newspapers, the television station – if you can switch down YouTube channels you can decide who can say something and who can discuss and whose no longer able to be critical what to discuss with the others, so it's such a big thing we experience, a very big thing, and I'm so happy that there is no violence needed to do this all. They did not use military up to now. The people did not make war up to now. There are some people who used violence and there were some victims already, I know, but it's not like a war and I think the Indian people they experienced it when they were getting rid of the British Government of the British colonial ship or how you say it, so they were struggling. It was Gandhi who made it a peaceful thing and a very very powerful thing, and I think we can learn a lot off those Indian people who did it already and are starting again. I was so happy to see it how the farmers in (inaudible) were no longer content being betrayed by their own government, and I think there are so many – people in Germany or in US who is betrayed by their own government, they could do it like the farmers in India, we could learn a lot from them. But it's peaceful. Just don't follow them.

You can laugh about him, he is naked, the king is naked. You know this story about the child, everyone was obeying was afraid from the king and the only one who was looking at this king and recognising "oh it's not true what he says, there is no power, he's naked". And I think it's a very good fairy tale, very much fitting to the situation. We should become like children now and I think it will be great fun to laugh out those crazy people who tried to influence the whole world, those few people nobody the world really understands, and how can you govern a world, how can you just say you know better - you must be crazy to do such things. We don't want to be hurt by crazy people.

There are lots of structures in our society that are still working, that are working well and we can change this dependency from foreign money, this private partnerships organising our public life – just kick them out. I think we have to take back the infrastructure we need – the schools, the railways, the television, we have to control it in a democratic state, and there can be business. You can earn a lot of money with other things, they can produce things, but not allow them making us dependent when they take over our infrastructure, what we need, what is our identity. Our health system, our communications. This might not be influenced by some mighty rich people somewhere, it's our thing.

It's ironic the history is very funny. I made reports in the Council of Europe about a role of media for democracy and I organised this discussion in the Council of Europe with forty-seven member states, and I discussed Reporters Without Frontiers and with other organisations, and we developed indicators, we developed twenty-six indicators to monitor or states that want to become members of the European Union. I did this in the working group with some very clever people together, and I was

repertoire it was my initiative and we really succeeded to define twenty-six indicators. They were used, for instance, in Serbia and other states that tried to enter the European Union and some of the indicators say that the media shall be independent from politicians. They may not be influenced by any medias. They should be free from political influence, and this was the main thing, they all agreed on this, but there started some problems when I wanted more indicators the independence from the money people, it was more difficult to get those indicators through and they are too weak, I think. What we experience now is that it's not the big dictators who are just telling the media, there are some states where it happens like this, when I think of Turkey and how some journalists are just endangered because they say something. This is political power limiting journalism and limiting the media, but most of the limiting they just buy the media, and they fire the people who do not say what they want to hear. This is more dangerous now and this is in all Western countries in all, I don't like the word, capitalistic countries you can observe this it's like that. So, we have to perhaps to sharpen those indicators a little bit in the future. There should be a new report, I would like to work with it.

Do we speak about conflict of interests, and it's very much elaborated how to avoid conflicts of interest, so we have transparency, and we have the interests that are at the table having them laid down for everyone and make it transparent, and we discuss a lot about this? **This is a preventive way to deal with power, and if we don't do it there is the risk of corruption. Internal experience that there are power or rich people who just buy things, buy functions, and this fight for trustworthiness of that if you entrust an organisation you have to rely on it, and if there is institutional corruption you cannot, so we have to fight institutional corruption. There is so much institutional corruption. What we observe now is the institutional corruptions. Our agencies don't protect us against liars, against false results of science. They are there to protect us normally, and the funny thing is within the institutions there are people who want to do the right thing.** They are not the bosses, but they are people who used to do the right thing all their life in those institutions and they suddenly find out that the boss says something different because he's listening to politics, the politicians sent him or put him there to say what the politicians like to hear and the bosses of those institutions you only become the boss of an institution if you do what the government wants you to do. And all those employees who are looking for the truth they are afraid now to come out. And I think we should think it over, I think we should not have such institutions without democratic control. So the decision who comes the boss of a very important constitution like Robert Koch's Institute or (inaudible) Institute, or the CDC, or FDA, or something like that we should have discussion, the opposition should be involved and we should agree on someone who we can agree we can trust, and who we can take away again if we see in this transparent system that there are secondary interest that are dangerous. So, we have to change a lot.

