




Pseudoscience: Into Tyranny without Evidence of a Virus? – Interview with Dr. Andrew Kaufman



Has SARS-CoV2 ever been proven to exist? Dr. Kaufman joins Kla.TV to answer this basic question. Dr. Kaufman’s viewpoint has not been given attention to or proven wrong by the decisionmakers who are imposing emergency laws on the world’s population, are fast-tracking injections and threatening to make them the basis of existence in society. Please encourage dialogue about this important subject by spreading this interview to your friends and acquaintances.

Dr. Andrew Kaufman MD a natural healing consultant, inventor, public speaker, forensic psychiatrist, and expert witness. He completed his psychiatric training at Duke University Medical Center after graduating from the Medical University of South Carolina, and he has a B.S. from M.I.T. in Molecular Biology. He has conducted and published original research and lectured, supervised, and mentored medical students, residents, and fellows in all psychiatric specialties. He has qualified as an expert witness in local, state, and federal courts. Andrew has held leadership positions in academic medicine and professional organizations. He has run a start-up company, which developed a medical device he invented and patented.

Dan: Dr. Kaufman, thank you so much for coming on with us today on Kla.TV.

Dr. Kaufman: My pleasure to be here, Dan.

Dan: So, preparing for this interview, I just went on google and I typed in something very simple. I typed in “Coronavirus infection”, in the google search. And right away it came up with a description of the disease: “Covid-19 affects different people in different ways. Most infected people will develop mild to moderate illness and recover without hospitalization. Most common symptoms: fever, dry cough, tiredness. Seek immediate medical attention if you had serious symptoms. People with mild symptoms who are otherwise healthy should manage their symptoms at home.” And I looked at this and I thought: In what normal universe would this be considered a deadly pandemic. I mean, imagine reading that description from ten years ago, what is going on that causes us to see that as the end of the world?!

Dr. Kaufman: Well, I mean essentially a very sophisticated psychological operation.

Dan: Tell us about that a little.

Dr. Kaufman: I mean, basically, what we have here really is the combination of a major,

major effort that probably has been planned for quite some time. And you can find lots of documents actually of various planning stages, including things like exploring the World Economic Forum, a website in their organizational charts. But, you know, what you have had is that everyone has these certain beliefs about health and the body and germs and they're instilled, you know, practically from infancy. And we are... you know, we enforce this message over and over again and now we're in a situation where essentially ... that those beliefs that have been instilled in us are being exploited for the purpose of manipulation and really changing our whole society, culture and structure of government and all of the infrastructure of every sector, essentially is being completely transformed right now under the, you know, guise of 'treating a pandemic'.

Dan: Right, right. Well, let's get right into the vaccines that they're trying to peddle on us right now. I looked at... I did another google search and you know, there is a question as to whether we can call what they're giving us, what they're putting out on the public of vaccine at all and this was an article from back in April from the health section of ABC News Australia and the title was "We've never made a successful vaccine for a coronavirus before". And there is a big picture of a scary corona blob and it says 'Developing a vaccine to target SARS-CoV-2 has a number of challenges. And then down below it has the doctor or the professor involved in this 'Professor Ian Frazer worked on the HPV-vaccine and thinks a Corona-vaccine is unlikely any time soon.' So, I guess, Professor Frazer was wrong because it was only a matter of months before they came out and they have one for this Covid-19. Can we really call this a vaccine?

Dr. Kaufman: Well, I think there is a couple of words that you need to examine carefully here. And, you know, first of all, let's just stick with the word 'vaccine' for the moment, and you said that it's never been successful. And one must ask, what do you mean by success. Do you mean... I think what they mean is commercially successful. In other words that it's highly profitable. But you know, the success that the average person would really think about is: 'Does it prevent disease?' Now, coronaviruses cause the common cold. So we'd be talking about a vaccine to prevent a common cold which is really just a nuisance. And not something that, you know, causes serious health consequences. But, if we really look at all vaccines, none of them have been shown conclusively to prevent any illness. And the reason is because these illnesses are not caused by viruses or there has never been any prima facie evidence to show that there are such viruses that cause these diseases. So we essentially have a strategy that doesn't fit the situation, so there is no way that it could actually work in the way that we are told it works. And if you look at the epidemiological evidence which is really all we have, because they're not required to do proper placebo-controlled trials. You can see that all of the diseases that are said to have gone away because of vaccines actually disappeared or greatly reduced before vaccines were even available. So, you can easily tell that the reduction or elimination of the illness wasn't a result of the vaccine because it happened before the vaccine. And so we really have somewhat of a misnomer with vaccines from the beginning because 'vaccine' comes from the word "vaccinae" or really the Latin root of 'vacca' which means cow. And it's because Edward Jenner who developed the original vaccine who was supposedly used on small pox worked by a totally different principle, not really related to the same immunology; it was more of a homeopathic approach where you give a less severe form of something to someone to prevent the more severe form. But that strategy changed around the turn of the twentieth century and they thought about changing the name. And, you know, they're also known as immunizations which that speaks to you,

