


Hardware Upgrade from a Dell Inspiron 1545 to a Dell Latitude 7480



It's been a while since I posted anything related to PC on this website. I love to share useful information and I think some visitors to this website will appreciate this.

For a little more than two years I had been using a Dell Inspiron 1545 laptop to update this website. It has a Pentium CPU, 4 gigabytes of DDR2 RAM. Some websites such as Facebook loaded very very slowly on it. At the time of this post, a Dell Inspiron 1545 is 11 years old!

A few months ago the monitor developed a black spot as you see in the photo below.



I had been using a much more powerful desktop PC to do my work. It has an Intel i5 CPU and 8 gigabytes of DDR3 RAM with two HDDs one of which is an SSD. I stopped using it for my PC work when the monitor for it also developed bad pixels. I now use it only to view YouTubes and videos on a 52 inch Smart TV connected by an HDMI cable. It's not easy to use it to do PC work with such a large screen.

It was time to get a new laptop. I considered buying an Apple MacBook Pro with an M1 ARM processor, but because of the expense and the fact the M1 is still relatively new which means a lot of software is not yet written for it,

I opted to stay with a machine I could continue to use my favorite software on a Linux OS. My favorite distros are Linux Mint and Fedora.

I found a fantastic deal on eBay: A Dell Latitude 7480 with an Intel i7 CPU and 16 gigabytes of DDR4 RAM. And for only \$399.00! And though this model is already 4 years old, the laptop was *not used* before! I can tell because there was no dust anywhere, and the battery is in pristine condition. It holds a charge for hours. The keyboard is great! The performance is great! You can find it here:




Click the image to see it on Ebay

This is a significant upgrade from the old Dell Inspiron! And the new laptop is much lighter, less than half the weight of the old Dell laptop.


I didn't want to buy a laptop with Windows 10 but since it came with Windows, I decided not to get rid of the Windows installation altogether but install Linux with a dual boot. I did this because someday in the future I may give it to somebody else who may prefer Windows to Linux.

Windows 10 made it easy for me to shrink the Windows partition with its Disk Management tool to make room for Linux. I shrunk the Windows partition to a little less than half what it was and then installed Fedora 34 Linux from a DVD drive connected to a USB port and used automatic partitioning. It was so easy and the installation went without a hitch!



My Dell Latitude 7480 with Fedora 34 Workstation and Gnome 4.0 Desktop

[The Communist Takeover of America – By G. Edward Griffin](#)



G. Edward Griffin (born November 7, 1931) is an American author, filmmaker, and conspiracy researcher. He is the author of *The Creature from Jekyll Island* (1994), which exposes the Federal Reserve System as a private banking cartel designed to undermine the economy of America.

I took the time to transcribe the text of the YouTube because I consider it quite insightful and important for the American public to know. I retain knowledge better when I read rather than just listening to a speaker.

The first part of the talk was given in 1969. I think any reasoning person ought to be able to see clearly just from the daily news how the communists have implemented their plans through the years.

At the time of this post, G. Edward Griffin is alive and 89 years old.

Another speaker is Hollywood producer Aaron Russo who gave a famous interview about his friendship with one of the Rockefellers who confided with him the Rockefeller plan for one-world government. Russo died within the year of giving that interview!

G. Edward Griffin Communist Take Over – A 1969 Lecture

(G. Edward Griffin) As early as 1928, the Communists declare that the racial differences among our people, constituted the weakest and most vulnerable point in our social fabric. By constantly probing and straining at this one spot, they calculated that eventually the cloth could be torn apart, and that Americans could be divided, weakened, and perhaps even set against each other in open combat.

We mustn't kid ourselves into thinking that the communists have placed their agitators only into the black communities. They're working both sides of the street. They want hatred, violence and bloodshed between the races, and they don't care how they get it or whom they use, even children if necessary. That

the communist blueprint calls also for white retaliation and violence in the black communities. It's a very important objective for the Communist Party.

So far, they've only been able to involve a small percentage of our Negro people in this war of national liberation, the great majority want no part of it in any form. But the one sure way to change that is to have white vigilante groups striking into the Negro sections, supposedly, to seek revenge.

Ladies and gentlemen, the plans and preparations for a communist revolution of force and violence are far advanced. The organization behind these preparations has almost unlimited financial resources, and it provides both training and leadership based upon years of experience in many other countries. Our enemies are deadly serious about their task. And it's nothing short of national suicide, for us to continue to ignore their plans and their progress.

