

# Who or What is Most Responsible for the COVID-19 Pandemic and its Mismanagement?

By Rob Rennebohm, MD

March 24, 2024

## Introduction:

In an earlier essay, *Reconciliation—Further Thoughts*,<sup>1</sup> the COVID-19 pandemic was analyzed, and the following conclusions were shared:

- The key leaders of the pandemic response have seriously violated many of the most fundamental and important principles of science, medicine, ethics, democracy, and common decency.<sup>2-34</sup>
- These violations included the implementation of a dangerous mass vaccination campaign without proper or honest study of its safety, efficacy, or necessity, and without a proper informed consent process.<sup>3, 4, 19, 20, 22, 27-31</sup>
- Cumulatively, more lives will be lost because of the COVID-19 mass vaccination campaign than would have been cumulatively lost had the COVID-19 vaccines never been used.<sup>3, 34</sup> This was predictable, but warnings were ignored.
- The leaders of the COVID-19 pandemic response have committed devastating crimes against Humanity.
- There is no valid excuse for these violations and crimes. Under the same circumstances, well-educated, careful, properly motivated scientists, physicians, and health authorities would not have made these mistakes.
- The general public, particularly those who have been highly vaccinated, has been betrayed by the health authorities who claimed to be serving them.

The current essay focuses on the following questions: **Why have the key leaders of the COVID-19 pandemic so seriously violated fundamental principles of science, medicine, ethics, democracy, and common decency?** Why have they not been honest? Why have they misled and betrayed the public? Has their behavior simply been the result of incompetence, and/or the sensed novelty and urgency of the COVID-19 situation? What have their motivations been? Given how poorly they have performed, how and why were they handed and entrusted with so much power in the first place?

What has been driving their decisions? What is the root cause of their behavior? Is there some unhealthy ideology that has been driving their behavior? Are they in the grip of such an ideology, perhaps without even realizing it? Are they merely functionaries of others who are in the grip of such an ideology? **Have we been witnessing and experiencing the natural and predictable evolution of society when it is governed by an unhealthy ideology?** To what extent have some of these unfortunate decisions and behaviors been deliberate?

It is critically important to thoroughly address these questions, because only then will we accurately understand the most proximal root cause of the COVID-19 pandemic and its mismanagement. After all, seeking the root cause of problems is one of the most important fundamental goals and principles of science, medicine, ethics, public health, and democracy.

**Crimes against Humanity have been committed; Why? Who or what is primarily responsible?**  
**Five hypotheses:**

A fundamental principle of science and medicine is to construct and carefully consider a variety of plausible hypotheses to explain phenomena of concern.

In this essay five different plausible hypotheses are presented and explained. They are offered primarily to stimulate and facilitate much needed dialogue about the COVID-19 situation and other problems facing Humanity. At the end of the essay we will address the question: Which of these hypotheses is most likely to be both true and helpful? Here are the five hypotheses:

1. **A naturally occurring pandemic:** The pandemic was caused by a natural coronavirus that jumped from bats to humans, probably because of too much human encroachment on natural habitats. Although mistakes have been made in the management of the pandemic, there has been no nefarious activity or harmful intent involved. Key leaders of the pandemic response have done the best they could under very difficult circumstances.
2. **Escape of a bioengineered virus that was being proactively studied for humanitarian purposes:** The pandemic resulted from a bioengineered coronavirus that accidentally escaped from a Wuhan laboratory. The Wuhan laboratory was involved in international collaborative study of potentially lethal coronaviruses that could cause a devastating pandemic. The goal of the research was to proactively develop a vaccine to protect the global population from such a threat.
3. **The social evolution hypothesis:** The COVID-19 pandemic and its mismanagement are the predictable results of the natural evolution of society when it is governed by an intrinsically flawed economic and social model.
4. **The pandemic was nefariously planned by “globalist elites:”** According to some critics, the pandemic and its mismanagement have been planned and conducted by a small group of nefarious individuals---i.e., certain members of and advisors to the world’s most wealthy transnational corporate capitalists.
5. **The pandemic and its mismanagement are the result of a combination of Hypothesis #3 and a tempered version of Hypothesis #4.** Both the mismanagement of the pandemic and the pandemic itself are results of **a)** the natural and expected evolution of society when it is governed by an intrinsically flawed economic model (i.e., the Global Corporate Capitalist Economic Model, the GCCEM) and **b)** acceleration of that evolution and worsening of its direction and outcomes because a small group of particularly dangerous members of the ultra-wealthy transnational corporate capitalists has become

extremely powerful and is exploiting opportunities (afforded by the intrinsically flawed economic and social model) to impose their unhealthy vision and plans for Humanity.

