

Deciphering the Swine Flu Scam

A Nun's Story

- BELL TOLLING for the Swine Flu -

Campanas por la GRIPE A

Entrevista a
TERESA FORCADES

An interview with
TERESA FORCADES

Monastery of Sant Benet
Montserrat – Barcelona
9/23/2009

[TC: Teresa Forcades has corrected on the subtitles some of the figures and data quoted in this interview.]

Monastero de
Sant Benet

Montserrat
Barcelona
23/9/09



TERESA FORCADES

I'm a Benedictine nun at Sant Benet of Monstserrat's monastery. Before joining the monastery, I practiced medicine for several years. I'm a physician specialized in internal medicine, and I have a PhD in Public Health at Barcelona's University. I carried out the specialization in the USA, at the State University of NY.

What we call swine flu-A, it's also called, mainly in Catalonia, "the new flu. This term (the new flue) may lead some people to believe that the "A" type flu virus is a new virus.

Well, this isn't a new type of virus. "A" type viruses are part of the yearly common flu... the seasonal flu. Regarding flu viruses we have... maybe everyone's aware of this, but I always start with the basics, we have A, B and C type viruses. These are the known flu viruses affecting humans. Because the "C" virus only normally affects a smaller proportion of the population, it's not used for the

manufacturing of the yearly vaccines. Therefore, every year, the seasonal flu vaccine is a mixture of “A” and “B” type virus.

Therefore the so-called “new flu or swine flu” is not new because of being of an “A” type. Then some could argue that it’s new because of the antigens of the A-H1N1 virus... the hemagglutinin (H) and the neuraminidase (N). These are surface proteins that could appear to give it the novelty nature. Well, this isn’t the case. It must be said, these proteins are not providing a novelty nature to this virus.

Because this same group, A-H1N1, was the same flu virus group that in 1918 caused the terrible pandemic that killed more than 20 million people worldwide. It was this same type of virus and it existed amongst the population until around the mid 50s.

In 1957 it seems to disappear from what it’s known as seasonal flu viruses. It disappears and reappears in the year 1977. This can be looked up by any physician or anyone in “The New England Journal of Medicine” where last month, an article was published about the history of the flu viruses, and I quote “The New England Journal of Medicine” as it’s the most well-known and respected medical journal.

The article confirms as fact that this virus reappeared (the A-H1N1 virus) in 1977 because it had been resynthesized in a lab. Therefore it came from a lab. And I say resynthesized but it seems that what happened was that they went to exhume the body of an Inuit, an Eskimo woman who died from this flu in 1918, as her body remained under the ice, it was possible to recover from the tissues the necessary elements to produce again, or to resynthesize this virus.

To recap, this happened in 1977 and according to “The New England Journal of Medicine” this is an established fact. From 1977, we have then the A-H1N1 flu virus being part of the pool or mixture of the seasonal flu viruses.

Well, what is then new this year? The novelty is the viral strain (S-OIV). This year’s viral strain (S-OIV) is a strain unknown until now. And it’s this new strain which was first diagnosed on April 17th (2009).

It seems that’s the origin of the first diagnose with two cases in California. These are the first cases on record when we first heard about a new virus. Therefore the novelty is just the strain (S-OIV). This is the first scientific fact.

The second important scientific fact to bear in mind is that since it began on April 17th until September 15th which is when I last read the statistics, the figures recorded, now, I’m quoting this figure by heart so it may not be exact but I won’t be so far off, 137 deaths worldwide. [TC: 137 in Europe, 3,559 deaths worldwide].

Therefore having already gone through the south hemisphere countries through what's called Austral Winter with this new virus, and having had a lower mortality rate than usual during this period. The numbers, as I say are by heart... from April 17th to September 15th 137, deaths in Europe and 3,559 deaths worldwide [TC].

The numbers, I insist are by heart but I won't be far wrong. And I quote them because, it's important to do so, there have been lots of declarations, but I'll quote one by a member of the National Medical Ethics Committee of France, whose name is J. Dupré. Or for instance another by the President of the General Spanish Medical Associations, Rodriguez Sendin. Both prestigious doctors have confirmed that based on the scientific data that we have at hand this new virus has a lower mortality rate than the common flu or than common seasonal viruses.

I'll end this scientific part with an important note, an important piece of data fully accredited on medical literature that says that it seems that people older than 60, have already a 33% against this new virus. These are important objective facts to take into account before getting into an in-depth assessment.

Next, I'll mention two irregularities that have taken place in the way... or the consequences so far of the discovery of this virus relatively new strain. The irregularities remain, to my understanding and to the understanding of any objective observer, they've remained unclarified, and they're too serious to remain unclarified.