The strategy of the proletarian revolution calls for the quiet conversion of our government into a communist regime, but **under the banner of socialism.**

What is Socialism?

Well, what is socialism? Alright, let's define it. According to the dictionary, socialism is a political concept based upon the principle of government ownership and control of property, the means of production, and the avenues of commerce. Under socialism, those who run the government – and the communists are confident that in America, they eventually will be the ones who do so – those who run the government will know who is to get something, and who has to wait, and **that represents control over human beings.**

What is all this to do with the communist revolution in America? Well, ladies and gentlemen, it has everything to do with it, because **the building of socialism is the communist revolution in America.** It represents the process, whereby **our country can be moved gradually toward communism, without the people even being aware of it.** No matter what grievance we may have real or imagined, no matter what national problems we may face, the communists seize upon these as excuses to build socialism. They have one and only one solution for all problems, more government, more government, and then more and more, until its total government. And forgive me for saying it one more time. **Total government is communism.**

How Communists Respond When They Lose An Argument

In 1943, the following directive was issued from party headquarters to all communists in the United States. It read,

*"When certain obstructionists become too irritating, label them after suitable buildups as fascist or Nazi or anti semitic, and use the prestige of anti fascist intolerance organizations to discredit them. **In the public mind, constantly associate those who oppose us with those names, which already have a bad smell. The association will after enough repetition, become fact in the***

public mind. “

Truth is a Far Superior Weapon Than Deceit

But because they are lying, it's possible to expose them. And this is their Achilles heel. By comparison, we have nothing to hide, therefore, we have no reason to lie. And we wouldn't want to even if we could, truth is a far superior weapon than deceit. It's a weapon which is denied to them. And in the end, it will be the decisive weapon that destroys them completely.

A World Government Based on Collectivism

(Hillary Clinton:) We get a lot of advice from the Council (on Foreign Relations, CFR). So this will mean I won't have this far to go to be told what we should be doing and how we should think about the future.

(G. Edward Griffin:) People like Hillary Clinton, know. Even at that elevated position Hillary Clinton is say one of the big movers and shakers. Compared to the Council on Foreign Relations, she's not. She's a small fish. And she knows that she's got to get the approval of the CFR.

(Aaron Russo: I had a friend, Nick Rockefeller, okay, who is one of the Rockefeller family. The ultimate goal that these people have in mind is to create a one world government. And this is given me straight from Rockefeller himself as what they want to accomplish.

(G. Edward Griffin:) Not just any world government, but a world government based on the model of collectivism. In other words, **big powerful centralized world government**. If it were a world government based on the principles of freedom, and freedom of choice, freedom of culture, low intervention, if no intervention in the lives of normal human beings, it might be a wonderful thing, but that's not the kind of world government, the left and the right have in mind. They're talking about total world government with all major decisions being made at the top and people at the bottom being peasants basically in a high tech feudalism.

[The Abomination of Desolation of Matthew 24: Jerusalem Compassed with Armies](#)



The early Protestant Reformers asserted that "Scripture interprets Scripture", which means the Bible is its own best interpreter. With that in mind, let's look at the Olivet Discourse as told in two of the three synoptic Gospels of Matthew 24 and Luke 21. I am not including Mark 13 because it's similar to Matthew 24.

Matthew 24:15 **When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation**, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand:)
16 Then let them which be **in Judaea** flee into the mountains:
17 Let him which is on the housetop not come down to take any thing out of his house:
18 Neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes.
19 And woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days!
20 But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day:
21 For **then** shall be **great tribulation**, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.

The parallel passage of the Olivet Discourse in the Book of Luke adds more detail to what Matthew wrote.

Luke 21:20 And **when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies**, then know that **the desolation thereof** is nigh.
21 Then let them which are **in Judaea** flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and **let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto**.
22 For these be the **days of vengeance**, that all things which are written may be fulfilled.
23 But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck, in those days! for there shall be **great distress** in the land,

and wrath upon this people.

24 And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and **Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles**, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.

How Luke 21 explains Matthew 24

Let's compare Matthew 24 verse by verse with Luke 21 and see what we can learn.