### **HYPOTHESIS #1:**

**A naturally occurring pandemic:** Hypothesis #1 contends that the pandemic was caused by a natural coronavirus that jumped from bats to humans, and that no nefarious activity or diabolic intent has been involved. According to this hypothesis, the SARS-CoV-2 virus was a naturally occurring bat virus that zoonotically spread to humans, primarily because human beings have been excessively encroaching on nature. That is, human encroachment on Nature is primarily to blame for the COVID-19 pandemic. According to this hypothesis, the virus was initially transmitted via a “wet market’ in Wuhan.

According to this hypothesis, any mistakes made during the COVID-19 pandemic response were innocent mistakes that were made primarily because “we were dealing with a brand new virus, about which little was known; the virus seemed to be very infectious and highly threatening, such that we needed to act quickly and boldly, without benefit of optimal information at the time.” There was no nefarious intent or decision-making.

### **HYPOTHESIS #2:**

**Escape of a bioengineered virus that was being proactively studied for humanitarian purposes:**<sup>32</sup> Initially, the leaders of the COVID-19 response denied that the SARS-CoV-2 virus was a bioengineered virus. When it was eventually revealed that several biolabs in the USA, China, and elsewhere had been conducting gain-of-function research on coronaviruses prior to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, that research was defended as a well-meaning effort to protect humanity from a potential coronavirus pandemic, in case such a pandemic occurred. Specifically, the research was designed to inform the development of a vaccine against such a pathogen. According to Hypothesis #2, the bioengineered virus, unfortunately, accidentally leaked from the Wuhan lab, initiating the pandemic. No nefarious activity has been involved.

### **HYPOTHESIS #3:**

**The “expected social evolution” hypothesis:** This hypothesis proposes that the pandemic (at least, its mismanagement) is a predictable outcome of the expected evolution of society when it is governed by an intrinsically highly flawed economic and social model.

If one understands how a society’s dominant economic model can transform society and cause it to evolve in a predictable way, it becomes less necessary to postulate that poor outcomes in that society (e.g., mismanagement of the COVID pandemic) are due to deliberate implementation of nefarious plans. In other words, according to this “**evolutionary hypothesis,**” undesirable outcomes are not necessarily due to a planned conspiracy. Instead, outcomes are understood as predictable results of whatever economic model is allowed to dominate in that society. Different models (with different beliefs, goals, modus operandi, and

types of leaders) predictably result in societies evolving in different directions, with different outcomes.

**If one understands how a society's dominant economic model can transform society and cause it to evolve in a predictable way, it becomes less necessary to postulate that poor outcomes in that society (e.g., mismanagement of the COVID pandemic) are due to a pre-planned conspiracy.**

I apologize for the length of the discussion that follows, but Hypothesis #3 is the least simplistic and most nuanced of the hypotheses, and requires the most explanation. On the one hand this hypothesis does not necessitate postulation of a pre-planned nefarious conspiracy. But on the other hand it does not preclude deliberate nefarious actions by at least a few highly placed leaders of the prevailing economic model.

