

Hypoxia Experiment: Do Face Masks lower our Blood Oxygen Levels?

Running Uphill with Two Face Masks and My Mouth Taped Shut

By John C. A. Manley Global Research, October 07, 2020 Theme: Science and Medicine

Do face masks lower our blood oxygen levels? I decided to put it to the test.

But first, let me state my bias: I disagree with face mask mandates. I've reviewed <u>randomized controlled trials</u> and find no evidence that masks reduce the <u>spread of</u> <u>infectious diseases</u>. Masks also have many <u>physical, social and, mental harms</u>. So I would love to prove that they cause hypoxia.

To find out I loaded my backpack with surgical tape, my notebook, a MacBook (<u>to record the experiment</u>), an oximeter, a medical-grade surgical mask and a <u>Guy Fawkes mask</u>. Ten minutes later, I had biked to an ideal spot to conduct the experiment: Atop a rather high hill on a wooded trail. Clamping the oximeter on my middle finger, I found my oxygen saturation was at 98% and my heart was thumping 77 beats per minute.

I then conducted four 10-15 minute experiments running up and down the hill with either no mask, a surgical mask, or a surgical mask plus a Fawkes mask. At all times I had my mouth taped shut (to prove I was breathing properly and restrictively through my nose). The following table shows the results:

	Duration	Oxygen	Heart Rate
nasal breathing + surgical mask + Fawkes mask	10 minuties	86%	82 bpm
nasal breathing + surgical mask	10 minuties	93%	99 bpm
nasal breathing	10 minuties	93%	99 bpm
nasal breathing + surgical mask + Fawkes mask	15 minuties	90%	96 bpm

I started off wearing a surgical mask and the Fawkes mask. I had no problem running, but the feeling of suffocation was intense. My breathing also increased. The Fawkes mask has only two small holes for the nose. After 10 minutes my oxygen saturation dropped from 98% to 86%. Below 90% is considered hypoxic by the <u>Mayo Clinic</u> (at least, at rest). My heart rate only increased 5 bpm.

Taking the Fawkes mask off and another 10 minutes of running brought my O_2 up to 93%. That felt better. my heartbeat rose to 99 bpm.

Taking the surgical mask off, however, and continuing with another ten minutes of running made zero difference in the readings or how I felt.

Lastly, I donned both the surgical and Fawkes masks again and ran for another 15 minutes up and down the hill. This time my oxygen held at 90%. With this final round my breathing was more relaxed which might explain the higher blood oxygen saturation.

As has long been my contention, the above experiment shows that the surgical mask makes absolutely no difference in blood oxygen levels. It did not cause hypoxia.

Yes, I know many people say it does. I would argue that such drops in blood oxygen levels were not caused by the mask, but instead caused by the wearer beginning to hyperventilate in reaction to the rise in CO_2 the mask causes. I'll write more about this in future <u>Red Pill</u> <u>Posts</u>.

It's rather funny to think that our large respiratory system is so inadequate that a thin, breathable, cloth mask would pose such a threat to our oxygen intake. (Plastic Guy Fawkes masks, on the other hand, are a little iffy.)

I'm not trying to defend mask wearing. I'm trying to defend the truth. It's hard to argue that masks don't stop the spread of infection, but do stop oxygen absorption. Arguing masks cause hypoxia may only discredit the views of those trying to stop masking mandates. There are <u>enough problems</u> with masks that we don't need to make any up. And the fact they're <u>ineffective at stopping illness</u> makes them an unnecessary distraction.

As Gandhi said: "Truth never damages a cause that is just."

Mind-numbingly boring video evidence of the entire 55-minute experiment is available <u>here</u>.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

John C. A. Manley has spent over a decade ghostwriting for medical doctors, as well as naturopaths, chiropractors and Ayurvedic physicians. He publishes the <u>COVID-19(84) Red</u> <u>Pill Briefs</u> – an email-based newsletter dedicated to preventing the governments of the world from using an exaggerated pandemic as an excuse to violate our freedom, health, privacy, livelihood and humanity. He is also writing a novel, <u>Brave New Normal: A Dystopian Love</u> <u>Story</u>. Visit his website at: <u>MuchAdoAboutCorona.ca</u>. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from the author

The original source of this article is Global Research Copyright © John C. A. Manley, Global Research, 2020

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

<u>www.globalresearch.ca</u> contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca