

## New, Still Undiscovered Corona Mutant in England

### Excerpt from the 780<sup>th</sup> contact of Saturday, 9<sup>th</sup> of October, 2021

**Billy** ... The governors themselves act completely confused and do not know what to do in this and that situation, also not regarding the rampantly spreading corona disease, which claims more lives than they really know. Also that the false digital vaccination passports and other proofs of vaccination are already in circulation in the millions, of which only some hundreds or thousands are recognised as fakes, is only a drop on the so-called 'hot stone', which already exists in this relation and lets the 'experts' live in euphoria and hope that their 'G'-nonsense (*In some German speaking countries, there are G-rules: '2G' means that a person has to be 'Geimpft' (= vaccinated) or 'Genesen' (= recovered from Covid), '3G' means a person has to be 'Geimpft', 'Genesen' or 'Getestet' (= negative Covid test) for admittance into restaurants or other venues.*) is effective. The fact that the true situation is the exact opposite to that which the rulers and 'experts' intend with their people-dumbing down and people-terrorising dictatorial measures, does not trigger correct and healthy thoughts in the peoples, nor a clear and firm willingness to do the right thing, rather only unwillingness, hatred and trouble-making. They act and determine just as wrongly as they did at the beginning of the rampantly spreading corona disease, consequently the epidemic at that time was able to get badly out of control and turn into a pandemic and claimed millions of dead, which will still go on. In fact, it is not yet recognised that a new mutation of the rampantly spreading disease is already striking again – especially in England – which will claim its victims and continue to spread throughout the world.

**Ptaah** ... Those responsible for the nations act completely headless, confused and scattered with their 'G'-decrees as well as other decrees, which they issue to the populations. The vaccination passport order and all the resulting criminal consequences in the populations are neither thought through in advance, nor is it recognised that they entice the otherwise upright and blameless citizens to criminality. This is the case apart from the fact that innumerable wrong proofs of vaccination and vaccination passports are put into circulation and are already in use, which falsify the whole control of the vaccinated persons in such a form that it already amounts to several millions, which have allegedly been vaccinated, which are not however. Also, there are millions of Earth's human beings, who were and are vaccinated with vaccines that are partly far too little effective, which means they offer only small or no security at all against infection. This in addition to the fact that 'vaccinations' occurred – as is still partly done fraudulently in between – which consisted of mere distilled water and were slipped between the real vaccines. This was practiced by at least 2 corporations, as we could find out, which brought them a lot of profit with fraudulent machinations. Involved in these criminal machinations, however, were indeed 2 corporations, as we were able to find out which unscrupulously enriched themselves at the expense of the Earth's human beings concerned – many of whom succumbed to the virus. This happened in the same form as with those criminals who make great profit by producing false vaccination certificates and vaccination passports in the millions and bringing them to those who are unwilling to be vaccinated, wherethrough the numbers of those supposedly vaccinated increase by the millions, to which also the vaccination fraudsters themselves contribute, who supposedly carry out vaccinations, but only feign it and gain profit from it. This happens while in any case the rampantly spreading disease will again attract and claim many newly infected ones and fatalities, because the low intelligentum of the national leaders already causes exactly the opposite of that which should be ordered and done correctly. This is our discovery, which we have been able to observe for quite some time, and which proves to us that the profiteers on Earth know no scruples. The further proof, however, is that which refers to the leaders of the nations themselves, who, in their low intelligentum, do not know and do not see what they are doing. The responsible ones of the countries, who, on the one hand, have learnt nothing from the consequences of the last great pandemic – from the influenza pandemic, the so-called 'Spanish flu', which broke out in 1918 and which, moreover, raged for years – on the other hand, did not bring any rationality into the consciousness of the national leaders of that time, as well as not to that of the national leaders of today's corona time. A valuable realisation of that, which should have been ordered and done without fear in order to contain the pandemic at the beginning and which should be done now is lacking with those responsible for the countries. On the contrary, the effective truth is falsified in favour of the lies of the vaccine manufacturers and the partly really ineffective vaccines, by starting a governmental vaccination campaign, which generally causes unwillingness and more harm than good in the populations. It is downright ridiculous – if it were not really enough to make one cry – that the vaccines are not really effective in the form they should be, namely because these are only being tested, and indeed worldwide, on the peoples who know nothing about it and fully trust in the vaccinations. They do not worry about why several vaccinations have to be given over a long period of time and the antibodies still dissipate and vaccine failures occur. The vaccine manufacturers consciously keep the Earth's human beings in low intelligentum and thus in thoughtlessness with regard to the rampantly spreading corona disease and the vaccines, because therethrough much profit can be made.