Firstly, the investigative journalist Jane Bürgenmeister, [TC: she pressed bioterrorism and mass murder attempt charges against the WHO, the UN, and some CEOs of governments and companies] a journalist born in Switzerland, with Austrian and Irish citizenship... heard about what I'm about to tell you now, and she was the one who made the information available, anyone can verify that the information that I'm going to disclose is accurate and objective.

What happened?

At the end of January 2009 and so before this new flu was the newly discovered flu, Baxter Pharmaceutical, a USA Company with a very important subsidiary Company in Austria proceeded to distribute from the Austrian subsidiary Company via 4 European neighboring countries, Czech Republic, Slovenia and Germany, to 16 different laboratories vaccination material for the flu, which was material for the vaccine to be administered between February and March to the population of those countries for the seasonal flu virus vaccine.

This material weighted 72 Kg. Well, I haven't calculated the exact number of doses, but it certainly means thousands and thousands of doses. So this was distributed ... and here comes the point when through one of those life's

coincidences situations or plans are revealed that otherwise would have remained in the dark.

The Czech Republic company Bio Test was one of the recipients of this material, one of their lab technicians decided through his own initiative and as something he was qualified to do but not obliged... to carry out an extra security test with the vaccination material that they received before proceeding to its distribution.

So, before the distribution of this vaccine, what this lab technician did was to inoculate this vaccine to animals called in Spanish “comadreja” or “hurones” weasels or ferrets, small mammals that have been used since 1918 to test flu vaccines. He inoculated these weasels and all of them died.

When he observed these unexpected deaths, and given that the inoculated vaccine shouldn't have caused the death of the weasels, he immediately raised the alarm, and they began checks to establish what this material received from Baxter contained, because if its contents was a vaccine, the death of all the animals was inexplicable.

The results of the analysis showed that in the material delivered by Baxter to those 16 laboratories, **two live viruses coexisted**.

One was the bird flu virus, the bird flu virus is the virus that appeared in 2005, and that caused a high mortality rate but infected just a few people. The number of deaths worldwide, and I quote by heart, was around 250, but as far as we know, around 60% of those infected died. This means that if 250 died worldwide, just around 600 got infected ... whichever the exact number is. Therefore the mortality rate of this virus is very high, but its infection rate is minimal. This virus was mixed with a seasonal flu virus that, as we all know, has an extremely low mortality rate; it means lower than 0.01% ... lower than 1% of mortality at any rate, but with a high degree of transmission. Well, it's highly contagious...

If you mix these two viruses and then you distribute it to thousands of people, what you're doing is you're maximizing the probabilities for these 2 viruses to merge, for them to recombine, and for new virus to appear to be both very lethal and very infectious.

This is a fact and this has been admitted by Baxter. They haven't said “No, this is not true... this is just what by Jane Bürgermeister says, or whoever, but this material wasn't there...” This has been officially admitted by Baxter... [TC: They have admitted that the contamination took place but not that the material was destined for human use. Claiming protection behind the confidentiality rights, they haven't disclosed information about its destination]. ..that the total 72 Kgs of the material contained a mix of live bird flu and seasonal flu viruses. This is a fact.

Could this have happened by chance?

The first think that must be said is that it is extremely unlikely. And I say this simply because in Science the word impossible... is something we never say.

What does it mean extremely unlikely?

It means that laboratories handling this kind of viruses have Bio Security Levels in place. The Bio Security Level 3 is the highest and the one that must be applied in this laboratory, it means that if we talk in a Science context about probability, based on known facts, the probability that this may have happened by chance is extremely low. Not only this, it's not just ... how can we explain the mixing of two different live viruses?

But also because the flu vaccine, as we all know, is a vaccine made with attenuated viruses. This means that it's perfectly normal for the flu vaccine to contain live virus. This is not an exception. But "attenuated" means that the virus must go through a radiation procedure. These viruses found in the Czech Republic and in the whole Baxter material hadn't been attenuated.

Therefore the odds of it happening by chance, well ... That's why I say that scientifically or simply from a humanly prudent standpoint we can't say that it's 100% impossible but, let's be clear, it's important to let it be known how unlikely it is for an accident to occur under these circumstances.

In any case, this has happened and it's under investigation.

This journalist, Bürgermeister has pressed charges, not only against Baxter, but also against the WHO (World Health Organization), she has also pressed charges against governments of important countries, because... it seems that with the information at hand it's more probable to think in terms of malicious intent and this is what she denounces rather than think that there have been a series of chance events almost impossible to conceive.

But, and I insist, it's very important to separate objective facts from those which haven't been proven yet.

I think that the good thing about this video, about this information that we are facilitating is that it may reach the wider public, the more people the better, and for it to reach those who, ... about the existence of plans from a world elite that wants part of the population to disappear... or even much of the population, that ... when hearing all this say "but... where's all this coming from? This is science fiction, I've never hard about this."