you know, the goal of giving you an immune response to something, right? But they decided in honor of Jenner to stick with that word, but it's really not that accurate because it applied to cow pox from the Edward Jenner vaccine. And cow pox is no part of any further, you know, vaccine, so it's really not the right word from the get go. But, it's even more in question in this current, you know, technology because it's been called that, but it's actually a brand new technology. So, in the past vaccines for, you know, these alleged viral illnesses was essentially just the fluid from a toxic cell culture. So, they, in a laboratory, made a cell culture usually with some kind of foreign cells like monkey kidney cells and they take snot from a sick person originally with that disease which, you know, is toxic material and they add a few more toxic chemicals and they grow the soup and then they take the fluid of and filter it and essentially that's a vaccine. They might do a little bit more or repeat that process a few more times but essentially that's what it is. And that's not what this current experimental treatment. And I want to emphasize that it is experimental because it does not have any approval from the FDA or any other governmental body. It only has the emergency use authorization and in the document which grants that - it says outright that it's not known if it's effective or not. So, you know, so we are talking about an experimental treatment, but this is a new technology, never been approved before, and essentially it's gene-therapy- is I think the best way to describe it, because it's taking a piece of messenger RNA, mRNA, which is the code for a gene that actually makes a protein product. And it's trying to use the cells of the person who gets the shot as a factory to make some protein. But, of course, this is very very worrisome, because since they haven't ever purified a virus and then pulled out a gene out of it that would make a protein from a virus, they really just used a computer to make up the sequence of this gene, based on, you know, sequencing thousands, tens of thousands of little fragments that don't know where they are from and they have a computer program to make up this fake gene sequence. So we really don't even know, what our bodies would make as a result of implanting this gene therapy technology. But what we do know is, that so far that there is a lot of people are getting sick and even dying from being part of this great experiment.

Dan: Now when you say 'getting sick and dying', we're talking about all sorts of things, we're talking about effects of the lockdown, we're talking about psychological effects and now we are also talking about reaction to the vaccine itself, correct?

Dr. Kaufman: Well, I was specifically talking about reactions to the vaccine, those other aspects are true as well.

Dan: Right, right. Well, besides the obvious danger of this being an experiment and being as everybody knows far less than the required - I don't know - 5 to 10 years to go through a vaccine, what do you see as some of the precise dangers that we might be facing? What could this do, genetically speaking?

Dr. Kaufman: Well, you know, I think, a lot of it is really unknown, because it has not been fully tested and I don't think they have really done enough research to fully understand the consequences of the technology. Also, vaccine manufacturers have in the past not disclosed all of the ingredients or constituents in their vaccines. So, for example, they have been... you know included DNA from aborted fetal cell lines, right? Now this has come out and now it's

more known but for a long time it was nowhere to be found. There's also evidence from two Italian microscopy researchers that they found evidence of nanoscale metals in virtually all vaccines on the market in Europe. And this is before the pandemic situation. And none of the manufacturers disclosed putting these materials in them, talking about rare and exotic earth metals, you know, including some things that are highly toxic and we don't know the purpose of these things. So I think there's an element of the unknown and I don't want to speculate and say, you know, there is this or that in there because I think it's just an unanswered question.

Dan: Right.