**It was in 2009 when I was working on the swine flu issue, I was still a parliamentarian, and I used my chance as a parliamentarian to table the motion, the name of the motion was fake pandemic, and this was shocking so many people that they were very much interested in the topic, and because it was forty-seven member states at the Council of Europe, you have the opposition there, you have the governing parties there so you can raise a topic where the opposition is interested, you can raise a topic where the governments are interested and there's always discussion – it's a very vivid discussion going on there on many topics on human rights, democracy and the rule of law.**

**Even if you are a politician if you find out something and you have to come out with it and you have to convince a majority, it is always a little bit, it's endangering your career perhaps, and I tried it when I found out it was a fake, the pandemic was a fake the swine flu pandemic was a fake, I went to Parliament in Germany and I showed up and said "dear colleagues, I have to tell you something. You are preparing to buy millions of doses of vaccines, but they are dangerous, and they are useless.**

**You are spending lots of millions for nothing, and you endanger the people, and I explained this in ten minutes, and they were all listening, there were 250 people in the room they were all listening for ten minutes without making noise or without reacting, it was quiet. When I finished it kept quiet, there was no one showing up and they are professionals, they are professional politicians, they were very much astonished about this reaction and even the minister who was before announcing that she bought fifty million doses of vaccines, that we should all be content and go to our constituencies and tell the people they have enough vaccines, and I said “no, you don’t need it, it’s a fake”, and there was quiet, they were all quiet, but there was no reaction. And the president said, “anything else, anything else to say to discuss?” and nobody discussed. I was frustrated about this. It was like speaking into an (inaudible), then I went to the Council of Europe and it was easier. I was head of the committee, I tabled it and I found enough signers who signed it and we tabled it in the parliamentary assembly, and we had a committee examining the whole thing the whole fake and I found a colleague from Great Britain who was continuing, because I stopped being a parliamentarian then, but I accompanied this process as an expert and he invited me as an expert, so I was in the matter the whole time and it was very interesting, and I learned a lot about WHO and corruption and I learned about how WHO works, how it has changed in the last twenty years.**

You feel, and if you say what you want to say, if you say the necessary that you will have a reaction, and then you just have to decide whether you, what is more important that everything is quiet and you don’t have problems, or whether you have more problems if you don’t say it, and I decided I have more problems if I’m quiet, because I have a responsibility as a politician and as a doctor who knows those things, I am the one who trained all his life dealing with infections, with epidemics, with epidemiology, this is my work, so if I would be quiet I could not see myself in the mirror anymore.

**You know there are people who take the easy way because they get a lot as a reward, if they keep quiet. I know there are many people who know what happens and who don’t come out because they are, some of them they get a lot of money that they say the opposite and some of them are just afraid to lose their job, and I can very well understand those people having a family, scientists or people working in an administration and there are scientists in administrations who very well know what is going on, but they don’t come out because they are afraid to come out and they would risk a lot. I don’t risk so much. I don’t risk as someone who is, I have a pension, I worked all my life and now I have a pension. I was a politician and neither as a politician or as someone who is in pension there is any risk for me. I lose all my site jobs, or I lose friends, you lose a lot of people who don’t want you to say it to speak out because it makes them feel bad when you speak out and they don’t dare to speak out, and so there are tensions, and you have to know it in advance. I’m not angry about them I can understand them, and I hope they’ll get along when their conscience in the long run if something bad happens. I think there is a big responsibility of signs in there. All my former colleagues who are the head of public health offices who learned the same as I did, they should know what happens. And there are some speaking up, they are coming out and they say, “no. This is not a pandemic. This is not right what you do.” I know a handful, but there are more than four hundred leaders of public health offices in Germany, all over Germany, and there are some thousand who work there and who know, and it would be good if they came out, but it’s not easy to come out.**

I only know the meaning of today, I don’t know the meaning of life. It’s nice to have people who trust you, and it’s nice if you can make people happy. It’s the nicest thing. It’s nice if you can give something and you see that people like it and that people need you and that you can, I think the best thing is to be with people, and that you have people who say, it’s good to be with you. So, I don’t know I can lose everything but not that.