I know that there are people who have been studying this for a while. But I would wish that my message reached someone who says ... "Look I don't know anything about that stuff, but I've just heard that there was a laboratory that delivered a contaminated vaccine, and that, interestingly ... (I haven't mentioned this but it's a fact...) it's one of the laboratories in charge of making flu vaccines this year."

Well, this fact alone makes it justifiable to myself to think that “Until such time as an explanation is given about why this contamination took place, I won’t wish it on me, on my child nor on anyone close to me”.

I don’t know if I’ve been clear enough about this point. Because I think it’s important to make it clear. I’d like to get to the second irregularity because there’s a second one even more scandalous than this first.

The second irregularity happened as follows...

What I’ve just said about Baxter happened in February. I’ve also said that on April 17th we had the first diagnosis of the new flu. Well then, on April 29th, twelve days after those two first cases were discovered, WHO’s Director-General, Dr. Margaret Chan (the World Health Organization depends on the United Nations) made a public appearance and announced a Level 5 Worldwide state of alert for the prevention of a pandemic.

What does this mean? Level 5 is quite a high level, after 5 there is only Level 6 left. Level 6 means the pandemic is already happening.

What does a pandemic mean? So how could, we may ask ... doctor Chan and the whole World Health Organization ... how could they declare a pandemic?

Because, well, I haven’t mentioned this but, on April 29 they say Level 5, and one month and a half later, just one month after the appearance of the first cases, on April 17th, so now I’m talking about June 11th... on June 11th Dr. Margaret Chan announces Level 6, (On 11/06/09 the WHO declares a Level 6 Pandemic, the maximum level of health alert) we then have a global pandemic of the A-H1N1 flu virus.

This global pandemic has already been declared from June 11th how could WHO declare a pandemic, taking into account that this virus has an infection rate, not an infection rate... a mortality rate lower than the yearly virus?

Then, how come isn’t there a pandemic every year, if the yearly virus is worse than this new virus? How come don’t we declare a pandemic every year?

Well, it’s quite simple. The answer is that this year in the month of May, in May 2009 the WHO changed the definition of pandemic from its then current definition of an infection by an infectious agent simultaneously present in different countries at the same time and with a significant mortality ratio to the proportion of infected population into removing from the definition this mortality characteristic.

Therefore the new definition went to describe a pandemic as a simultaneous infection present in various countries and carrying an infectious agent showing

any novelty characteristic, thus leaving us unable to know the type of immunity present within the population.

With this new definition and it is a definition... I'm quoting it from the "British Medical Journal". So I insist that all this information that I'm giving doesn't come from the alternative press, for whom I have great respect, but I think it's important to know that all this information comes from the most prestigious magazines and absolutely "main stream" as they say in English, free from any possible suspicion of tendentiousness anyway.

So this amended definition is from May this year, if the mortality requirement disappears from the definition of pandemic, as I said, then we should ask ourselves... well... what prevents the annual common flu from being declared a pandemic? And the answer is that ... with this definition in place nothing prevents it.

With this definition... what we are seeing now, with this investment ... and I'll get now into the political consequences, which is in fact where I wanted to get to. All that is happening now that seems to be justifiable because of its exceptional nature, under the new definition; it wouldn't present anything exceptional about it.

So this would be the situation year after year, and this is just with the flu, not to mention other diseases with the same characteristics... One may say... wait a minute... Isn't it true that this virus is less infectious, sorry... less lethal... that it presents a lower mortality rate than the annual seasonal virus?

And this fact can be read everywhere, everybody says so... Even our minister (Health MP) here... They admit this is the case. Well, if this is the case... how can it be that a pandemic has been declared bearing in mind the serious political consequences which we'll talk about now?

So this is simply what I'm putting together... perhaps the new piece of information that I'm giving is this... and I insist it's from the "British Medical Journal": that the definition of pandemic has changed, but this can be seen by anyone by asking WHO to send you the pandemic definitions for 2008 and 2008, and there you can see that this change exists. It can also be read on their web site, etc.

In the document that I'm disseminating, I also quote an article from an American journal, where they explain that after visiting the WHO website they commented "Listen, here it says that high mortality is a pre-requisite for a pandemic and here nobody dies..." They told them, wait a minute... and they changed the definition on the web... this article has been quoted and it's from CNN which is not a source under suspicion in this sense.

Therefore the WHO irregularity seems even more serious to me, because it's equally objective, clear and easy to verify, and it brings us closer to the possible real consequences so it's not just about elaborating on possible intentions or who did what as you've seen I've stopped there, because I like to distinguish

between what I can prove from what I cannot, but about what it's already happening now because of this definition.

To end this part on the irregularities...

In the USA, due to the 11th June pandemic declaration because of the new virus, this same month, USA declares Public Health National emergency, [TC: in April, 26/04/09] which also carries political consequences. And this emergency declaration was possible in the USA having at the time, in the month of April, 20 cases of infection and 0 deaths. With 20 cases of people infected all of them documented.