Matthew 24:15 When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand:)

*Luke 21:20 And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that **the desolation thereof is nigh**.*

Luke 21:20 tells us what Matthew 24:15 doesn't. It explains clearly the final prophecy of Daniel 9:27:

Daniel 9:27b ... and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

The "overspreading of abominations" is the Roman army. "He shall make it desolate" is the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. Notice Luke 21:20 says, "the desolation thereof is nigh"? The desolation of what? Clearly from the context, it's talking about Jerusalem. And when? In 70AD by General Titus.

*Matthew 24:16 Then let them which be **in Judaea** flee into the mountains:*

*Luke 20:21 Then let them which are **in Judaea** flee to the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out; and **let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto**.*

See how Luke adds more detail to the Olivet Discourse compared to Matthew? Not only does it tell the people of Judea to flee to the mountains, but it tells those who live outside Judea not to try to enter it! And why? Because if you do, the Romans will kill you! Do you see how this prophecy applies only to the people Jesus was talking to at the time? It's cannot possibly be an Endtime prophecy unless you include 70 AD as part of the Endtime. Jesus was telling who to flee? The people who lived in Jerusalem and Judea, not anywhere else in the world. And who obeyed Jesus' warning? The Jewish Christians! Every one of them was saved from the slaughter of the Romans! The ones who were killed were the ones who believed the false prophets and fled to the Temple to be saved.

*Luke 24:22 For these be the **days of vengeance**, that all things which are written may be fulfilled.*

This verse is not included in Matthew 24. It explains why Rome was attacking

Jerusalem. The “days of vengeance” are God’s wrath on the unbelieving Jews who rejected Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ, the Messiah. Jesus Himself brought the Roman army to destroy Jerusalem and the Temple to show that God is done with the Jews as a people. True Israel today consists of both Jews and Gentiles! The Epistles of Paul and the Book of Hebrews make this abundantly clear.

Galatians 3:26 For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

27 For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

29 And **if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed**, and heirs according to the promise.

Hebrews 8:8 For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when **I will make a new covenant** with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah:

9 Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.

13 In that he saith, **A new covenant, he hath made the first old.** Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.

*Matthew 24:21 For then shall **be great tribulation**, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.*

*Luke 21:23b ... for there shall be **great distress** in the land, and wrath upon this people.*

When was the “then” of Matthew 24:21? It was when Rome was attacking Jerusalem. The “days of vengeance” are God’s wrath on the unbelieving Jews who rejected Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ, the Messiah. Those days are over. There was never such tribulation of the Jews as there was in 70 AD!

Notice that Matthew 24 says “great tribulation” and Luke 21 says “great distress”? There are both the same thing! And Luke goes further and says, “wrath upon this people”. Upon which people? Upon the unbelieving Jews who did not obey Jesus’ warning to flee Jerusalem and Judea! They were killed by the Romans. According to pastor Chuck Baldwin of Liberty Fellowship, General Titus did not want to totally destroy the city of Jerusalem and the Temple. His army was so enraged against the Jews his couldn’t stop them! The soldiers therefore must have been divinely inspired to do what they did! Not even their own general could stop them from destroying the city and the Temple.

I hope I have given you enough food for thought in case you believe in the

Futurist doctrine of a coming third Temple of Solomon and a future Antichrist occupying it for a seven-year peace pact with the Jews. The Temple may be rebuilt in the future, but I would not call it a fulfillment of prophecy. And I certainly wouldn't call it the "holy place" of Matthew 24:15! It would be an abomination to God because it would reflect yet the further rejection of the Blood of Christ in preference of the blood of animal sacrifices. God is finished with animal sacrifices! How do I know that?

Daniel 9:27 ...he (the Messiah) **shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease...**

Hebrews 9:11 But **Christ** being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, **not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building;**
12 **Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood** he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

"Ok James Japan! So you're saying there won't be great tribulation in the Endtime?" I'm not saying there won't be tribulation caused by the enemies of Christ resulting in persecution of Christians. And I certainly do not believe that the Lord will rapture the Saints out of the midst or even before the beginning of great persecution. Nowhere does the Bible say that. If you think it does, please state the Scriptures that say so in the comments below. What I am saying is we do not know how long such a tribulation will last. It may be much shorter than 3 and a half years. It may be much longer than that. We cannot go by a final seven years scenario as I was taught because such a doctrine is based on a false interpretation of Daniel 9:27.

"So what will happen, James Japan?" I don't know! We only know that Christ will return for us. When? We don't know. Did any prophet of God predict that antichrists would bring the entire world into bondage and many into economic hardship by engineering the coronavirus scare which resulted in pandemic phobia and leading to greater government control of the people through vaccinations and vaccination passports? NO! NOT ONE PROPHET OF GOD PREDICTED THAT! Am I wrong? If I am, please educate me in the comments below. Thank you!

[COVID-19 mRNA Injections are Legally Not Vaccines! – By Dr. David E. Martin](#)



This is a talk by David E. Martin Ph.D. He is the developer of several innovation-based quantitative indices of public equities and the founder of the Purple Bridge Funds and M-CAM International. He has worked closely with the United States Congress and numerous trade and financial regulatory agencies in the United States. Dr. Martin is also a Batten Fellow at the University of Virginia's Darden Graduate School of Business Administration. (Quoted from <https://z3news.com/w/david-martin-presents-evidence-corona-virus-manmade/>)

Transcript of David Martin's talk

(Dr. Martin:) January 11, 2021, at least got the date, right? We're not in December anymore.

Today, hey, by the way, thanks, everybody, for the last six weeks that that series has been shared a lot, we've gotten a lot of great feedback. So thank you, everybody, who has been a huge part of our six-week series on the integral accounting view of what's next. That's been a really wonderful experience. Today, we're diving back into some really important stuff. And there are a number of you who have been asking questions about the status of legal proceedings, and so forth. And, and today, I'm going to give give you a little window into a couple of the approaches that are going on in various lawsuits. We're not commenting specifically on lawsuits right now that are active and pending simply because that's just not an appropriate thing to do. Other than to say, there are active and pending cases.

But today is a really weird one, people. And I have to say, you know, back in the early 1990s, I was doing clinical trials at the University of Virginia medical school. And I happened to be working in a very controversial medical technology area called electromagnetic field therapy or EMF. And historically, I mean, if you go back for decades, there's been all kinds of disputes around whether or not that technology works or not.

And so we were doing a multi-center clinical trial for a Japanese company. And I became very aware of 15 US Code Section 41, which is part of the Federal Trade Commission Act, that specifically has to do with advertising that a product or service can prevent, treat or cure human disease unless you

possess competent, reliable scientific evidence, including when appropriate, well-controlled human clinical studies substantiating that the claims are true at the time they're made. So there's a rule under the Federal Trade Commission Act, and it has been used to shut down alternative medicine for years like you know, people who have been naturopaths, people who have been chiropractors, people who have been in any of the what are considered to be kind of alternative medical spaces have become very familiar with this, because it's the way the Federal Trade Commission shuts people down. confiscates materials, confiscates businesses, does some really egregious acts. And it occurred to me that no one seems to be talking about this when it comes to what is being promoted in the current regime!

And so, I thought, we're going to take a look into 15 US Code Section 41 today. And the reason for this is twofold. Number one is because it's important. Number two, is because I think that we need to call out a very important thing. So there's a part of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which also has to do with what's called deceptive labeling practices. It's when you use terms or phrases or words where you know that you are using them with an intent to deceive, deceptive medical practices. And so today, we're going to take apart a couple of the deceptive medical practices, and suggest that if any of you, and this is now a specific challenge, people, listen, we've been doing 39 of these videos.

Somebody who's watching this video knows an elected official, somebody watching this video knows a prosecutor, whether that's a US Attorney, whether that's an Attorney General in a state, somebody in the viewing of this video knows somebody who needs to listen to this video. And I'm going to really encourage you to share this, because it's actually super important. Listen, if this law can be applied to shut down people of goodwill, who are trying to help other people, it certainly should be equally applied when we know deceptive medical practices are being done in the name of public health. And we're going to get to that.

But Kim, let's start off with both of us worked in hospitals. Both of us worked in medical centers. As a condition of employment, you had to have shots, right?

(Kim:) Yeah, definitely had to have shots that have hep B and a few others. That was a bit way back in the day. But yeah, we had to have, all of us had to have as to be a nurse. You had to have shots done.

(Dr. Martin:) Yeah, I mean, at the Medical Center at the University of Virginia, you know, hep B was a standard. If you didn't have hep B, you know, you had no patient interaction. How about when you were in your own business?

(Kim:) No, not when I was running my own business, because I wasn't employed by a hospital. I did my own assessments of my own group of nurses. And we didn't have to because I was the boss.