According to our very precise records, if I am to mention something of it again, the rampantly spreading disease of the Spanish flu claimed 116,931,423 lives, and indeed, into the furthest corners of the Earth, therefore also the natives of the jungle areas, still called primitives and savages by the Earth's human beings, were befallen and given over to death.

**Billy** Therefore it is not true that 'only' 50 million persons were carried off by the Spanish flu? And all the things you just said about the multiple vaccinations, I really think that is unbelievable.

**Ptaah** No, the number of deaths during the Spanish flu does not correspond to the truth. Our records correspond to very accurate numbers, namely down to the last denominator. For several thousand years, we have had the possibility to elicit and count a population of a planet up to the last person born until a certain point in time. And this was done also concerning the Influenza in the years 1918 to 1921, because that which comes forth from the earthly records is very inaccurate, also the continuance of the rampantly spreading disease, which truthfully lasted up to the year 1921, which, however, was not recorded in Earth's history.

Already at that time the responsible ones of the countries failed – as it was also at other times with pandemics which were rampant on Earth – because in their inability of right behaviour and the necessary right decisions as well as the right orders to the respective population, they failed so completely as it is also the case today with the rampantly spreading corona disease. As in all earlier times the responsible ones of the nations were incapable of right logical thinking and thinking ahead, so are today's national leaders incapable of this as ever, which they try to make up for by nonsensical orders, confused declarations and words. Thus they all make the whole matter of the rampantly spreading disease even worse, because of 1<sup>st</sup> the gross overpopulation and 2<sup>nd</sup> their own short-sightedness that set the populations and thus the individual human beings – the vaccinated and the unvaccinated – against each other. Therethrough the vaccinated and the unvaccinated become insecure, which leads to disputes, demonstrations and Gewalt (*Gewalt: "There is no English word that conveys the true meaning of the German word 'Gewalt'. 'Gewalt' is the brutal execution of elemental might and force, but it is far above all might and all force. 'Gewalt' exists in different and relative forms, one example being a 'gewalttätige Gesinnung' – expression from the character, personality, thoughts, feelings and emotions that shows the inclination to act with Gewalt. When human beings possess or carry out acts of Gewalt and it is not based in logic, then this usually involves violence, brutality, degradation and is terribly destructive."* (Meier, BEA 2010, *The Goblet of Truth*, page XIII, footnote), and also to the fact that the vaccinated fall into the delusion that they are now armed and immune against further consequences of the rampantly spreading disease, which is not true at least in the case of this rampantly spreading disease, which is extremely insidious and mutation-rich, as well as having the characteristic of continuing to exist as contagious impulses, which is completely unknown to earthly virology science. And the fact that the rampantly spreading disease, also after the doubtful and partly completely unsuitable vaccinations, also brings the actuality that regardless of them, vaccination failures and many resulting deaths occur from it to a large extent, is simply brushed aside and partly kept silent. Even though there are reports, the full truth is tenaciously concealed. That is something that is withheld from the Earth's human beings as information, as the fact of the full truth is also concealed from them that the corona virus as rampantly spreading disease pathogen in the body can only be paralysed, but not killed, because viruses consequently cannot be killed because they are not life-forms, but organic structures which can only be paralysed in their function and be switched off. Therefore, in this respect, a vaccine lie is in general need of explanation, so that the majority of Earth's human beings, who have no medical as well as no virological knowledge, become aware that they are attacked with a virus of a disease-causing organic structure, which does not correspond to any form of life and therefore cannot simply be fought with normal medicines and put out of function, rather that it requires special means, which usually have to be researched for years and administered by injections.