I won't get into the documentation as I don't wish to drag on... But it's also important to know that the documentation is not so reliable, it's not so simple... and also it's not being carried out now. It was in June or July, when WHO said to stop verifying with lab tests who had swine flu or not.

In the UK, for instance, they do it through a phone consultation where the person reports the flu symptoms, then they note down swine flu. This is the way is done now. Therefore when they say there are 12,000, 13,000 cases... whichever number they say now, it's very important to be aware of the way in which these figures are worked out.

Once again, these are objective facts that can be verified on the official web, WHO, and I'm quoting by heart but I think it was in July, said that there was no need to verify every case in the laboratory, therefore were assuming that every flu case is a case, and in some countries (in many others they don't even do this) in some countries they're making surveys... based on..."we had 100 and 50 were swine flu cases, so we assume that the rest is also that way" but this is a survey or a generalization, lacking sufficient data at least on the ones that I've seen in the books... And these are the irregularities.

Now I'll move on to the third part, which focuses on the political consequences, political consequences of a pandemic declaration. Well, it's as simple as this:

WHO is an international organization that... normally issues recommendations... then it is assumed that each sovereign country applies or not the recommendations following its own criteria, its own circumstances, and well, its own internal research.

In 2005 this changed allowing an exception precisely in case of a pandemic, this means that in case of pandemic WHO doesn't make recommendations, it gives order. This means that the countries again, this is verifiable and objective fact in the case of a pandemic, the countries... and a pandemic is something very serious, a pandemic is, well... as in the old definition, is a real serious threat to the health of the whole population, and that justifies this medical emergency it does within the context of the old definition, not in the one that we have now.

Therefore with the present definition, well... the title has remained the same, global pandemic, but its contents have totally changed, because the significant mortality rate doesn't exist. But the political consequences remain because of the heading, there the law says... "In case of a pandemic" within their treaties and agreements with the member countries.

So from 2005 when faced with a pandemic WHO doesn't recommend but orders member countries which actions to take. That's why we hear from the authorities in Catalonia and the whole of Spain... "We're awaiting WHO's recommendations ..." perhaps that's a manner of speech... but it's not just that they are waiting for them because they think it's the right thing to do, but because they have to abide by them, not as recommendation but as order from the moment that it's issued.

Well, you may ask... and what terrible thing may arrive? Well... the mandatory vaccination. **This is the most important point to me.** It is very important to spread this information so that even if the vaccination is offered on a voluntary basis, the larger the number of people who know about the circumstances surrounding this vaccine and all the facts that we're telling the better, so that each one of us can make an informed decision.

The point we're going to talk about now is slightly different, it's about the real possibility that this vaccine was issued, or distributed, or announced as a mandatory vaccine. And how can it be possible that I'm forced to have, or to accept a vaccine that I don't wish to have?

Well, the reasoning is quite clear... if we are in a global pandemic situation, although I insist, even if in the present case it doesn't qualify... It seems that there's a risk that if a person doesn't take the shot this may put other people's health at risk. Therefore the countries are under obligation to ensure that the law is obeyed. If this is the law, what would this mean?

Well, the same as usual: fine or prison. Talking about fines, it seems that in Massachusetts, a document has already been made public in preparation for a possible mandatory vaccination, if this was the case the fine would be 1,000 dollars per day... or it could reach up to 1,000 dollars a day.

So the thing works this way, you say: "no I don't want to get vaccinated." "Oh, ok. Then look, 1,000 dollars daily from civil service, for every day you don't get the vaccine." This is a way. Other ways that are happening already now, but this without the general law of obligatory nature, there are companies that say to their workers, "if you don't take the shot, I fire you."

There are open lawsuits in different countries, in the US, in the UK, in France, because there are people that have already faced this dilemma. And that have tried to refuse, and in some cases in private companies, where there's no collective labor agreement, in US for instance, this has already made people lose their job for refusing to accept this vaccine.

And you may say: “but there’s no vaccine yet.” Not yet, but the one that is already in distribution, because here in the monastery, we already have it, and it already exists, is the one for the seasonal flu. This has been delivered sooner. Because WHO has recommended to give, the seasonal one and then, in most of the cases, in two doses, the new flu one.

And now I’m going to talk about this. Then, what may happen to a person who refuses to get this vaccine? If the vaccine is not mandatory, and by now it is not in any country, then nothing happens. You say no, and sign a document if necessary, and the same for your children, they don’t get it and no problem. If the vaccine was mandatory, as I said, fine or prison, as it is what must be done in a country, if there’s a law, it must be obeyed, if not this would be a joke.

Let’s see, facing this, this daily 1,000 dollars fine, or facing the possibility of a prison sentence, one would say “let’s not exaggerate, I got the vaccine every year, or not me but my father has, or I know people who get it, so we simply get it this year, and it’s alright... look a disaster, they’re making money, as always, as happened with the papilloma, but what can I say, I’m not paying 1,000 dollars a day, or I’m not risking going into prison”.

Facing this possible answer, it is important to know three factors that make the vaccine of the swine flu, or this year’s flu, to be different to every year’s vaccine. I mean, this argument of it being the same as every year’s vaccine, but this time it’s for the swine virus. Well, then we take it, we’ve been fooled once again, politicians or whoever, but it’s not going to be the last time.

Three novelties, this vaccine has, in contrast with the vaccine of every year. Why is this vaccine not going to be the same as every year? The first novelty is, I have already said it, because WHO recommends, most of the pharmaceuticals that are producing this vaccine, recommend it to be given in two doses. This is a novelty. Nobody has ever heard before that flu vaccines come in two doses. Normally it’s given once and that’s all... next year you take it again, but it’s never given in two doses. This year it comes in two doses, and also, as I said, WHO has already recommended, in fact, the vaccine delivery has already arrived at senior care homes, monasteries and other places, so that everybody takes the vaccine for the seasonal virus.

If the WHO’s recommendations are followed this year, those who follow them, will end up receiving three flu vaccinations: the seasonal one, the first dose for the swine flu. I’ve also heard that some laboratories produce it just with one, but most of them have announced it will be a vaccine in two doses. Therefore, the seasonal one, that is already available this month, the first dose for the swine flu, and the second dose. That way, the possibility of secondary effects is multiplied by three, theoretically it is multiplied by three, and these vaccines do have secondary effects.

But this is only theoretical. In practice, nobody knows what could happen, because it's never been done before. Because no one has ever before received three doses of the virus, three shots with alive viruses of the flu, and from different types one after the other, in the middle of a supposed pandemic or flu season. This is the first novelty, this is new.

Second novelty. It has to do with the coadjuvants. This has been denounced by the French Labor Union of Nurses. The National Nurse Labor Union of France has published a document that you can also check, where they talk about, well, they put many examples, but I'm giving just one, the company Glaxo Smith Kline, one of the pharmaceutical that produces the vaccine, in fact it is responsible for the research with children that it's being done in Spain, the pioneer country in the world that has accepted that children, I think from 6 months old to 17 year old, try an experimental vaccine, and thus see what the secondary effect may be, or what point do they reach. This is the company that promotes this research.

This company is using a coadjuvant that's never been used before, in those flu vaccines. And this, in different ways, all the companies that produce swine flu vaccines have announced that they use these kinds of stronger coadjuvants than the kinds that are normally used every year for flu vaccines.

What is a coadjuvant?

A coadjuvant is a substance that's generally added to the flu vaccine. "That it's added" means that the objective of the coadjuvant is to stimulate and excite the immune system to produce a higher immune system response. This is mainly done for the vaccine to be more effective, but in this case, French nurses have denounced that this coadjuvant is going to multiply ten times, this is the intention in the first studies, multiply ten times the immune system response. Excite the immune system of the person so that it produces a response ten times higher than the normal and common one.

This coadjuvant seems to mix polysorbate with the excipient, or the coadjuvant squalene, which is the same, used against Anthrax and was given to the soldiers in the Gulf War, and there are many studies that prove that they had serious secondary effects, in terms of central neurological system, paralysis and arthritis, this is the squalene.

This new coadjuvant is, therefore, the second novelty. There are coadjuvants still untested, and that pharmaceutical companies justify precisely because they've asked to produce millions and millions, in fact billions, 4.6 billions of doses of this vaccine, it's what it's been set, to vaccinate the whole population. Rich countries and those pharmaceuticals have already announced that they are making donations of millions of doses to third world countries that couldn't afford it. So the plan is to vaccinate the whole world population.

Well, in this production circumstances, some pharmaceutical companies justify using coadjuvants, still untested, so they can put fewer antigens. – They save.

They can save antigen and in each injected dose of vaccine, fewer antigens and more adjuvant. Which means less natural immune system excitation and more artificial excitation to compensate the lack of antigen to produce vaccines. This is the official explanation. The thing is that it's the second novelty; the adjuvant is not the same as every year.

Therefore nobody knows to what degree this artificial excitation of the immune system is going to cause autoimmune diseases. In fact there's one, the ascending paralysis of Guillain-Barré. This is known or associated to the administration, for instance, of the flu vaccines in 1976. In this moment it just affected the US, in a similar campaign we're living now, also through mass media and politicians. In this campaign they ended up vaccinating 48 million of US citizens.