(Dr. Martin:) Yeah. But there are people. I mean, let's be really clear. There are people for whom vaccines and various medical measures are a requirement for employment. And that's a really interesting problem where you

get forced into doing something, and that made me think. Somethings troubled me. And the thing that's troubled me is that both Pfizer and Moderna have been promoting what they call a "vaccine".

Now, for those of you who don't really think about it, you have thought about it, because the public thinks that when you say vaccine, one of at least two things is happening. First is, whatever you're getting is going to keep you from being infected by some sort of pathogen. So that's assumption number one. Assumption number two, is that somehow or another, if you get that vaccine, somehow you're doing your public health bit to make sure that you don't transmit it to other people, right? Am I going out on a limb here? The word "vaccine" kind of means that.

And let's let's go back in history a little bit, shall we? Let's go back to 1905, to the very, very, very, very, very famous Jacobson case in Massachusetts (Jacobson v. Massachusetts Ref: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jacobson_v._Massachusetts), the Supreme Court 1905. And I'm going to read the quote, because I think it's important,

"This Court has more than once recognized as a fundamental principle, that persons and property are subjected to all kinds of restraints and burdens in order to secure the general comfort, health, and prosperity of a state."

So what the Supreme Court and Jacobson said was that the police powers the public health powers were legitimate if they secured the general comfort, health and prosperity of the state. That implies that the individual benefit is superseded by a collective benefit, that somehow or another, the individual is not the point when it comes to public health laws, it's about the community, which would then suggest that to meet a vaccine public health standard, and quite frankly, a vaccine public health definition, something about either you are immune from getting a pathogen or and potentially and, you are not going to transmit the pathogen, must be part of what lives inside that definition. That couldn't be more straightforward than the Supreme Court of the United States in 1905, which, by the way, happens to be a decision that I have yet to even meet many attorneys who have bothered reading it. They talk about vaccine litigation. But I haven't heard many that can actually quote the majority opinion out of Jacobson, which is a very dangerous problem that we have.

But here's where it gets more interesting. So when Moderna was started, and if you go back and look at their SEC filings, and we've gone through all their SEC filings, they make a point of saying that their technology is a gene therapy technology, gene therapy technology, you'll notice that they don't say vaccination, they actually say gene therapy technology. And it was set up to be a cancer treatment. So this is gene therapy, chemotherapy.

Now, let's just stop for a minute. Let's just ask the question. If Anthony Fauci got up and said to everybody, "Hey, we want you to take chemotherapy for the disease that you may or may not ever have." There wouldn't be a single person raising their hand, the prophylactic chemotherapy, you wouldn't be doing it. You know why you wouldn't be doing it? Because it's a dumb idea, that's why you wouldn't be doing it. And, States wouldn't be able to mandate

it and employers wouldn't be able to mandate it, no employer would be able to mandate a chemotherapy for a disease that you don't have. That would not be a legal thing to do. But they called their technology, gene therapy technology. They made a big point of saying that this was not investigational new drugs, this was gene therapy technology. This belonged in the Center for Biologics, potentially even the CDRH, the Center for Device and Radiological Health, because let's think about what they actually do. And by the way, this is super important. All the references are going to be in this video on the YouTube channel. And I'm going to put a bunch of the references actually, in the comments section on Facebook Live so that you can go see this yourself.

But what they're doing is they're putting together a synthetic fragment of nucleic acid, it's not mRNA. It's not natural. It's not even a natural component of a fragment. It's a synthetic fragment, it's a technology embedded within a fat carrier, a peg carrier, and that is being introduced into the cell not to induce a immunity from infection with a SARS COVID virus, and it's not to block transmission of it. It's actually to lessen symptoms associated with the S1 spike protein, not even the virus itself. So it gets better and or worse, depending on your point of view. The fact of the matter is this thing is actually not a vaccination.

Now, why would I say it's not a vaccination? People go, "Dave? Why would you say it's not a vaccination?" Well, let's look at the legal standard for what a vaccination is. And let's start with the Center for Disease Control's own definitions, why not start with the people who run the racket?

Two important operative definitions: Immunity is protection from an infectious disease, protection from an infectious disease. If you are immune to a disease, you can be exposed to it without becoming infected. Now, by definition, neither Pfizer nor Moderna even claims that to be the case. That's straight-up, not their definition. So immunity, you can be exposed to a pathogen infectious disease without becoming infected. Not only is that not the case, we're going to get to this in a minute, but in their clinical trials, they specifically say they're not going to test that. So stay with me on that.