**“Laws of Nature” and “Laws of Economics and Human Nature:”** There are lessons we can learn from the COVID-19 pandemic that can help us to understand who/what has been responsible for the pandemic and its mismanagement. Among the most important lessons of the pandemic are those regarding “Laws of Nature.” Specifically:

When a mass vaccination campaign (vaccination across all age groups) with a suboptimal vaccine (a vaccine, like the COVID-19 vaccines, that only partially thwarts viral replication and transmission but does not prevent viral replication and transmission) is implemented in the midst of an active viral pandemic (like the COVID-19 pandemic), the virus is placed under considerable population-level immune pressure.<sup>22-31</sup> This vaccine-induced, population-level immune pressure, predictably, leads to the natural selection and dominant propagation of viral variants that (via random mutation) happen to possess mutations that give them a “competitive advantage” (“fitness advantage”) over other variants. As the immune system and the virus go back and forth in making their adjustments and counter-adjustments, these moves and countermoves lead to the predictable appearance of a vast array and continuing succession of increasingly infectious new “immune escape” variants (e.g., the many Omicron variants and subvariants), and is highly likely to eventually result in the emergence and propagation of a variant(s) that will be highly virulent when contracted by highly vaccinated individuals in highly (and rapidly) vaccinated populations (though not necessarily highly virulent when contracted by healthy unvaccinated individuals). In other words, such a vaccination campaign prolongs the pandemic, causes it to evolve in a more dangerous (virulent) direction, and results in a worse outcome.

The above reality is due to fundamental “Laws of Nature”---e.g., competitive binding, conformational changes, steric hindrance, and the evolutionary principles of random mutation, “fitness advantage,” natural selection, and dominant propagation that Darwin taught us more than 160 years ago. It is these “Laws of Nature” that make the evolution

and outcome of the COVID-19 pandemic (when treated with a mass vaccination campaign) predictable.

**Just as an intrinsically flawed mass vaccination campaign drives the natural selection and dominant propagation of increasingly infectious variants (due to their fitness advantage) and, thereby, drives the evolution of the pandemic in a worrisome direction;  
an intrinsically flawed economic model (e.g., global transnational corporate capitalism) drives the natural selection and dominant propagation of increasingly powerful and self-interest oriented societal leaders who are a good fit for that economic model but are a poor fit for Humanity and drive evolution of societies in a worrisome direction.**

When a given economic and social model is massively implemented throughout global society, certain results are predictable, due to fundamental “Laws of Economics and Human Nature.”<sup>35-45</sup> For example, if an economic model that, intrinsically, upregulates and rewards the self-interest oriented capacities of our Human Nature (and downregulates and discourages our altruistic capacities) is extensively implemented across the globe, the expected result will be a great amount of self-interest oriented social and economic behavior---individually and collectively---particularly at leadership levels.<sup>35-37, 45</sup> On the other hand, if an economic model that, intrinsically, upregulates and encourages the kind, altruistic capacities of our Human nature (and downregulates and discourages our unkind and selfish capacities) is extensively implemented, the expected result is a great amount of kind, unselfish social and economic behavior---individually and collectively---with kind, altruistic decisions being made by societal leaders.<sup>35-37, 45</sup>

**If an economic model that, intrinsically, upregulates and rewards the self-interest oriented capacities of our Human Nature (and downregulates and discourages the altruistic capacities of Human Nature) is extensively implemented across the globe, the expected result will be a great amount of self-interest oriented social and economic behavior---individually and collectively---particularly at leadership levels.**

The discussion that follows explains the intrinsic characteristics of two different economic models and how these characteristics predictably affect the evolution of society, particularly regarding decisions made by a society’s leaders, including decisions about management of a pandemic.

**A comparison of two different social and economic models (ideologies):** Compare the intrinsic characteristics and fundamental principles of what we will call (for purposes of this discussion) the Global Corporate Capitalist Economic Model (GCCEM) to the intrinsic characteristics and fundamental principles of the Children’s Hospital Public Economy Model (CHPEM)---regarding what these models encourage, discourage, and seek to accomplish.<sup>39-41</sup>

[**Note:** In this discussion, the term “**GCCEM**” does not refer to small “Mom and Pop” capitalism or small businesses that kindly serve communities. It refers to the corporate capitalistic activity of giant global transnational corporate capitalists.

The term “**CHPEM**” refers to the social and economic model practiced in children’s hospitals during the “Social Beauty era” (the decades prior to the late 1990s).<sup>39, 40</sup> Unfortunately, since the late 1990s, children’s hospitals have become increasingly corporatized, such that, now, many children’s hospitals are no longer practicing the CHPEM.]