Among these 49 millions there were, I don't have the numbers with me right now... but there were around 3,000 complaints of paralysis with the Guillain-Barré syndrome. So this is accepted as a consequence. In fact the CDC... Centers for Disease Control and Prevention of the United States (www.cdc.gov) have already announced that it is inevitable that there will be paralysis cases if the whole of the population get the vaccine, but despite this, they're going ahead with it.

When, I insist, we must always keep in mind that this virus of the flu is more benign than the usual virus. Therefore if check the pros and cons, and this is what French nurses do in their document, the possibility of spending a few days at home with the flu, like every year, in fact, less than every year, or the possibility of suffering an ascending paralysis, which in some cases people recover from but in many cases they don't, that can even lead to death, then... at least this information must reach everybody so everyone takes responsibility.

And the last one,.. the third novelty regarding every year's vaccine... The third novelty is that pharmaceutical companies, because they've been asked to, supposedly make this extraordinary effort to produce such a vast amount of doses in a record time, they are forcing agreements, and in the US it's official that this agreement has been signed, agreements to absolve them of any legal responsibility in case that this vaccine has adverse secondary effects or even if it causes death.

In the US, the Secretary of Health, Kathleen Sibelius, signed a document that gives impunity, political immunity, it won't be possible to ask for responsibilities nor compensation, nor from the involved politicians nor from the pharmaceutical companies. This is a third novelty that I think is very significant, for money can't buy health or life, but if the pharmaceutical company or the responsible person is not... let's say it other way... is willing to financially compensate we can take it as guarantee that it is not foreseen to have an avalanche of complaints.

If the responsible person makes sure, with objective, clear, and verifiable public documents, that it won't be possible to bring a lawsuit against them, he is taking from us an guarantee that this vaccine is not going to have adverse secondary effects.

As a thought, I'd say to sum up what I said up to now, if what happened with Baxter and those contaminated vaccines, which is proven to be true and they are contaminated, we don't know why or how they were contaminated, but that they were contaminated we do know it for sure. If this contamination hadn't been discovered by chance and this, let's remember, was in February in 2009, today we would have the pandemic, this terrible pandemic that they're announcing without a real basis. They're talking about this pandemic without a real or objective basis.

If, in February, this hadn't been discovered by chance by the Czech researcher or lab technician who carried that test, which he didn't have to, today we would have this pandemic that is being announced.

Then, knowing this, and keeping in mind the current WHO legislation and the irregularities, for instance, how is it possible that, what happened in February, has not been discussed in the international press? How is it possible that politicians haven't talked about it?

This hasn't had any political or media impact. This, we should ask to ourselves how all this is possible.

Keeping this in mind, and keeping in mind that the pandemic would have happened, if this hadn't been discovered by chance, I think it's very important to state that the real threat, that those vaccines, which will arrive very soon, are contaminated, may be contaminated, and that a coercive legislation could be imposed when, despite of the fact that they may be contaminated, a coercive legislation could be imposed, that could force all of the population to take this vaccine by law, I think this is a risk that cannot be and must not be minimized.

Do, by no means, panic because panic doesn't help in any way, quite the opposite. But one thing is not promoting, or having or expressing panic, another is to not spread or share an information or a thought, like I'm doing, that may be important as we still have time for a reaction and that's why I think this initiative is so important.

Therefore do not minimize, this is just a risk, so I can't say for sure that the vaccines will be contaminated, I don't know it for sure, I haven't made them, nor analyzed them, I don't think it's going to be easy, either, to get access to this vaccine in order to analyze it independently, if it's possible we will try or help to do it. But I don't know of anybody who was able to do it.

What happens if more people start dying now? Or this that was announced, that a second wave is coming and a mutation is coming? In terms of this, it is also

very important to know that, that swine flu virus has not mutated in 70 years. Then how is it possible to announce a mutation this year when this virus is not known to have ever mutated in this short period of time, during a period of 70 years? I mean, what we didn't have for 70 years is a flu coming in two waves with different virus. Then again this is an irregularity.

But, let's assume that many people start dying now, because of the flu or with compatible symptoms, then it will be even more important to refuse to this vaccination, for two reasons.

First if this virus starts giving an increased mortality, it's because it's not the same. That is, it will have mutated although it's something that doesn't agree with up-to-date data. If it has mutated, the vaccine is not of use anymore. The vaccine that's been produced now, this is the why every year a different vaccine is produced, because there are mutations, we have to produce a vaccine adapted to the new mutation.

So, if an important amount of population doesn't die, it is not necessary to take the vaccine, because, as I say, the risk is very high, the risk may be higher than the benefit. If we start seeing a high rate of mortality caused by this flu, or because of compatible symptoms, then, this surprise could only be due to two reasons.

The first is that the virus has mutated, therefore the vaccine is not good. Or second, it is another virus or other viruses, and therefore, the vaccine is not good either, and it could even be the vaccine itself the means of transmission of those new viruses, according to what happened with Baxter in February.