And then the CDC says a vaccine is a product that stimulates a person's immune system to produce immunity, see the definition above, to a specific disease protecting the person from that disease. And then it says vaccines are usually administered through needle injections, but also can be administered by mouth and sprayed in the nose. Now, that's the CDC.

So let's just stipulate for the sake of this conversation, that the CDC his own definition, and what Pfizer and Moderna are doing, do not match.

And by the way, you should be thinking somewhere in this video, hold on a second. If this isn't a vaccine, why are they calling it a vaccine? That's a question. You should be thinking in your head because we're going to come to that in a second.

But I thought, okay, CDC, CDC is not the law. CDC is an expression of an agency, empowered by the law, but it's actually not the law. So why don't we

actually look at the laws where vaccine has been defined? And it turns out, that's a much harder exercise than you would think. Because vaccine The term is actually not a legally defined term in an enormous number of statutes that govern vaccines, which is actually a really interesting thing. But let's look at some examples. And I just pulled a couple examples from the Iowa code. Vaccine, and I'm quoting means a specially prepared antigen administered to a person for the purpose of providing immunity.

Immunity once again, the operative definition, which is to say that when exposed to a pathogen, you are not susceptible. That's the Iowa code. How about Washington State? You know, the State that has been absolutely tyrannical and all of its interventions around Coronavirus, allegedly the birthplace of the US experience with Coronavirus, State of Washington. Vaccine legally defined term now, this is in the statute, means a preparation of a killed or attenuated living microorganism or fraction thereof, just Just stop right there, vaccine means a preparation of a killed or attenuated living microorganism. Stop right there. And mRNA synthetically developed by Moderna and Pfizer do not meet this definition. bOr a fraction thereof, it's not a fraction of a living thing or a killed thing, because it's neither living nor killed. They are explicitly synthetic gene therapies. **They are not vaccines as defined by the statute that upon administration stimulates immunity.** There we have it, again, that stimulates immunity, meaning that you do not get a thing when exposed to that pathogen, right? That protects us against disease and is approved by the Federal Food and Drug Administration and safe and effective. Now, that's the State of Washington statute. And by the way across the board, that's the definition of vaccine, which means immunity is a defined term vaccine is a defined term.

But here comes a really big problem. The big problem is that if we look at the clinical trials that were approved for what was called the SARS-CoV2 COVID-19 vaccine program under the operation warp speed, listen very carefully to what the primary endpoint is.

The primary endpoint is the prevention of symptomatic COVID-19 disease. Now, let's pause and unpack that starting with COVID 19 disease.

As you all know, if you've been watching this show at all, you know that in February, the World Health Organization, and the CDC and the Department of Health and Human Services made a very clear distinction. They wanted to make sure that COVID-19, which was a series of clinical symptoms, which included things like fever, muscle pain, aches, loss of smell, certain radiologic findings in the lungs, a whole host of things, there's a laundry list of things that all got subsumed within this thing called COVID-19, which by the way, has been now redefined as to pick which is pneumonia, influenza COVID, as a combined set of things so that we can catch more people allegedly dying of this thing. But **COVID-19 disease is actually not a disease, it is a set of symptoms.**

And they were very clear on this, by the way. They tried to make a causal statement, they tried to say sorry, COV2 causes COVID-19. But then there was a tiny problem. Most of the people who tested positive using the RT PCR method had no clinical presentation, which means you can't make a causal

statement. You can't say the virus causes a disease, because unfortunately, most people with a positive PCR test for a fragment of what was called SARS-CoV-2, didn't have any problem. In fact, well over 80% had no problem. Which then leads us to the question of, okay, so we can't say it's causal, but it's more problematic than this, the primary endpoint for the vaccine trial was actually not a vaccine endpoint.

A vaccine endpoint has to do with immunity. And a vaccine endpoint has to do with transmissibility. And neither of those were measured, and it gets worse.

And I'm quoting right now straight out of Moderna's own statement. "Key secondary endpoints include prevention of severe COVID-19 disease, and prevention of infection by SARS-CoV-2." But here comes a tiny little problem. By their own admission in their clinical study, it was and I'm quoting, "impractical to measure infection." That's right, you heard me correctly. It's impractical to measure infection. So there is no evidence inside the phase three clinical trials, that any of the gene therapy had anything to do with the infection or not of SARS-CoV-2.