**Planet Lockdown Interviewer:** So it's human relationships?

**Dr Wolfgang Wodarg:** Yes, you can say that it's like brotherhood, or however you say (inaudible) I don't know, friendship. You know, this was, we don't, it's not so easy in a society where the role of family members are diverted, they all work, they all have outside interests so what was the family with all the conflicts in the family, with all the discussions in the family, with all the different interests in the family, but there was a family nobody questioned it, and they felt as a member, as a family, they felt somewhere at home, but this has been spoiled by the way we now live in this economy shaped world. It's about earning money, earning one's life. It's about competition. And you know one thing I found out when you install competition, brotherhood is destroyed. Everywhere with so many people they say competition makes society more successful, we have more ideas and competition, and they seduce us into competition. Even in health our health system used to be a solidarity thing, (inaudible) of people getting ill we all pay a little bit and then we can help them, we had solidarity with the sick people. but this has changed. Those companies now, insurance companies, in competition, they look now for people who are not expensive, and they pay a lot, so they look for the money, there the idea of solidarity is gone in our health systems and in our insurance companies. And now the church is ringing I hope people gather there.

It's important for you and it's important for your friends and for your neighbours that you say the right thing. If you don't say the right thing your neighbours can't rely on you anymore, they will find out you don't say the right things. I think when you say the right things to people who do wrong you lose friends, perhaps.

**Planet Lockdown Interviewer:** What I mean to not say the right thing or do what is right, speak the truth. Why's it important to speak truth? To do good things.

**Dr Wolfgang Wodarg:** You know I'm very fond of the principal of science, which is doubting, and I grew up with scientists in my professional life and I got to know many very good scientists and the best ones were those who never believed, who always were doubting, who were always asking questions, such a present if you ask questions if you doubt because then you start thinking again. And in science you don't believe, so when you grew up in such an environment, I think this is where the rules are like that. It's not a bad thing to doubt, it's not a bad thing to speak out "you're wrong with your numbers. You're wrong with your results. I think you forgot something when you made your science. And this is the present, and if you suddenly, in science, experience that people are quiet, that they hide data, that they don't publish when they don't have the result the sponsor likes, you feel very very bad, you are no longer in science. This is not science, this is business, this is earning money, this is I don't know what, but it's not science. I like this looking for truth and I know what was truth yesterday will not be truth tomorrow, but the truth is doubting, and we can rely on science because we can rely on their doubt and this is a very, it makes me happy that it is like that and I don't want to miss this because it's not bad to doubt. It is professional, it is professional work.

I can say something about the first step, the first step is very very difficult sometimes because you are with people who have arranged with you, and if there is something which is very new and which is mixing up the whole discussion you had before, all the values you had before, you were believing this institution, this politician is good, you were discussing and suddenly you find out this politician is not good, he's lying, he's betraying you because he likes his cars and his houses in the long run. I think that if someone who does this would have a big conscience, bad conscience, and I think there is more value in it to speak out and to say even if you are wrong. You have to be aware that with your new ideas you might be wrong, but if you are not afraid to have the discussion there's no problem – you can be wrong! You can learn, but if there's no discussion, if the discussion is not allowed and you are calmed

down, if you're wiped out in the channels, if your books are burnt, I think this is a society I don't want to live in, and then I start fighting. I want to live in a society where we strive for truth, where we try to find out the right way for all of us and I think this is worthwhile good doing all of this.

You know it's very difficult to be true to oneself when you don't have a fixed picture of yourself, when you're in the morning suddenly astonished with who you are, and you find out you have changed, so this orientation I don't have it. I don't have me as a person as someone who is fixed whom you can calculate how he acts, it's recursive, I have to use my intellect as long as it works. I have to use my language as good as possible and I have to be curious and I have to find out, with other people, the truth, the best ways to live and such things and so I don't look at myself as something I have to follow. I'm there I'm new every day, and I think this is a present.