**Billy** Researched for years, yes, that is good. If one considers that only now a vaccine against malaria tropica has been found, which took more than 100 years of research.

**Ptaah** Yes, but whether it is effective for all 3 species, tropica, tertiana and quartana, and how it really works, that is not yet clear, as I know. ...

## **Corona: An ARD editor expresses critical views in an open letter about the public broadcasters**

*Ole Skambraks / Multipolarmagazin.de, Thursday, 7th Oct 2021 17:13 UTC*

In an open letter, an ARD employee expresses his criticism of one and a half years of Corona coverage: Ole Skambraks has been working as an editorial employee and editor at the public broadcaster for 12 years.

I can no longer remain silent. I can no longer accept without a word what has been happening for a year and a half now with my employer, the public broadcaster. Things like 'balance', 'social cohesion' and 'diversity' in reporting are anchored in the statutes and media state contracts. What is being practiced is the exact opposite. There is no such thing as true discourse and exchange in which all parts of society can find themselves.

From day one, I was of the opinion that public broadcasting should fill exactly this space: Promote dialogue between proponents of measures and critics, between human beings who are afraid of the virus and human beings who are afraid of losing their basic rights, between vaccination advocates and vaccination sceptics. But for the past year and a half, the space for discussion has narrowed considerably.

Scientists and experts who were respected and reputable in the time before Corona, who were given space in the public discourse, are suddenly called cranks, tin foil hat wearers or Covidiot. As a much-cited example, I may refer to Wolfgang Wodarg. He is a multiple medical specialist, epidemiologist and long-time health politician. Until the corona crisis, he was also on the board of Transparency International. In 2010, as Chairman of the Health Committee in the Council of Europe, he exposed the influence of the pharmaceutical industry in the swine flu pandemic. At that time, he was able to personally represent his opinion through public broadcasting; since Corona, that is no longer possible. He has been replaced by so-called fact-checkers who discredit him.

### **Paralysing Consensus**

Instead of an open exchange of opinions, a 'scientific consensus' was proclaimed that has to be defended. Anyone who doubts this and calls for a multidimensional perspective on the pandemic is met with indignation and scorn.

This pattern also works within newsrooms. For the past year and a half, I have no longer been working in the daily news business, which I am very glad about. In my current position, I am not involved in decisions about which topics are implemented and how. Here I describe my perception from editorial conferences and an analysis of the reporting. For a long time, I did not dare to leave the role of observer; the supposed consensus seemed too absolute and unanimous.

For some months now, I have been venturing out onto the thin ice and making a critical remark here and there in conferences. This is often followed by a shocked silence, sometimes a 'thank you for pointing it out' and sometimes a lecture on why it is not true. Reporting has never resulted from this.

The result of a year and a half of Corona is a split in society that is unparalleled. Public broadcasting has played a major role in this. It is increasingly failing to fulfil its responsibility to build bridges between the camps and promote exchange.

Often the argument is put forward that the critics represent a small, insignificant minority that should not be given too much space for reasons of proportional representation. This should have been disproved at the latest since the referendum in Switzerland on the Corona measures. Although a free exchange of opinions in the mass media does not take place there either, the vote was only 60:40 in favour of the government. (1) With 40% of the votes cast, can one speak of a small minority? Thereby it should be mentioned that the Swiss government had tied the Corona aid payments to the vote, which may have influenced some person's decision to put their cross in 'yes'.

The developments of this crisis are taking place on so many levels and have an impact on all parts of society that what is needed right now is not less but more free space for debate.

It is not all that which is discussed in public broadcasting that is revealing, rather that which remains unmentioned. The reasons for this are manifold and require an honest internal analysis. The publications of media scientist and former MDR broadcasting council member Uwe Krüger, such as his book, 'Mainstream – Why we no longer trust the media', can help here.

In any case, it takes some courage to swim against the current in conferences where topics are discussed and debated. Often, the one who can present his/her arguments most eloquently prevails; in case of doubt, of course, the editorial board decides. Very early on, the equation was that criticism of the government's Corona course belonged to the right-wing spectrum. Which editor would then still dare to express a thought in this direction?