Dr. Kaufman: And I think that's some of the toxicity that we're seeing ... may come from these other agents although there's agents in there also that are known to be damaging. Like for example – I can't remember which product this is, but one of them contains Polysorbate 80. And this is, I think it's used as an emulsifying agent or something, they justified in some way, but we... it's known to increase the permeability of the blood-brain barrier. So, if there are elements in the vaccine, they'll be more likely to penetrate into the brain and spinal cord and we know that many of the adverse reactions are neurologically driven. So this is probably relevant, like we see in things like Bell's Palsy, for example. There have been a number of cases where it affects the cranial nerves which are the nerves in the brain that supply innervation to the head and neck. And so the muscles that move your face are innervated by the cranial nerves and that's a palsy of one of those cranial nerves. And I believe it's a facial nerve on one side, and causes, you know, the face to be paralyzed on one half, or half of the face. And so this is the kind of thing that you could see a direct connection between this particular ingredient and then something else in there that's toxic to the nervous system that could cause this type of a reaction.

Dan: As a psychiatrist could you speak to the ... the fact that when you show hesitance towards this new RNA vaccine coming out and you're talking to let's say a normie, and you give them a data point like this, the Bell's Palsy and potential dangers – why is there such resistance to learning any sort of fact about it? What is it that ... I mean if I go down this road with many of my relatives, we don't even begin to discuss any of this, there is no interest whatsoever... – psychologically speaking, why aren't they at least a little curious why cousin Dan has a tin-foil hat on, you know? They just don't wanna know, they do not wanna go there. I'm sure, you've run into this.

Dr. Kaufman: Yeah, well, you know, for those of us who realize, you know, what's going on and we are skeptical of everything and we don't trust the government or anybody else because we have seen over and over again how they put forth policies that actually hurt their constituents. It's very very difficult, you know, to talk with people, so-called normies who are not woken up to this and in fact, you probably have relationships with people in your lives, maybe family members, maybe even a spouse, close friends, even grown children, you know, so this is really creating a rift in all these relationships and really polarizing people. But, what I've come to realize is that there are very strong forces that really prevent people from being able to consider factual and rational information or arguments. So like they can't talk about this situation in a rational manner, thinking and you know, debating facts. Now some

people are capable of this but it's very rare in my experience. What happens is that I think there are two factors, and one is that people are sort of like in a cult-like mind-set with respect to, you know, what the government or the news, media-channel says, that their whole life, right, they have believed in these authority figures that they are honest, that they are treating them well. And so they... that's their position and they trust that information and then of course, if you trust that then you're gonna be deathly afraid that you and your whole family are gonna die. And even if this contradicts what you see with your own eyes, it still permeates your existence. And from this point of being in a fear-kind-of-survival mode that renders you unable to think really outside of that box. You can only consider direct threats to your survival, so that you can't really talk with someone in that mind-state. And then the other major thing, you know, can be described using different terms but I think cognitive dissonance is a good sort-of catchall phrase and what this means is that when confronted with information that shatters the entire model from which you view the world. So like for example, if you're ... let's say that you are a medical doctor, right, like I have training in, and if you realize the truth about germ theory - the evidence doesn't really support that germs cause disease, you really then have to give up your practice of medicine. And so you are not willing to do that because that will mess up your entire life, right?!

Dan: Yes, yes.

Dr. Kaufman: Right, it could ruin your family, your marriage, your finances, everything like that. It's very risky. So, most people or you know, like let's say, you just can't consider that the government would act against you, right? I mean, even though there's countless examples in history where the government murdered all its people, right? Like, you know, in China, Russia, in Germany, Cambodia, right, Turkey, etc. etc. So, it's not like there aren't examples but you have sort of this faith, right, that the government is like your parent – sort of parents philosophy of government and for your own parent to harm you is something you can't believe, right, because it just rocks your whole world and so you don't consider anything that would suggest that that's a possibility. And I mean there seems to be - especially in a certain generation - this real strong trust, and I've heard this from some ... even members in my family who are, you know, in the baby-boomer generation, that they're just like, oh, come on, you know, the government wouldn't do anything to hurt me.

Dan: Right, right.

Dr. Kaufman: And that is a strong belief.

Dan: Yes, and I think, you know, the resistance to any examination of the vaccines is just compounded – let's say in the present case – after people got the vaccine. Because they don't ... they can't later come to admit that they may have harmed themselves. And double it when it comes to their children, you know, if you ask them, well, do you think, 60 vaccines before the age of 4 might be a little too much, they cannot question that because then it would mean they have harmed their own children. So, ...