The GCCEM intrinsically encourages behaviors that enable individuals, corporations, and nations to become optimally successful, financially, in a “competitive world.” Power, control, and acquisition of financial wealth are goals of practitioners of the GCCEM. Proponents of the GCCEM have correctly observed that individuals, corporations, and nations that compete the most aggressively and pursue their self-interests most aggressively will “beat” competitors that are less aggressive and less self-interest-seeking. Accordingly, the GCCEM intrinsically encourages and rewards aggressive pursuit of self-interest and aggressive participation in competition (made worse by an incorrect, warped understanding of the true meaning and role of “competition”<sup>38</sup>). The GCCEM upregulates individualism, exploitation of others, an attitude of superiority, empire-building (including use of force and violence, if deemed necessary to obtain and maintain opportunity and control), while downregulating the human conscience.

The GCCEM encourages the above behaviors because these behaviors are needed to give individuals, corporations, and nations a fitness advantage over “the competition.” In other words, in pursuit of its primary goal (accumulation of wealth, power, and control) the GCCEM predictably upregulates and materially rewards the self-interest oriented capacities of our human nature, while downregulating and discouraging highly desirable human capacities such as empathy, compassion, sensitivity, fairness, humility, honesty, altruism, and conscience.<sup>35-38, 41, 42</sup>

In contrast, the CHPEM fundamentally and intrinsically encourages behaviors that optimize meeting the needs of others (e.g., children).<sup>39, 40, 43, 44</sup> The CHPEM intrinsically emphasizes and upregulates empathy, compassion, humility, fairness, altruism, honesty, incorruptibility, egalitarianism, and a healthy awareness of conscience. In other words, the CHPEM upregulates and soulfully rewards the kindest capacities of our human nature, while downregulating and discouraging our most unkind capacities.

**Two different understandings of Human Nature:** The root cause of the difference between the two above-described models is a fundamental difference in their respective understandings of Human Nature.<sup>35-37</sup> The GCCEM is based on (and is justified by) a negative, incomplete, and inaccurate understanding of Human Nature. Instead of viewing Human Nature as being comprised of a broad spectrum of behavioral capacities (with extreme unkindness at one end of the spectrum and extreme altruism at the other end---a spectrum that has a self-interest oriented half and an altruistic half), The GCCEM focuses almost entirely on the self-interest oriented half of the spectrum and contends (erroneously) that human beings are primarily self-interest oriented and rather hopelessly so. The GCCEM minimizes and even ignores the positive (altruistic) half of the spectrum---namely, the human capacities for kindness and altruism.

Proponents of the GCCEM justify their economic model by their beliefs about Human Nature, and they declare their model to be the “only realistic” economic model “because it conforms to what we know about human nature.” They have little faith in human capacities for kindness, altruism, and goodness. They believe it is unrealistic and would be folly to base a social and economic model on human capacity for kindness and altruism. They emphasize that the GCCEM is consistent with their understanding of human nature (which they erroneously believe to be a correct understanding). In accordance with these beliefs about human nature, the GCCEM intrinsically promotes and rewards people who exhibit behaviors along the self-interest oriented end of the spectrum---because these behaviors provide a “fitness advantage” when a society is governed by the GCCEM and is engaged in cut-throat competition.<sup>38</sup> The GCCEM thereby, intrinsically, upregulates these capacities, individually and collectively, particularly among its leaders.

Furthermore, the GCCEM’s view of Human Nature fails to consider and/or ignores the fact that expression of our behavioral capacities (e.g., expression of our capacity for meanness vs expression of our capacity for kindness) can either be upregulated or downregulated, depending on what social and economic model dominates society. Intrinsically, the GCCEM upregulates expression of the self-interest oriented capacities of our human nature and downregulates expression of the kindest and most altruistic capacities of our human nature.