This is where my thoughts lead me. And now I'd like to conclude with a proposal. The proposal is very clear.

On one hand, stay calm, this is fundamental. To stay calm, take your usual precautions to not get infected, common sense precautions, and do not get the vaccination, because there are all those circumstances. This is my recommendation, but is also the recommendation of many people of "*seny*" in Catalanian... [Audience: "Of common sense".] of common sense. There are many people talking in this way, many doctors, a whole association, nurse unions, and so on... This is the first part.

But then we have the second part, which is the one that we may have not heard so often. And it's that one, that I now, from this platform we are... Is where I think I'm going to upload. ...

Can I say it now? Because last week, in Catalonia, I started an initiative called Catalunya Religio (.cat) This is a web site, where the photos still don't appear, as it just started. But I've been asked to collaborate a bit. So, this week, I'm going to upload the link to the document that I'm talking about. I'm also going to give you this document, so I think it's going to be accessible...

So I appeal, from this document, and now from this visual platform, I appeal to activate urgently all the civil citizenship resources, and legal resources, to avoid two things in our country.

The first one. That no one can force anybody in this country to get a vaccine that they do not want to get.

And the second one. Those who, of their own will, desire to get the vaccination, won't be deprived of. I mean, to avoid that anyone who desires to get the vaccine is deprived of his right to ask for responsibilities or financial compensation in case the vaccine causes him serious disease or death.

First maybe a personal note, it would be about this part of "experts". More and more, the world seems to move around experts, and that a person who is not a doctor or public health doctor, or who does not have credentials, or who doesn't consider themselves to have enough knowledge to critically evaluate this mass of information that comes to us from everywhere, it seems hard... unless it is investigative journalism, or people who have been preparing for many years to do this.

What happens with those who are actually health professionals? That they have, unlike me, in this my case it's different, their work depends on them acting according to what the profession as a whole is saying, or not going far away from it. It's really hard.

If I were practicing medicine at a hospital, as I was for several years, I don't know if I would be talking here and now. I know I have the knowledge and education, but my work, my everyday life and my surroundings don't depend on that my medical community, from Barcelona or my country, may think what I'm saying is correct or incorrect. That is I don't have to feel this fear, and I say this just to point that it may be a reason for some health professionals who think the same way I do, or who are asking themselves these same questions but say "if I'm not 100% sure I don't take the risk of making these questions".

Although, I must also say that there are many health professionals in our country that, maybe not everything I've said, maybe they haven't touched the political aspects that much, but they perfectly handle the scientific data, and they have made them public, with even more data than I've given. In this way, it's very important to know that this is not something particular.

O would like to make a note on "fear".

Well, we must not be scared of the known swine flu(A). Because, as I've said a few times, but I'll say it once more, according to objective facts, it has a lower mortality rate than seasonal flu. I didn't mention this in the data but, the mortality rate of every year's flu, the good years in Europe, the flu is not the same every year, some years it's severe, or more severe, and some others it's more benign.

So, the official data of the diseases centre, the center that collects this information as European level, that would be the DCD in the US, then the European is called E, from Europe, ECDC. (European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control <http://ecdc.europa.eu>).

This centre's numbers are: the good years of flu 40,000 people die from complications associated or derived directly to the flu. 40,000 in a flu season. This is good years.

The bad years, the numbers that handles this ECDC, this official agency, is 220,000 deaths.

It's important to know it because when one says: "120 people have died!" Well, let's wait, we cannot just count them one by one... If every year, as a normal fact, in the best of the years, 40,000 people die, and in bad years 220,000, if we count one by one, we spread an unjustified panic. Therefore we mustn't fear or feel panic to the swine flu that is currently circulating, if we take into account the numbers I've just quoted.

However, in everything that I've said there are many elements that may cause fear, or that can cause anguish, or a real concern. I think that this anguish, and real concern is good to have it. It's not good to let it shadow the political action, because that's what it's all about.

Now we are in time, nobody has declared a National Emergency, nobody can do it either with the information we have, this would be impossible. Now we have the doors open to act politically at a political level, to ensure the two things I said before, in our country. That nobody can be forced to get a vaccine that they don't wish. And those freely desire it, and get it, won't be deprived of their right to demand political responsibilities and receive financial compensations.

And just as another note... If you want me to say something about what's going round, that I didn't want to discuss directly, well, this hypothesis that seems to underlie, that it's some sort of a plot... A plot to do something... Because WHO has said all of that. I'm not answering these questions, because I can not answer them.

But I may make a little note... So, as far as we know about the history of humanity, there have been groups who wanted to dominate the world. This is not new. We cannot come in the 21st century and say "Ah! There's a group who wants to dominate the world".