Dr. Kaufman: Yeah, that is a top one. And you know, I'll tell you that, you know, I've talked to a lot of people who are aware of the truth about vaccines, but almost all of them have come to it through a personal experience like that many of them parents of a child who, you know, and they, of course, had to deal with the guilt about that to come ... to come clean. But in other words, they have had a personal experience that was devastating, and that was the only way they were able to see, to actually look at the truth of the matter. Whereas people that didn't have that experience, you know, like you're saying, it's too hard to even look, because if you do realize that even if your child is healthy, right, you're gonna feel like 'o my God, what should I do'... Like I have had this moment, believe me, many times, because I, you know, regrettably did vaccinate my children when they were younger, and I even, I think I put off researching vaccines when I was researching other areas of medicine because I was afraid of finding this what you described. But, you know, eventually I did, and thank God I did, and I was able to stop, you know, sooner than if I had laid it further.

Dan: Right, right.

Dr. Kaufman: And I knew... like I knew they're gonna have some coming up due in this time like I've done research for them, you know, and I did get it done and changed course. But, you know, it was difficult and I was already facing, you know, going against the grain considerably for years before I reached that point.

Dan: Well, and we're still in that point, I mean, let's say your son or daughter gets accepted to Berkeley, right? The California, the UC (University of California) system requires the flu vaccine to get in and of course pretty soon you know what other vaccines are gonna be required to get in.

Dr. Kaufman: Ya, well, so we're all kind of faced with this situation in many ways right now, but I'll tell you that they, you know, a school has no business or in fact no-one else has any business forcing any kind of health decisions on anyone. And you know, this is something that we have to decide that we're gonna stand up against because if we allow it and go along with these things, even if it seems like a little thing, in my opinion, it's only gonna lead to these requirements becoming stronger and more pervasive and you know, that... the governments around the world have announced their plans to make this so. For example, a politician in the UK just last week said that they would require proof of vaccination at some point just to enter grocery stores. So you're basically saying: You're not healthy enough to eat ... ,right? It's kind of ridiculous reasoning, but so, people who are saying yes now to these things to getting tested, you know, getting tested is really one of THE most damaging things that you can do, because all of the policies are driven by the testing data, right, and we know the testing is completely meaningless because first of all it's not a test that's designed for that and there's no virus that's been shown to cause a disease that you would even test for. So, it's just a made-up thing. It's like going to the roulette wheel, and you know, if it's red you are positive and it's green, you're negative; except that they take that positive and negative and use it to take away more of our freedoms. And the vaccine requirement is gonna be one of those things. So, if people stop getting tested, everything will come to a grinding halt, because there will be no more cases.

Dan: Yes, and I find it in so many cases, it's interesting that you can... you can take down the official arguments just by using their own statements, like: Fauci has said himself that a test that's run over – what was it – 35 – what do you call them?...

Dr. Kaufman: ...cycles of threshold...

Dan: cycles of threshold, render the test useless and yet we know that in certain places, they're running more cycles than that. So,...

Dr. Kaufman: Well they were pretty much universally running more, but even so that in itself is a trap, because if you say, okay, suddenly let's say all the health departments say, you know, we're right. You're right, Fauci, we're gonna change our protocol, and we're gonna only do 30 cycle threshold. Okay? But it's still a test that's measuring something that doesn't exist or reporting to, right? So, it's still invalid, you know, and by the way, there are other parameters that they could tweak to get a higher percentage of positives, not just the cycle threshold. They can decide to dilute the sample less and they can also change where the cut-off point is for a positive. And you know, people... I mean the thing is that the technique of PCR which is not suited for a diagnostic test at all, the reason why they use it is because it's so easy to fudge it (means, "so easy to manipulate it"). You know, you can adjust all these different, tweak in all different ways and pretty much get whatever results you want. For whatever – like you could show anything, not just this fake virus, but you could show other fake viruses as well.

Dan: Right, right.

Dr. Kaufman: It's very versatile.

Dan: Yes, I know you've explained this many times in your videos, so I wonder if you could sort of do it in a nutshell – there is the question of whether the vaccine has been isolated. And I know that... let's say on our side.. we claim it hasn't and then the official's side ' no, it's been isolated a hundred thousands of times' - isn't there a doctor in Germany and one in Denmark, someone in Scandinavia who were offering a hundred thousand Euros or something, two hundred thousand - if it's so clear, why hasn't this money been claimed?