In contrast, the CHPEM (at least, during the “Social Beauty era”)<sup>39, 40</sup> is based on a much healthier, more accurate, more complete and positive view of human nature. While fully acknowledging human capacities for selfishness and unkindness (in all of us), the CHPEM emphasizes the positive half of the spectrum, namely the human capacities for kindness and altruism. Furthermore, the CHPEM fully appreciates and emphasizes that expression of human behavioral capacities can be either upregulated or downregulated (increased or decreased), depending on what social and economic model dominates a society.

Proponents and practitioners of the CHPEM point out that the CHPEM has already proven that it can be a realistic and highly successful social and economic model.<sup>39, 40</sup> Indeed, the CHPEM has been practiced, affordably, in children’s hospitals for decades, throughout the world, to the great benefit of everyone. Moreover, the CHPEM has also proven that replacement of the CHPEM with the GCCEM (i.e., the corporatization of health care) greatly

decreases the spirit and reduces the effectiveness of children's hospitals. That is, practitioners of the CHPEM have not only proven that it is realistic to expect the CHPEM to optimally serve children (and societies), but they have also proven that it is unrealistic (folly) to expect the GCCEM model to optimally serve children (and societies).<sup>39, 40</sup>

**A contrast in the selection of leaders:** An extremely important intrinsic characteristic of the GCCEM is that it inevitably and predictably elevates and places into positions of "leadership" those individuals who are most likely to help the corporation "beat the competition" and make the corporation most successful, financially. With the GCCEM the CEOs tend to be people who are willing and naturally inclined to enthusiastically embrace and exhibit the behaviors that the GCCEM encourages and rewards and that "pursuers of wealth" need to practice in a hyper-competitive world in order to become financially successful. If a corporate CEO is too altruistic, sensitive, kind, fair, humble, and "too principled," the corporate entity will be at a competitive disadvantage and will "lose" when competing with a similar corporation whose CEO is willing to be ruthless, unfair, dishonest, unkind, and has little or no conscience.

Unfortunately, another truism about the GCCEM is that when these inevitable "leaders" with little or no altruism (and often little or no conscience) ascend to their positions of power (due to their natural selection and dominant propagation due to the "fitness advantage" they give to the organization they serve), they populate subordinate positions of power with like-minded and like-behaving individuals (rather than placing altruistic, exceptionally kind people into these positions). Soon, and predictably, most positions of leadership and power, throughout the global corporate capitalist system, become populated with relatively insensitive, corruptible, self-interest oriented individuals, often with less prominent conscience. With the GCCEM the "survival of the fittest" game is more likely to be won by corporations led by the type of CEOs just mentioned.

**The most important intrinsic flaw of the  
Global Corporate Capitalist Economic Model (GCCEM)  
is that it automatically populates positions of highest  
leadership with individuals who are inclined  
to vigorously express the self-interest oriented capacities of our human  
nature—because this characteristic gives  
them (and the "corporation" they serve) a fitness advantage  
over competitors.**

In contrast, a chief intrinsic characteristic of the CHPEM is that it purposefully elevates and places into positions of leadership those individuals who are "natural leaders" and have demonstrated an abundance of kindness, altruism, empathy, humility, fairness, and conscience. They are also selected because they have developed a reputation for being exceptionally incorruptible and highly principled. Such "natural leaders" are most likely to enable the organization to achieve its goal of kindly and superbly meeting the needs of those whom they serve (children, e.g.) and are naturally selected (asked to lead) because of



their exceptional fitness to lead that altruistic effort. These are also the leaders who will be most likely to create and preserve opportunities for others to experience “a most precious freedom.”<sup>43</sup>

**GCCEM-generated leaders, predictably, make different decisions than do CHPEM-generated leaders. The former make decisions based on what is best for corporate interests, while the latter make decisions based on what is best for Humanity.**

It is no wonder, therefore, that decisions made by the leaders within the GCCEM are so different from those made by leaders within the CHPEM. Leaders within the GCCEM are focused on accumulation of financial wealth, and they make decisions and naturally select co-leaders with little or no regard for a candidate’s empathy, compassion, altruism, fairness, or conscience; while leaders of the CHPEM are focused on meeting the needs of others, and they make decisions and empower co-leaders with great regard for a candidate’s empathy, compassion, altruism, fairness, conscience, and incorruptibility.