### **Unanswered Questions**

Thus, the list of inconsistencies and unanswered questions that have not received substantial coverage is very large:

Why do we know so little about 'gain of function research' (research into how to make viruses more dangerous to humans)?

Why does the new Infection Protection Act state that the fundamental right of physical integrity and the inviolability of the home can henceforth be restricted – even irrespective of an epidemic situation?

Why do persons who have already had Covid-19 have to get vaccinated again, even though they are at least as well protected as vaccinated humans?

Why is 'Event 201' and the global pandemic exercises leading up to the spread of SARS-CoV-2 not talked about, or only talked about in conjunction with conspiracy myths? (2)

Why was the internal paper from the Federal Ministry of the Interior, known to the media, not published in its entirety – and discussed in public – which called for authorities to create a 'shock effect' to highlight impacts of the Corona pandemic on human society?

Why does the study of Prof. Ioannidis on the survival rate (99.41% in under 70-year-olds) not make it into any headline, but the fatally wrong projections of Imperial College do (Neil Ferguson predicted half a million corona deaths in the UK and over 2 million in the US in spring 2020.)?

Why does an expert report, prepared for the federal Ministry of Health, say that the utilisation of hospitals in 2020 by Covid-19 patients was only 2%?

Why does Bremen have by far the highest incidence (113 on 10/4/21) and at the same time by far the highest vaccination rate in Germany (79%)?

Why have payments of 4 million Euros been received on a family account of EU Health Commissioner Stella Kyriakides, who was responsible for concluding the first EU vaccine contracts with pharmaceutical companies? (3)

Why are individuals with severe vaccine adverse events not portrayed to the same extent as 2020 humans with severe Covid 19 illnesses? (4)

Why is nobody bothered by the tainted counting of 'vaccine failures'? (5)

Why does the Netherlands report significantly more adverse reactions to Covid 19 vaccines than other countries?

Why has the efficacy description of Covid-19 vaccines on the Paul Ehrlich Institute site changed three times in recent weeks? 'COVID-19 vaccines protect against infection with SARS-CoV-2 virus.' (August 15, 2021)

'COVID-19 vaccines protect against severe course of infection with SARS-CoV-2 virus.' (September 7, 2021)

'COVID-19 vaccines are indicated for active immunisation to prevent COVID-19 disease caused by SARS-CoV-2 virus.' (September 27, 2021) (6)

I would like to go into detail on a few points.

#### **◀Gain of function▶ and ◀Lab leak▶**

I have not yet heard or read anything of substance about 'gain of function research' – that is, research to make viruses more dangerous, which was conducted at the Institute of Virology in Wuhan, China, and funded by the USA. This research takes place in so-called P4 laboratories, where work has been going on for decades on how viruses occurring in the animal kingdom can be altered in such a way that they also become dangerous for humans. ARD and ZDF have so far given this topic a wide berth – even though there is a clear need for discussion. A first question to be discussed could be, for example: Do we as a society want such research?

The 'lab leak theory' – the assumption that SARS-CoV-2 originated in a laboratory – has been the subject of numerous reports. It must be mentioned that this topic was immediately branded as a conspiracy myth last year. Alternative media that followed up on this lead were banned from social networks such as YouTube and Twitter, and the information was deleted. Scientists who voiced this thesis came under massive attack. Today, the 'lab leak theory' is at least as plausible as transmission by a bat. The American investigative journalist Paul Thacker has published the results of his meticulous research in the British Medical Journal. Dr. Ingrid Mühlhauser, Professor of Health Sciences at the University of Hamburg, writes about this:

"Step by step, he [Thacker] shows how operators of an American laboratory group purposefully develop a conspiracy theory to disguise their laboratory accident in Wuhan as a conspiracy. The myth is supported by renowned journals such as the Lancet. Science journalists and fact-checking service providers adopt the information unreflectively. Scientists involved remain silent for fear of losing prestige and research funding. Facebook blocks messages questioning the natural origin of SARS-CoV-2 for nearly a year. If the laboratory accident thesis is confirmed, ZDF and other media would have defended conspiracy myths."