Dr. Kaufman: Well, so, Dan, this all comes down to really the definition of a single word. Because we all would agree, every... you know, human being with common sense would agree that if you're gonna demonstrate that there is a brand new organism that lives, that you've discovered, you'd actually have to show that organism, right, you'd have to have it, possess it, in your hands, right, in this case in a test tube because it's microscopic, but you'd have to actually have it by itself, nothing else. Right? Just the thing. And that's what 'isolate' means. But, in virology back in the 1950ies they came up with a trick. And what they decided to do is that we're gonna mix a whole bunch of things together with this, you know, fluid from a sick patient, we're not gonna isolate anything – we're gonna mix everything together, we're gonna add a whole bunch of more stuff including cell culture from a foreign animal and

poisoned chemicals and stuff and then we're gonna watch those cells die and we're gonna say that when they're dying they put off particles that that's a virus. And this is one of the biggest frauds, perpetrated in science in my opinion. Because they changed the meaning of this word 'isolation' to this foreign tissue culture toxic experiment. And they don't actually isolate anything, they never get a virus by itself, they never show that it's an actual thing that exists, and then they can never actually examine its structure and composition, like what's it made of. So, you know, they say all the stuff like 'it has a spike protein', but they've never actually shown the actual virus and then characterized the spike protein to say what it is. It's basically made up from a number of different experiments. And I can explain how it's done, but because they changed the definition of this word, they published papers that say, a novel virus is isolated. But they don't mean that it was isolated in the way that you'd have to do to discover a new organism. Instead they use it to describe this tissue-culture experiment. And this is really so dishonest. It's really lying, they're outright lying when they say this. But for the casual observer - and even most doctors are like this that you don't ... they don't actually read the whole paper of a scientific paper. So what they do is, they see the title and you can find, you know, now, probably ten or more papers that say, that isolation of SARS-CoV-2. But none of them mean that they've actually isolated it. They all have just repeated this tissue-culture-experiment which doesn't show anything. And then they have, you know, the so-called genome and, which, you know, a genome is the complete genetic sequence of an organism, right, and so we have this for humans where they took human cells and took the DNA out of human cells and they sequenced them and took a long time and have the whole sequence, right. So, they published like many papers and have a website where they have hundreds of different genome sequences for this made-up virus, but never once did they actually have a virus and take out the genetic material. Instead, what they did is, they took lung fluid from somebody which had all their genetic material and ... plus a bunch of other from bacteria and stuff... and then they chopped up the genetic sequences into tinier pieces and they looked for ones that they predefined and said were from a virus and then sequenced like 20 of thousand of these little fragments and then had a computer model them into one complete strand and filling gaps by just making it up. And that's what they say is a genome. But it's a purely made-up theoretical construct. It's not a real genome of a real organism. And they're using this, you know, pseudo-science to try and essentially, you know, change the world.

Dan: So, you're telling me this, I'm a real amateur, I'm curious, what is it like if you've done this, when you go up against a mainstream doctor, epidemiologist and you bring this argument forward. Has that happened? Have you had that debate?

Dr. Kaufman: Well, no, I haven't. And there are a lot of people that are trying to put this together, but a lot of people have, you know, challenged my opinion about this and a few people that agree with me like Dr. Tom Cowen. But the thing is that no one has put forth any evidence to say, like either one to explain how this tissue culture experiment really does prove the existence of a virus, or to present evidence that they really did do the real isolations somewhere. And here it is. But instead people just say ... point they send the articles and say 'look, right in the title it says isolated', but they didn't actually read the experiment. And so there have been just a couple of people that have been willing to have a conversation with me and go through the paper and talk about the experimental method. And both of those times the person changed their mind.

Dan: Wow.