**Over time, in a society governed by the GCCEM, positions of leadership become increasingly populated with increasingly self-interest oriented and aggressive leaders (especially at the very top), and this causes society to evolve in an increasingly heartless direction. Instead of evolving to create increasing Social Beauty, society evolves to increasingly create “mean arrangements of man.”**

**A contrast in social cultures:** It is also no wonder that the social culture that evolves under the GCCEM is very different from that which evolves under the CHPEM. A truism is that economic models greatly influence individual and collective values and goals, social behaviors, and the way societies are organized, led, and evolve. Economic models transform social culture, social education, and social organization in ways that reflect, sustain, and support the intrinsic beliefs and goals of the economic model. In other words, the prevailing economic model creates a social culture that reflects and supports the social philosophy and behaviors promoted by the economic model and its leaders. For example, the GCCEM creates a social culture that is characterized by individualism, self-interest seeking, cut throat competition, exploitation of others, and varying degrees of corruption, and this predictably results in an overall coarsening and dehumanization of society and crushing of the human soul; whereas the CHPEM creates a culture of altruism and superbly meeting the needs of others, a culture that lifts spirits and provides deeply meaningful experiences.

**Economic models transform social culture, social education,  
and social organization in ways that reflect, sustain,  
and support the intrinsic tenets and goals of the economic model.**

**On Corruption:** It is not surprising that corruption is a huge problem in societies that are governed by the GCCEM. The GCCEM's beliefs, goals, modus operandi, and criteria for selection of leaders create fertile ground for growing corruption. Corruption is a tactic that serves corporate interests well (until/unless held accountable), while it utterly fails to serve Humanity. As already stated, the GCCEM tends to promote people to leadership positions, in part, because they have proven to be willing to bend principles.

By the way, an often quoted phrase is: ***“power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.”*** The intention of this phrase is to warn that the more power a person has, the more likely they are to become corrupt. However, it is important to realize that power does not always corrupt. The extent to which “power corrupts” depends on the extent to which the people in power are unprincipled and easily corruptible, which, in turn, depends on the prevailing economic model. The CHPEM deliberately and wisely selects natural leaders whose characteristics include “incorruptible” and “highly principled.” Accordingly, power is far less likely to corrupt leaders of the CHPEM. In contrast, the GCCEM, unfortunately, selects leaders who are relatively more corruptible and less principled (compared to CHPEM-generated leaders). It is no surprise, therefore, that “power tends to corrupt” leaders of the GCCEM, while power is far less likely to corrupt leaders of the CHPEM.

**Currently, the GCCEM is the dominant economic model in societies throughout the globe.** Practitioners of the GCCEM have largely captured the institutions within societies, including public institutions, including regulatory agencies. Because of the intrinsic characteristics of the GCCEM, including the leaders it naturally selects, it is not surprising that numerous crises are now threatening Humanity. The GCCEM, by its intrinsic nature, breeds intense animosities, cut-throat competition, extremism, division, polarization, dogmatism, hateful intolerance, and pursuit of dominance and advantage over others---behaviors that lead, for example, to frequent wars, as we have seen throughout our lifetimes.

**The GCCEM, by its intrinsic nature, breeds animosities,  
cut-throat competition, extremism, division,  
dogmatism, hateful intolerance, and pursuit of dominance  
and advantage over others---behaviors that inevitably lead  
to frequent wars, as we have seen throughout our lifetimes.**

Because leading practitioners of the GCCEM have accumulated great wealth, power, and control, they have been able to prevent the CHPEM from becoming a predominant economic and social model. It is no wonder, therefore, that we do not currently enjoy a world with the kind social behaviors, social values, deep meaningfulness, and kind

leadership that would become widespread if the CHPEM were the dominant operative model across the globe.

