

What Are the Pharmaceutical Industry's Connections to Schools of Public Health?

By Prof. Bill Willers

Global Research, October 20, 2020

Region: <u>USA</u>
Theme: <u>Intelligence</u>, <u>Science and Medicine</u>

Dr. Eric Rubin, an adjunct professor at Harvard's <u>T.H. Chan School of Public Health</u>, has been Editor-in-Chief of the New England Journal of Medicine (NEJM) since 2019. On October 8, 2020, an editorial in the Journal, <u>"Dying in a Leadership Vacuum"</u>, excoriated the Trump Administration for having mishandled the Covid19 Pandemic, with editors concluding that such leadership should be thrown out of office. Coming shortly before the Presidential election makes the editors de facto campaigners for a Biden Presidency, which is unseemly for a scientific journal, as objectivity and freedom from political involvement is expected for such a designation.

Below editorial text is a link to "Disclosure forms provided by the authors". Scroll to Section 3 and "Relevant financial activities outside the submitted work", and see that author and NEJM Deputy Editor Lindsey Baden has received grants from the Wellcome Trust, the Ragon Institute, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and NIH/NIAID (the latter headed by Dr. Anthony Fauci, mainstream media's highest profile health expert). The reason for the grants, in every case, is "vaccine development".

There is also a link to the <u>NEJM Group</u> that takes one to a site filled with the slick photographic imagery characteristic of medical insurance brochures and the TV ads of the pharmaceutical industry: handsome models, setup scenes, the too-perfect age/gender/race balance, dramatized happy people. Rather than a mission statement, the Group has a <u>"Learn about NEJM Group" page</u>.

The NEJM Group is a division of the Massachusetts Medical Society (MMS) that authorizes the same lockdown-related "mask up!" model deriving from the industry-funded World Health Organization (WHO) — nearly half a billion \$\$ from the Gates Foundation plus the vaccine alliance GAVI — its declarations descending to the likes of the MMS, the CDC and their equivalents in states around the world, thence to political figures who rely on officially designated "health experts", and finally to policing powers that inflict the rules on populations.

This highly organized arrangement advances unabated, thanks to a firmly controlled media insuring that the many countering voices of expert opinion are carefully excised from public awareness (see here, here,

The NEJM connection to Harvard's T.H. Chan School of Public Health prompts association with Johns Hopkin's <u>Bloomberg School of Public Health</u>, named after billionaire donor Michael Bloomberg. Bloomberg certainly invests strategically, as does businessman and fellow billionaire Bill Gates, leading WHO funder-cum-self appointed global health authority and a key figure at the World Economic Forum (WEF). Bloomberg School was one of the three hosts of <u>Event201</u>, the pandemic exercise that presaged the actual Covid19 Pandemic by 20 weeks. That the other two hosts of the Event201 simulation were the Gates Foundation and the WEF begs questions regarding the relationships and common interests of the three. So why aren't journalists reporting on the many connecting threads?

Here in Wisconsin, public masking has been made mandatory by the Governor. Two health experts on whom he would rely recently proclaimed during televised interviews that public masking is effective in controlling Covid19. The state's Chief Medical Officer stated that studies in many countries had yielded "hard evidence that risk of transmission goes down dramatically when people wear masks." A Dean of the UW-Madison School of Medicine and Public Health declared that research studies had demonstrated that "universal mask" has been able to "cut in half" the number of predicted Covid19 infections, and that public masking should be accepted as "the new social norm." Both experts have not only medical degrees, but also academic degrees in public health, one from the Bloomberg School, and the other from the Minnesota School of Public Health.

Understand this: There is actually no science at all to support mandated masking. Requests to both Wisconsin health experts for citations to scientific studies establishing the effectiveness of public masking were answered with opinion pieces rather than controlled trials that would justify invoking "Science!" Between May and July of 2020, the decades and dozens of studies establishing the ineffectiveness of public masking to curb viral transmission were abruptly rendered invalid. Suddenly, all over the world, the word from governmentally authorized health experts was "mask up" to save lives, because "We have the science." It was, and remains, a patently false claim. The Director of the CDC in September, 2020 told a U.S. Senate committee "We have clear scientific evidence they [masks] work, and they are our best defense.", and he knew that was false even as he spoke.

If public health is not a valid reason for masks, one is led to conclude that the power of the mask to isolate individuals, and to divide society into warring camps, was perceived early in the Covid19 Pandemic as so potent that enforcement was made a key component in lockdown strategy. The mask had become a powerful tool for behavior modification and social control on grand scale. And to what end?

Both public masking and mass vaccination are advanced within the context of governmental mandate. Reactions to mandated masking demonstrate to governments how best to overcome resistance when the time comes to require vaccination. Already, judgement that enforcement of such a requirement is both legal and moral is being established in the public mind. Meanwhile, massive infusions of money flow to schools of public health from such as the Gates Foundation, which focuses on vaccination of the entire world's population (e.g., here, here, here), and from the pharmaceutical industry (here, here, here) as it prepares for a future of trillions of dollars in profits.

And while the schools of public health collude with industry in vaccine manufacture and testing, and oppose <u>"vaccine skepticism"</u>, they evidence no willingness to confront valid concerns about <u>potential dangers of vaccines</u> in the face of industry's disturbing <u>freedom</u>

<u>from accountability</u>, and the unexplained connections of the government-industry program known as <u>Operation Warp Speed</u> with <u>elements of the military</u> and U.S. Intelligence. Nor do they deal with the issue of non-immunity-related <u>tracking information</u> that may be inserted during vaccination.

Never before have the words "science" and "expert" been bandied about so carelessly and with so little justification.

Never before has one seen such a careful selection of certain, unanimous "health experts" to showcase for the public, while at the same time there has been a scrupulous censoring of dissenters.

Science so politicized, so controlled, and so in the thrall of profiteering interests, is not merely a betrayal of the public alone, but also of science itself.

*

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.

The original source of this article is Global Research Copyright © Prof. Bill Willers, Global Research, 2020

Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: Prof. Bill Willers

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

www.globalresearch.ca 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