Dr. Kaufman: So, most people are not willing to actually read the paper, and so like and I've heard some people like someone recently, an alternative health expert put out a video saying that the virus has been isolated. But in this video they didn't actually present any evidence of that. What they did was they took a bogus argument that ... that... not an argument that I made, but that some other people made, and just that it wasn't isolated and just contradicted that one argument. And...but that's not, you know, that's not really presenting proof. So, if for the, you know, most of the scientists out there, they would have to basically change their career if they were gonna take this seriously, like there is one virologist who came to the same conclusion on his own and many years before I reached this conclusion. And, I'm talking about Dr. Stefan Lanka here. But Dr. Lanka actually discovered a real virus earlier in his career and it's a virus that lives in sea algae, so it's not associated with humans or mammals. But he actually found that it's not, it doesn't cause disease in the algae, it actually helps them survive. But he purified and isolated this virus in... by the real definition of the word, and showed it to exist, and it had a very unique shape and structure to it. And then he went off to try and do research in measles and that's when he discovered that wow, they didn't actually isolate a measles virus, like I did with this algae virus. So what's going on? And he was essentially, you know, pushed out of academic science because of those opinions, right, and that's really what anyone would be facing if they were to take a more honest and objective look at this. And that's why so few people are willing to do that, and even, you know, there are a number of really good people who have, you know, these are mainstream people. Like, I can't remember his first name now, but Yeadon. I think it's Mike Yeadon who is an executive at Pfizer, right, a big pharmaceutical company. And he's got, you know, amazing courage to come out and be critical of what's going on and be critical of the vaccine. But I think that if he... what he is thinking to himself is that if he were gonna talk to someone like me and consider that the virus doesn't actually exist, he probably is worried that he would just be a laughing stock. And he is already taking a lot of criticism for speaking out the way he is, right, so he's just not willing to sacrifice maybe the reputation. I mean I'm not speaking for him, I'm just guessing. So, like he is a great guy, like I don't want to say anything bad, and maybe he would talk to me about this, and you know, if you hear this, please, I'd love to have a conversation. But I'm just trying to imagine what it would be like being in such a prominent position. Like for me, you know, I was just willing to lose it all, so I was willing to get fired from my job, which I did, and I was willing to leave the practice of allopathic medicine, which I did. But I made those decisions first, and because I felt that it was more important to speak the truth than, you know, to have those things and I figured the universe would make it work out it okay for me, which it has, you know. But we need other people to develop the courage, because if you look at the reality of the situation: If you don't speak up now, you know, in the future you're not gonna have the situation you have now, it's all gonna be gone. Especially if you're a doctor, you know, I think we can see the writing on the wall that medicine is gonna become like the police. Right, that it's all gonna be about surveillance: Did you get vaccinated? Did you get exposed to this germ or that germ? And most of it is gonna be automated with A.I. , and that's the reason why they have imposed electronic medical records on the system, not to make it more efficient but to take the decision-making out of the hands of the doctor and put it in the hands of whoever is the business manager.

Dan: Yes. We could spell out a pretty dystopian nightmare situation which we are already getting into, if people don't speak up now. So, I think on that note we'll close it. I have one quick question: If you could get into the mind of Joe Biden for two minutes and force the next executive order, what would you make it?

Dr. Kaufman: Well, I'm not even sure that you can do this with an executive order, but I would have him not renew the Emergency Banking Powers Act, because that... and you have to do a little research to figure out what I'm talking about, but essentially that is the act that keeps us in such a state of emergency. And you'd have to really look at the law a bit, but it would free us up to a huge degree if that were not renewed, for certain. But, you know, in reality executive orders have no authority. And, you know, they are called that because really the government is also acting as a corporation. And you can look it up on Dun & Bradstreet. And an executive order comes from the executive of a company. But it's not law, so it's not binding, and you know we've seen this be really abused by presidents to exert power, and by governors, in this situation and I think this is... they're actually trying to change the law to make an end-run around the legislative process which is much more difficult to enact, you know, laws that have major changes, especially if they take away our freedom. So, I think my act would be to prevent any executive orders from being done by any president. Because we have seen that the acts that he did execute - and I think he had a record for the most on the first day in office -... that they really have been destructive and been pushing the sort of communist, collectivist, technocratic agenda forward rather than anything that would benefit the people in the United States.

Dan: Okay. Well, Doctor Kaufman, our time is up, thank you very much for coming on, and I hope this gets out to people all over the world and we can continue to spread the message. And thank you for your work.

Dr. Kaufman: Oh, thank you for having me, Dan, and giving me this platform.

After the interview this important answer still was given by Dr. Kaufman:

Dan: I don't think this will go on the... I think we're actually done, but can I just read you one part of that and just get your reaction to it?

Dr. Kaufman: Sure!