#### **Ivermectin and Alternatives to vaccination**

It has also been apparent for months that there are effective and inexpensive treatments for Covid-19 that must not be used. The data on this is clear. However, the pseudoscientific disinformation campaigns against these agents are indicative of the state of our medicine. Hydroxychloroquine has been known for decades and has been used millions of times for malaria and rheumatic diseases. Last year, it was suddenly declared dangerous. President Donald Trump's statement that hydroxychloroquine was a 'game changer' did the rest to discredit it. Political rhetoric no longer permitted a scientific debate on HCQ.

The catastrophic situation in India caused by the spread of the Delta variant was widely reported in the media in the spring (at that time, there was still talk of the Indian variant of the virus). The fact that India brought the situation under control relatively quickly and that the drug ivermectin played a decisive role in large states such as Uttar Pradesh was no longer newsworthy. (7)

Ivermectin also has provisional approval in the Czech Republic and Slovakia for the treatment of Covid 19 patients. At least MDR reports on this, albeit with a negative connotation.

In the list of possible drugs from the Bavarian Broadcaster, ivermectin is not even mentioned, and on hydroxychloroquine only negative and no positive studies are cited.

The molecule clofoctol also showed good activity against SARS-CoV-2 in laboratory tests in the summer of 2020. Until 2005, the antibiotic was marketed in France and Italy under the names Octofene and Gramplus. Several times, the Institut Pasteur in Lille was prevented by French authorities from setting up a trial with Covid-19 patients. After several attempts, they recruited the first patient for it in early September.

Why do health authorities vehemently oppose treatment means that would have been available from the beginning of the pandemic? I would have liked to see investigative research by ARD! It should be mentioned that the new Corona vaccines could only get an emergency approval because there was no officially approved treatment for SARS-CoV-2.

It is not my intention to promote some Corona miracle cure. I would like to point out facts that have not received the necessary attention. From the very beginning, the public discourse has propagated the opinion that only vaccination can provide a remedy. At times, the WHO even went so far as to change the definition of 'herd immunity' in the sense that it could only be acquired through vaccination and no longer through a previous infection, as was previously the case.

But what if the way taken is a dead end?

### **Questions About Vaccine Efficacy**

Data from the countries with particularly high vaccination rates show that infections with SARS-CoV-2 are not uncommon even in fully vaccinated persons, but are commonplace. Dr. Kobi Haviv, director of Herzog Hospital in Jerusalem, speaks of 85% to 90% of critically ill patients in his ICU being dually vaccinated. (8) Science magazine writes, referring to all of Israel, "On the 15<sup>th</sup> of August, 514 Israelis were hospitalised with severe or critical Covid-19 illness ... Of these 514 people, 59% were fully vaccinated. Of those vaccinated, 87% were 60 years or older." Science quotes an Israeli government advisor who states, "One of the big stories out of Israel [is], 'Vaccines work, but not well enough.'"

Furthermore, it is now evident that vaccinated persons carry (and spread) just as much viral material of the delta variant as unvaccinated persons.

What follows from this data situation in Germany? – A lockdown especially for the unvaccinated or, to put it somewhat euphemistically: the '2G rule'. The society is de facto divided into two classes. The vaccinated get their freedoms back (because there is no risk potential for others), the unvaccinated (because there is a risk potential for others) have to undergo tests that they have to pay for themselves, and in the event of quarantine they no longer get paid. Employment bans and dismissals based on vaccination status are also no longer ruled out, and health insurance companies could impose less favourable rates on the unvaccinated in the future. Why this pressure on the unvaccinated? Scientifically, it cannot be justified, and socially, it is extremely harmful.

The antibodies generated by vaccinations decrease significantly after a few months. A look at Israel shows that after the second vaccination, the entire population is now receiving the third dose, and the fourth has already been announced. Those who do not refresh their vaccination after six months are no longer considered immune and lose their 'Green Pass' (the digital vaccination card that Israel has introduced). In the US, Joe Biden is now talking about Corona boosters every 5 months. However, Marion Pepper, immunologist at the University of Washington, questions this strategy. She told the 'New York Times' that "repeated stimulation of the body's defenses can also lead to a phenomenon called 'immune exhaustion.'"

Little discussed is the fact that much more robust immunity can be built up through natural infection. 'Ultra-potent antibodies' or 'super immunity' was found in humans infected with SARS-CoV-2 last year. These antibodies respond to over 20 different viral mutations and persist longer than antibodies generated by the vaccine.

After all, Health Minister Jens Spahn has now announced that antibody detection will also be permitted. But in order to be officially considered immune, a vaccination must still follow. Who understands this logic? A CNN interview with Dr. Anthony Fauci, chairman of the National Health Institute (the American equivalent of the RKI) illustrates the absurdity. Human beings with natural immunity are still not considered by politics until now!

I know a doctor who is desperately trying to get an answer from health authorities and the RKI on this issue: One of her patients has an IgG antibody titer of 400 AU/ml – significantly more than many vaccinees. His corona infection was over six months ago, so he is no longer considered immune. The answer she got was: "Why don't you vaccinate him?", which the doctor refuses to do with this titer.

### **Lack of Basic Journalistic Understanding**

The way out of the pandemic propagated by politics and the media turns out to be a permanent vaccination subscription. Scientists who demand a different approach to Corona are still not given an adequate stage by

the public media, as the partly defamatory coverage of the #allaufdentisch campaign has shown again. Instead of discussing the content of the videos with those involved, they have sought out experts to discredit the campaign. In this way, the public broadcasters are committing exactly the same mistake that they accuse #allesaufdentisch of.

Spiegel journalist Anton Rainer said in the SWR interview about the video action that these were not interviews in the classic sense: "In principle, you see two individuals in each case who agree with each other." I had a stomach ache after listening to my station's reporting, and was completely irritated by the lack of basic journalistic understanding to also let the other side have their say. (9) I communicated my concerns to the parties involved and the editorial management by e-mail.

A classic saying in conferences is that an issue is 'already done'. This was the case, for example, when I raised the very likely under-reporting of vaccine complications. Yes, that's right, the topic was discussed with the in-house expert, who – unsurprisingly – concluded that there was no under-reporting. 'The other side' is indeed mentioned here and there, but it very rarely gets face time in the form of actually talking to the individuals who take critical positions.

### **Critics Under Pressure**

The most outspoken critics have to reckon with house searches, criminal prosecution, account blocking, transfer or dismissal, up to and including admission to a psychiatric ward. Even if these are opinions whose positions one does not share – in a constitutional country such a thing must not exist.

In the US, there is already discussion about whether criticism of science should be labelled a 'hate crime'. The Rockefeller Foundation has offered \$13.5 million for censorship of health misinformation.

WDR television director Jörg Schönenborn has declared "facts are facts, they are certain". If that were so, how is it possible that behind closed doors scientists argue incessantly and even disagree deeply on some quite fundamental issues? As long as we do not realise this, any assumption of supposed objectivity leads to a dead end. We can only ever get closer to 'reality' – and that is only possible in an open discourse of opinions and scientific findings.

That which is taking place right now is not a sincere fight against 'fake news'. Rather, the impression is that any information, evidence, or discussion that contradicts the official narrative is being suppressed.

A recent example is the factual and scientifically transparent video by computer scientist Marcel Barz. In a raw data analysis, Barz is astonished to find that neither the figures for excess mortality nor bed occupancy nor the incidence of infection correspond to what we have been reading or hearing from the media and politicians for the past year and a half. He also shows how these data can certainly be used to portray a pandemic, and explains why he believes this is dishonest. The video was deleted by You Tube at 145,000 clicks after three days (and only made accessible again after objection by Barz and much protest). The reason given: 'medical misinformation'. Here, too, the question: Who decided on what basis?

The fact checkers from the 'people's snitch' discredit Marcel Barz as a fake. Correctiv's verdict is a bit softer (Barz has responded to that publicly and in detail). The expert report prepared for the Federal Ministry of Health, which shows that the utilisation of hospitals in 2020 by Covid-19 patients was only 2%, proves him right. Barz contacted the press with his analysis, but got no attention. In a functioning discourse, our media would invite him to a debate.