**Planet Lockdown Interviewer:** Yes, so I guess you say to be true to yourself is the sort of goal of all this, huh?

**Dr Wolfgang Wodarg:** Yes. You have your way you learnt to get along with the problems of your daily life and of your work and you have a set of possibilities and you use them, and at the same time you know others have it too, so the nice thing is to learn and to find out new things, and to discuss about it, so there is something developing in communication and this is what I live for.

I think we have the big possibility; we have choices, we can come out, we can open the shops, we can put away the mask and we can speak about it. We can find others who do it with us, not that we don't do it alone, we are weak alone, but if we find enough people whom recognise and whom you can convince what nonsense is happening and how its destroying our daily life, I think this is a good experience and we should hurry. **We should open, we should forget those lies. They are lying and we have, in front of our children, we have the duty to say the truth. Our children wearing masks it is impossible, it is a thing we cannot tolerate that children are damaged like that. Or that old people in care houses are alone may not be visited. They themselves can decide whether they prefer to have their children and grandchildren around, or whether they want to be alone because they are afraid – they can do it themselves. No law maker can decide this, and we should advise them, we should inform them if they want, but what we see now we see old people deprived of their families and dying alone, and even deprived, even there is no staff anymore because they are all in quarantine. The staff are diminished, old people are more and more alone and old people don't like to live anymore under such circumstances.**

This is what we do. This is what we watch, and those people who frighten us, who try to calm us down with vaccinations, the vaccinations are killing even more people than they save, as we see it now. In many countries we have very very bad reports. We have to stop this, because we are responsible and the politicians who tell us that it is important that this happens, we cannot tolerate them anymore doing this to us. We elected them and they just don't follow the rules, and they don't follow their own rules, even. So, I think something has to happen very soon.

We have a choice to do something because we are millions of people, and those people are few. Do you think they will tell their soldiers to shoot at their own people? The soldiers won't do it because they belong to us. They have their families, they have children in our schools, they suffer too from nonsense, and I think soldiers, policemen, there are many policemen now speaking up, and there are people coming out. And first, there are those shop owners that are closed down, those artists they cannot do work anymore and they are the first to show up because they cannot lose more than they have already lost, and I think others will follow. We all will lose if don't speak up.

If they want to make us a machine, they want to make us slaves, we say no – we don't want to become slaves. Just piss off we don't need you anymore. We are many. We can just go on, we can just go to bars and go to shops, we don't need to be afraid of any pandemic. **There is no pandemic. It's a fake, and it's so evident now if you see all numbers it's so evident, and they still go on lying. It's just like a mafia it's horrible, and we don't have to tolerate this. It's our right to speak up. It's our society, it's our democracy. It's good to speak out, how free do we feel.**

There are some countries, I saw pictures from Egypt where nobody wears a mask, where they just go out to the market as always. The Government yes says to the World Bank, yes we do everything, but the people do they give a shit, and they just go on living and this is right. **In Tanzanear they do it right, even their politicians it's okay the people can go on, it's a fake, and I hope we have politicians in the future that do the same. We still have the old ones who lie who are lying, but there will be elections and we will go for the elections. We kick them away, or those traditional parties who are just joining those liars and are betraying us who are afraid of losing their power if they don't follow the mighty ones in Davos. They have no chance, next elections they will be gone.**

And we will find that it is difficult because it is anyway – it is a great reset what is happening, but it should not become the reset the Davos people, the club in Davos wants us to have. We will have our own reset, and this will be a big struggle – a democratic struggle and we will have new ideas and we will try to find out the right ones. Perhaps we find a different way of organising our societies. Perhaps we have many smaller societies just networking together.

Yes, I think we are blocked, and we cannot do the right thing if we are afraid, so we have to free ourselves, we have to help ourselves. One has to help the other to get rid of those fears and to start thinking again, and to be rational. You have to be brave and to be brave you also have to find companions who are brave too, because it's easier to be brave when you are not alone. If you're alone and brave maybe you just die, and nobody cares. You said the right thing, nobody listened. You were brave, you're dead, there's no use, so you have to find other people, so you have to fight with others together. So, you have to be tactical. Braveness may sometimes be stupid. If you want to change something to the good, you're not allowed to be stupid. You have to be clever, because you are responsible for others.