Sorry but that is not new, it's as old as the world, from the Romans, and if we go further, the Incas and every known Empire... with a good intention. That is, an intention to fix a world that is chaotic, and difficult to control, so let us control it, whomever this "us" is, to help humanity, to actually make a world where there's a minimum order... So we won't have a Hitler here, another thing there.

And for a long time it's being said that there is overpopulation. Well, if that was so, even if we look at it from this kind of hypothesis, I think fear is unjustified by this historical background. It's just being aware that this happened before in history. There have been people who, irresponsibly, have caused world wars, and they could have foreseen and acted politically but they didn't.

We are in the 21st century. Human beings are the same with their extreme goodness. And these conspiracies will never be able to break this human goodness, this impossibility to control the whole world. But that there are people who try... throughout history they have always existed.

And I'm not amazed at the possibility that this has something to do with this kind of action. I think that the spectacular nature of talking about international plots, global mass murder... shadows the other side. And I think it's a bit self-defeating. I mean, now I'd like to not have said it... just because with the things I said before, which is all I wrote in the written document, is more than enough. Is more than enough for any person willing to take political responsibility or action, may be able to say "OK, I've had enough, I know what I must do."

Well, each one will do what they want, but at least it is an easy, objective and well-founded information. While, if we dwell on this almost morbidity, saying that "they want to dominate us... There's a group that wants to own the whole humanity!" We rush off... and I insist, I'm not saying it's possible, but I'm not interested in touching that, because I think we are onto something more serious, which is this possibility, in a few weeks or a month, when those vaccines arrive, to really take up on a civilian action, and maybe, let me finish with this, these groups who care about human rights and about the quality of our democracies... because we talk about democracies, but when they are put into practice, happens as here in Catalonia.

Almost a year ago, there was a legislative initiative of the people, because Catalonia is, well Spain is the country, in the European Union, with the highest proportion of transgenic farming, and it's located, around 80%, and I'm quoting from memory, it may not be accurate, but it's not very far, it's located in Catalonia.

Therefore, from Catalanian "*pagesia*" (peasants) there was this initiative to promote this legislative initiative of the people to debate in the parliament whether or not this should be.

For instance, the transgenic in Catalonia, are not in all of Spain, the products, from the supermarket, are not labeled to show if they contain transgenic or not. And this was one of the proposals in the project. According to our democracies, the minimum number of signatures needed to promote a legislative initiative for the people is 50,000 signatures. And collecting 50,000 signatures is a lot of work.

Well, they were collected, or we collected, as I also participated, 102,000 signatures. Despite this, the Catalanian Parliament has said that they're not

going to debate it. This happened here this year. It's only an example of what I want to say when I talk about monitoring the quality of our democracies. So they won't be formal democracies but, at the time of truth, there's a political practice that is closer to a dictatorship than to a democracy.

Or yes, what I wanted to say... Those who monitor [are] the different people and groups, and jurists groups, and groups of people for the human rights... but not the official ones.

Those groups commented, or summarized or highlighted in different documents as something special what happened in Spain. When Aznar... When the terrorist attack in Madrid... March 11th of 2004... when there was the terrorist attack in Madrid, there was a political change. Popular Party (PP) lost and Socialist Party (PSOE) won.

Well, this popular response against an attempt from those who held the power, to give an official version of the facts, making use of a moment of panic. And that was trying to imitate what happened in the US where, from a terrorist attack, that you may talk about causes and authors... there are also many theories, but the one sure thing is that it causes panic among the population and they make use of that panic to reduce people's freedom. That didn't happen here.

And this, as I say, it's been highlighted by international groups, that say... as if the Spanish State was an example of what happened... a spontaneous call of people strong enough to take the streets, this is a lot nowadays, and stop the manipulation where they were near a declaration of a state of emergency or whatever, to justify this reduction in people's freedom. Then, well... We've done it before, so come on and let's do it again.

Un reportaje de

Alicia Ninou

Y

Judith Abadías

Barcelona 23/09/09

A report by:

Alicia Ninou and Judith Abadías

Barcelona 09/23/2009

Transcripció'n:

Amalia, Alish Y gripeArtificial

Translation and Subtitles:

Marta Cobos (gripeArtificial)

Correction of translation:

<arina and Paula Hera'ndez

TERESA FORCADEES I VILA
Degree in Medicine from the University of Barcelona.
Specialty in Internal Medicine
At the New York State University.
PHD in Public Health from the University of Barcelona.
Degree in Theology from Harvard University.
Benefictine nun at the monastery of Saint Benet
In Montserrat, Barcelona.

TC: Teresa Forcades has corrected
On the subtitles some of the figures
and data quoted in this interview.

We've made this interview with the only intention of spreading all this information
to the largest number of people, so that people can decide of their own free will.

Available at:

www.timefortruth.es
www.vimeo.com/ALISH
www.youtube.com/IALISH