Dan: They might splice it in. But... so, from a recent New York Times article - this is kind of a long quote, but it says: 'In the official language of research science a vaccine is typically considered effective only if it prevents people from coming down with any degree of illness. With a disease that's always or usually horrible like Ebola or rabies. That definition is also the most meaningful. But it's not the most meaningful definition for most coronavirus-infections. Whether you realize it or not you have almost certainly had a corona virus. Corona viruses have been circulating for decades if not centuries, and they are often mild. The common cold can be a coronavirus. The world isn't going to eliminate coronaviruses or this particular one

known as SARS-CoV-2 any time soon.’ And, my reaction to that is three things: Well, it seems that he’s admitting that the Coronavirus is not horrible, like Ebola or rabies. Two: We’ve never developed a vaccine for corona virus, and three: this vaccine isn’t going to prevent infection either. So, my point is, even if you read this stuff coming out from the official authorities, the Paper of Record, it doesn’t add up.

Dr. Kaufman: Yeah, well, that is typical. You know, this is why people need to really just learn how to think critically. Because, you know, most of the time people skim or they just read the headline, and they take it face value. Right, but that is gonna always be misleading especially in a newspaper, because, you know, they are basically experts at, you know, manufacturing opinion.

Dan: Right.

Dr. Kaufman: And they have a certain readership and they are pushing the story or narrative in a certain direction and then they’re gonna write their pieces in that way. And you’re not gonna be able to detect that bias unless you actually read it. But I do think it’s actually a much better decision ... is to not look at the mainstream media at all because you go to the primary source of the information yourself. So, if it’s about an executive order for example, go to whitehouse.org and read the executive order. Right, that’s gonna give you much more information than a New York Times article about it. You know, and then you’ll be able to start thinking and making your own opinions about what does this mean, what does it mean for me and my life? Right, and then, you know, maybe there’ll be some other scholars that might do a thoughtful analysis that you learn about outside the mainstream media. You know, people doing it because they’re passionate or skilled or, you know, they wanna sort of get information out to people, right? People like we are! And, I’m not saying, don’t trust me as a source of information, or you or anyone else in the space, but it’s good to hear other people’s opinions about things because it stimulates your own thought. So, you go to the source material, yourself, right, like the government website, the statistics, read the scientific study that describes whatever you’re talking about, and then, maybe look at some other’s people commentary on that to enrich your interpretation but don’t ever just accept what someone else says. And when you read a scientific paper also, like it’s important to know, and this is a mainstream accepted notion, more than half of published research findings are false! That’s been written in a main paper, in PLOS One by Professor Ioannidis from Stanford. And so, if you are reading a scientific paper that means it’s got a fifty per cent or better chance that it’s false, the conclusions. So, you should have that frame of mind when you read the paper. And then you’ll figure things out much better. If you assume it’s true then you’re gonna miss important details. And this is how I read the virology papers. Because I realized, you know, there is at least a 50:50 chance that their conclusions are false. Now, what I determined is that the ... all virology papers fall into that false category of half of them. ... But I didn’t know that to begin with. But you still, like whenever anyone reads a scientific paper you have to have that starting point that there is greater than half of a chance that the findings of this paper are not true. And I can’t assume that they are. Or there’ll be grave consequences. Like we’re facing here.

from wd

Sources:

<https://www.andrewkaufmanmd.com/>

This may interest you as well:

#Vaccination-en - www.kla.tv/Vaccination-en

#Coronavirus-en - www.kla.tv/Coronavirus-en

#Interviews-en - www.kla.tv/Interviews-en

Kla.TV – The other news ... free – independent – uncensored ...



- what the media should not keep silent about ...
- Little heard – by the people, for the people! ...
- regular News at www.kla.tv/en

Stay tuned – it's worth it!

Free subscription to our e-mail newsletter here: www.kla.tv/abo-en

Security advice:

Unfortunately countervoices are being censored and suppressed more and more. As long as we don't report according to the ideology and interests of the corporate media, we are constantly at risk, that pretexts will be found to shut down or harm Kla.TV.

So join an internet-independent network today! Click here:

www.kla.tv/vernetzung&lang=en

Licence:  *Creative Commons License with Attribution*

Spreading and reproducing is endorsed if Kla.TV if reference is made to source. No content may be presented out of context. The use by state-funded institutions is prohibited without written permission from Kla.TV. Infraction will be legally prosecuted.