You cannot have a vaccination. It's not under the legal definition of vaccination, you cannot have a vaccination. That is in fact, not meeting either an immune or a transmission standard. And their clinical trial was set up specifically so that it could not measure either of those things.

And then, let's quote, shall we, from *The New England Journal of Medicine*, and from [The Lancet](#). And this is October, and this is December respectively. And I'm just going to go ahead and read this quote:

"At the time of this writing, no correlate of protection from SARS-CoV-2 has been established." (Ref: <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa2028436>)

Maybe you misheard what I just said. **As of this writing, no correlative protection for SARS-CoV-2 has been established.** In other words, not a shred of evidence from the clinical trials said anything about protection from infection with SARS-CoV-2, which means every single person who has value signaled their vaccination because they're doing their part not to be infected with SARS-CoV-2, and not to get COVID-19, newsflash, you have been violating the Federal Trade Commission Act by deceptive practices. You've been telling people that there is a protection that the data itself does not afford. But maybe that was just one report. So why don't I read from the second report? And I quote, and this is the *Lancet* and *New England Journal of Medicine*, quote,

"No existing vaccines have been shown to be effective against infection with any betacoronavirus, the family that includes SARS-CoV-2, which causes Covid-19." (Ref: <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMe2034717>)

People, this isn't my opinion, this is not me selectively choosing to take a spin on facts. This is in fact, fact. Which then begs the question, Kim. What would motivate Pfizer and Moderna and more importantly felonious Fauci, the unsavory, what would motivate them and CDC and others to lie to the American people about this being a vaccine, because vaccines in the ordinary course of

the use of that term, invokes within the listener, a presumption of protection against infection, and protection against transmission, neither of which have been established at all? Why would they use the term vaccine?

And here's where we have to depart from the facts. And we have to go into conjecture because that's the only thing we have available to us. As recently as 2018, Moderna was insisting that they were not making vaccinations, they were insisting that this is gene therapy technology, and it was cutting edge and it was all this kind of nonsense. And suddenly, courtesy of SARS-CoV-2, it suddenly became a vaccine company. It wasn't a vaccine company before. It's not a vaccine company now, **it's a gene therapy technology company with an unproven gene therapy**. That's what it is.

So when asked to ask the question, okay, so why, why do we keep hearing about vaccines? Ah, well, here's the reason I think we keep hearing about vaccines. And once again, my opinion here, people, this is not based on information that I have readily available, but it is my opinion. I think that if Anthony Fauci if Moderna and Pfizer, and others, public health authorities around the country and around the world, actually called this gene therapy chemotherapy, number one, people wouldn't want to take it. And they wouldn't want to take it for a good reason. Because experimental gene therapy is a bad idea, no matter who it is, no matter what it is, no matter where it is. Experimental gene therapy should not be relentlessly and recklessly distributed to a population, that shouldn't happen. So that's number one.

But number two is the 1986 liability exclusion. And this is what I think it really is. See, as long as Mr. Alex M. Azhar, the director or the Secretary of Department of Health and Human Services, as long as Alex Azhar keeps the state of emergency going, as long as every governor and every mayor and every unelected official keeps the state of emergency going under emergency use authorization rules, liability is a shield that's afforded to people like Pfizer and Moderna and others. So they're making billions of dollars on the back of something for which they have no liability. But, if this was not a vaccine, then all a sudden the liability shield would vanish, because there is not a liability shield under the 1986 Act for a medical countermeasure that is gene therapy.

Which means we're probably having governors, and the Health and Human Services and CDC and others, maintaining the illusion of a state of emergency not because there's a state of emergency. They're maintaining it, because it maintains the illusion of the liability shield. Remember that if you suspended the state of emergency today, like, I don't know, if you're the governor of South Dakota, and you ever have anybody who remotely cares about this matter, listening to this video, lift the state of emergency because on the day you do it, RT PCR can't be used. Because RT PCR is not a diagnostic, it has never been approved, and it does not and cannot diagnose and treat a disease, which means every time Bloomberg, Gates Foundation and Zuckerberg foundation COVID-19 dashboard reports that there is a another case of COVID-19 because of a positive RT PCR test, they are violating the 15 US code Federal Trade Commission Act. You cannot diagnose a thing that cannot diagnose the thing. That's a misrepresentation. That is a deceptive practice under the Federal Trade Commission Act. And they're liable for deceptive

practices. Because it turns out, you do not have a waiver of liability under deceptive practices, even in a state of emergency.