Millions of times, content on Corona topics is now being deleted, as journalist Laurie Clarke shows in the British Medical Journal. Facebook and Co. are private companies and can therefore decide what is published on their platforms. But are they allowed therewith to control the discourse?

Public broadcasting could provide an important balance by ensuring an open exchange of opinions. But unfortunately, there is no such thing!

### **Digital Vaccination Passports and Monitoring**

The Gates and Rockefeller Foundations designed and funded the WHO guidelines for digital vaccination cards. They are now being introduced worldwide. Only with them should public life be possible – whether it is riding a tram, drinking a coffee or seeking medical treatment. An example from France shows that this digital ID card should remain in place even after the pandemic has ended. MP Emanuelle Ménard has called for the following addition to the text of the law: The digital vaccination card 'ends when the spread of the virus no longer poses a sufficient risk to justify its use'. Her proposed amendment was rejected. Thus, the step towards global population control or even a surveillance state through projects like ID2020 is very small.

Australia, meanwhile, is testing a facial recognition app to make sure individuals in quarantine stay home. Israel is using electronic wristbands to do the same. In one Italian city, drones are being tested to measure the temperature of beachgoers, and in France, the law is being changed to allow large-scale drone surveillance.

All these topics need an intensive and critical exchange within society. But it does not take place sufficiently in the reporting of our broadcasters and was not an election campaign issue.

### Narrowed Perspective

The form in which the perspective of discourse is narrowed is characteristic of the 'gatekeepers of information'. A current example is provided by Jan Böhmermann with his demand that the virologist Hendrik Streeck and Professor Alexander S. Kekulé no longer be given a stage because they are not competent.

Apart from the fact that the two doctors have extremely respectable CVs, Böhmermann has thus readjusted the blinkers. Are people who present their criticism of the government's course with velvet gloves now no longer even to be heard?

The restriction of discourse has now gone so far that, on several occasions, Bavarian Radio has not broadcast the speeches of members of parliament critical of the measures during the broadcast of parliamentary debates in the state parliament.

Is this the new understanding of democracy in public broadcasting? Alternative media platforms are flourishing first and foremost because the established ones are no longer fulfilling their role as a democratic corrective.

### Something Went Wrong

For a long time, I was able to say with pride and pleasure that I work for public broadcasting. A lot of outstanding research, formats and content come from ARD, ZDF and the German radio. The quality standards are extremely high and thousands of employees do excellent work, even under increased cost pressure and cost-cutting measures. But something has gone wrong with Corona. Suddenly I perceive tunnel vision and blinkers, and a supposed consensus that is no longer questioned. (10)

The Austrian broadcaster Servus TV shows that it is possible to do things differently. In the program 'Corona-Quartet'/'Talk in Hanger 7', supporters and critics alike have their say. Why should this not be possible on German television? (11) "You can't give a stage to every nutcase," is the quick answer. The false balance, the fact that serious and dubious opinions are heard equally, must be avoided. – A killer argument that is also unscientific. The basic principle of science is to doubt, to question, to verify. If this no longer takes place, science becomes a religion.

Yes, there is indeed a false balance. It is the blind spot that has entered our minds, which no longer permits any truthful debate. We throw apparent facts around our ears, but can no longer listen to each other. Contempt takes the place of understanding, fighting the other opinion replaces tolerance. Basic values of our society are slapdash thrown overboard. Here they say that individuals who do not want to be vaccinated are crazy, there they say: "Shame on the sleeping sheep".

While we argue, we do not realise that the world around us is changing at breakneck speed. Virtually all areas of our lives are undergoing transformation. How that transformation takes place depends largely on our capacity for cooperation, compassion, and awareness of ourselves and our words and actions. For our mental health, we would do well to open the debate space – in mindfulness, respect and understanding of different perspectives. (12)

Writing these lines, I feel like a heretic; someone who commits treason and must expect punishment. Perhaps it is not so at all. Perhaps I am not risking my job, and freedom of speech and pluralism are not at risk. I very much hope so and look forward to a constructive exchange with colleagues.