So maybe the reason why they're calling it a vaccine is because they can count on the fact that neither you nor I will ever have this video, you and I will never do this independent inquiry you and I will never ask the question, is it possible that the entirety of what operation warp speed was, was nothing but propaganda? Which leads me to my conclusion.

Some of you know this, some of you don't. But operation warp speed has a middleman. And the middleman is a company called ATI, a defense contractor out of North Carolina. And it turns out that that defense contractor is the one that clears the billions of dollars of orders for vaccines. And that defense contractor is the one that then is supposed to be controlling the rollout of the vaccines, which has been a total train wreck, even setting aside all of the ethical, legal moral obligations of the things that we just talked about. But ATI also has another contract, also with the Department of Defense, and other government agencies, and that contract is for propaganda and misinformation.

"Hold on a minute! You mean that the company that actually got the contract to officially manipulate public media to officially convey the propaganda of the United States government, you mean that company is also the company in charge of operation warp speed, Dave? Is that what you're saying?" And the answer is, you got it! That's exactly what I'm saying. This thing does not stink like rotten fish because I'm making up some sort of stench. It stinks like rotten fish because it is rotten fish. That's why it smells of rotten fish.


So listen, this is a pretty straightforward situation. You're being lied to. Your own government is violating its own laws. 15 US code is not my interpretation. They have thrown this book at more people than I can count. They have shut down practitioners around the country, time and time again for violating what are called deceptive practices and medical claims. Guess what? They're doing exactly that thing. Right now.

You need to send this video to your US Attorney in your state. You need to send this to your attorney general in your state. You need to actually do something with this video. Don't just share it among your friends don't preach to the converted. This is a violation of federal statutes perpetrated by defense contractors by gene therapy companies, not vaccine manufacturers, by gene therapy companies who are doing experimental trials and doing them under deceptive medical practices. That's what this is.

And by the way, every statement that I have made before I went to my opinion, and my opinion is pretty grounded, because if you really examine why I think that the liability shield is the point, look at how many times the Department of Defense wanted to confirm that they were shielded under the immunity act of the emergency use authorization. They would not play this game if they didn't get the liability shield. And that liability shield came from the emergency use authorization.

So we're very, very, very desperately in need right now as a civilization to make sure we interrupt this. And the reason is because real people are being harmed. Real people are actually having significant side effects. Some people may in fact be dying. The doctor in Florida, who two weeks after receiving the vaccine, dropped over dead, very healthy guy, a couple days after he got the vaccine started having splotches and blotches and everything else, and then at the end of two weeks died, his death is being investigated, are you ready for this? By the CDC and by Pfizer! That's like asking a bank robber to investigate their own bank heist. It is beyond insane people. And it's time for each one of you not to just like this, not to just share this, but send it to law enforcement in your state, because somebody somewhere out there in these 50 states is going to actually care about following the law. Somebody is, or this is not America. It's on you. Do something with this. I'm doing the work. You can help me carry the burden. So make sure you share this and we'll see you again next week. Thanks very much.

God's Word of Encouragement to Cain Before He Killed Abel



Today, May 5th, 2021, I learned I have been misinterpreting Genesis 4:7 my entire life!

Genesis 4:6 ¶And the LORD said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen?

7 If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be **his** desire, and thou shalt rule over **him**.

Who or what is the “his” and “him” of Genesis 4:7? I always thought it was referring to sin. But when listening to an audio version of Genesis 3:16, it struck me how similar the words are which the Lord used to speak to both Eve and Cain.

Genesis 3:16b ... and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

Then I read what the 18th century Bible commentator Adam Clarke had to say about Genesis 4:7.

Unto thee shall be his desire, &c. – That is, Thou shalt ever have the right of primogeniture (the exclusive right of inheritance belonging to the eldest son), and in all things shall thy brother be subject unto thee. These words are not spoken of sin, as many have understood them, but of Abel’s submission to Cain as his superior, and the words are spoken to remove Cain’s envy.

Wow! God was telling Cain he shouldn’t be envious of his younger brother Abel! Cain was the firstborn and he was Abel’s superior. Cain had the birthright, not Abel. But in spite of the Lord’s encouragement to him, his envy of his younger brother still got the best of him and he killed him. In spite of the fact the Lord tried to lift up Cain’s spirit so he wouldn’t sin, Cain’s pride and jealousy caused him to sin anyway! So sad!



God speaking to Cain.