Ole Skambraks

*ole.skambraks@protonmail.com*

*About the author: Ole Skambraks, born in 1979, studied political science and French at Queen Mary University, London, and media management at ESCP Business School, Paris. He was a presenter, reporter and writer at Radio France Internationale, online editor and community manager at cafebabel.com, program manager of the morning show at MDR Sputnik and editor at WDR Funkhaus Europa/Cosmo. He currently works as an editor in program management/sound design at SWR2.*

*Further information of the author*

*PS: For fact checkers and people interested in a multi-perspective, here are the counter-positions to the points discussed in the text:*

*ARD-ZDF-Study:*

*Immunity of the Vaccinated:*

*Immunity of the Persons who have Recovered:*

*Vaccination Failure/Pandemic of the Unvaccinated Persons*

*Pseudo Experts/Science deniers/PLURV Principle*

*Notes:*

*(1) The exception was the coverage during the referendum, during which Swiss television was obliged to give both parties the same broadcasting slot (video here)*

*(2) Other pandemic emergency exercises included 'Clade X' (2018), 'Atlantic Storm' (2005), 'Global Mercury' (2003), and 'Dark Winter' (2001). These exercises were always about information management.*

*(3) Panorama did report on the payments, but has not clearly portrayed Kyriakides' role regarding the Corona vaccine contracts. Otherwise, the issue has not been of great importance in the media.*

(4) For example, public radio barely reported on British musician Eric Clapton, who developed severe reactions after vaccination and now regrets it.

(5) According to the RKI, a vaccination failure occurs when a vaccinated person can show both a positive test and symptoms – for unvaccinated persons, a positive test is sufficient. In this form, the unvaccinated statistically carry much more weight.

(6) Each under the heading 'List of approved vaccines'; previous PEI website editions accessible via the Internet Archive Wayback Machine.

(7) WHO has even praised the Indian state of Uttar Pradesh for its corona policy, but without mentioning ivermectin. The vaccination rate in Uttar Pradesh is below 10%.

(8) See also FDA meeting of the 17<sup>th</sup> of September, 2021, at 5:47:25.

(9) The fairest reporting comes from BR, although also here it was about and not with the makers. MDR offers an extensive and differentiated analysis on its media portal.

(10) I would not like to speak of an actual 'unified opinion' of the public broadcasters. There have always been critical contributions and course corrections in reporting. However, how a topic is treated is always a question of context, broadcasting time and scope. My observations have also been noted by other colleagues.

(11) Fresh formats like ZDF's 'Auf der Couch' (On the Couch) give us hope, even if I do not think a Karina Reiss or a Wolfgang Wodarg will be taking a seat there any time soon.

(12) The 'Dialog Kultur' (Dialog Culture) initiative opens up viable approaches that could also be interesting for media formats.

On the 26<sup>th</sup> of October, at 23:30 h, I received the following by fax:

**The following refers to the editorial in Zeitzeichen, 2<sup>nd</sup> October, 2021.**

(Exact verbatim reproduction of the information to Billy).

**Salome Billy,**

**For your information**

**He has been dismissed. Yesterday in RTDE**

**He spilled the beans – now he has to go: SWR employee Ole Skambrake suspended without explanation.**

**26<sup>th</sup> October 2021, 21:09**

We have posted his contribution in the FIGU Zeitzeichen.

**Corona: An ARD editor expresses  
critical views**

**in an open letter about the public broadcasters**

Ole Skambraks/Multipolarmagazin.de, 7<sup>th</sup> Oct 2021, 17.13 UTC

In an open letter, an ARD employee expresses his criticism of one and a half years of Corona reporting: Ole Skambrake has been working as an editorial employee and editor at the public broadcaster for 12 years. I can no longer remain silent. I can no longer accept without a word what has been happening for a year and a half now with my employer, the public broadcaster. Things like 'balance', 'social cohesion' and 'diversity' in reporting are enshrined in the statutes and media state contracts. What is practiced is the exact opposite. There is no true discourse and exchange in which all parts of society can find each other.

figu.zeitzeichen.160.pdf

*Translation: Vibka Wallder; corrections: Andre Criado, Vivienne Legg and Christian Frehner.*