**To review: The most important intrinsic flaw of the GCCEM is that, because of its inaccurate understanding of Human Nature, it automatically populates positions of highest leadership (throughout societies) with individuals who are most inclined to vigorously express the self-interest oriented and less kind capacities of our Human Nature—because this characteristic gives those leaders (and the “corporation” they serve) a fitness advantage over competitors, and, accordingly, such leaders and corporations are naturally selected.**<sup>35-37, 42, 45</sup>

**Over time, positions of top leadership become increasingly populated with increasingly heartless, aggressive, and corrupt leaders, and this causes society to evolve in an increasingly unkind, corrupt, callous, and mean-spirited direction. Instead of evolving to create increasing Social Beauty and meaningfulness, society evolves to increasingly create “mean arrangements of man” and becomes increasingly coarse.** That is, society evolves in a direction of increased hateful intolerance, increased distrust, increased surveillance, increased authoritarianism, increased global competition, increased self-interest seeking, increased corruption, increased war, increased heartless technocratic totalitarianism, and increasingly poor decision-making at the top leadership level. Such leaders have a “fitness advantage” when it comes to serving the corporation and waging wars (including war against Humanity itself), but not when it comes to serving Humanity and waging peace. The predictable results are forever wars, the dehumanization and coarsening of culture, and crimes against Humanity.

**Why has the GCCEM prevailed?** Why has the GCCEM, rather than a kinder model like the CHPEM, dominated societies throughout the world? Why has the GCCEM become so powerful? The short answer is: because practitioners of the GCCEM are focused on seeking power, control, and financial wealth; they excel at achieving these goals (being willing to use unprincipled tactics to do so); they use extraordinarily powerful propaganda and their extreme wealth to achieve these goals; and we (the general public) have passively allowed the GCCEM to prevail.<sup>41</sup> In particular, **we have not adequately challenged the tenets (the intrinsic philosophy) of the GCCEM, particularly its claims about Human Nature.**

Unfortunately, once the GCCEM gains a foothold and accumulates immense wealth, it becomes increasingly powerful and controlling—because of the top leaders it selects and because, by nature, it is not intrinsically constrained by a strong conscience or a strong inclination to be empathetic, fair, kind, and altruistic. Instead, it is quick to employ intolerance, dishonesty, rules breaking, military force, and its extreme wealth to obtain, sustain, and further expand its power and control. (These characteristics are reminiscent of how malignancies behave in medicine.)<sup>42</sup>

Moreover, in countries and institutions throughout the world key leaders of the GCCEM maximally utilize the tactic of finding, promoting, and financially rewarding subordinate “leaders” who will obediently carry out the plans and protect the interests of practitioners of the GCCEM.<sup>46-48</sup>

**We have not adequately challenged the tenets (the intrinsic philosophy) of the GCCEM, particularly its claims about Human Nature. Unfortunately, once the GCCEM gains a foothold and accumulates immense wealth, it becomes increasingly powerful and controlling---because of the leaders it selects and because, by nature, it is not intrinsically constrained by a strong conscience or a strong inclination to be empathetic, fair, kind, and altruistic.**

We, the general public, could have prevented the GCCEM from ever becoming so globally dominant and powerful. Through insightful public education and healthy public dialogue we could have warned the public about the predictable evolution of society when the GCCEM is allowed to become the dominant social and economic model across the globe. We could have developed great awareness of the CHPEM and the kind, peaceful social culture it could create. Through education and dialogue we could have effectively immunized the public against the seduction and propaganda of the GCCEM. But we did not engage in such public education and dialogue. Instead, we allowed the promoters of the GCCEM to mis-educate the public, capture our institutions, and dominate social culture.

Over the years we have applied some pressure on the GCCEM, but it has been suboptimal pressure.<sup>41</sup> We passed some legislation to try to make the GCCEM kinder, gentler, more equitable, less exploitative, more environmentally friendly, and less corrupt, but that has been far too little, and far too late. Tactics of aggressive practitioners of the GCCEM have, predictably, evolved to escape most of these legislated constraints (use of off shore tax shelters, e.g.) and this has resulted in these practitioners of the GCCEM becoming increasingly powerful, increasingly brazen, increasingly intolerant of dissent, and more powerful and dangerous than ever before---imminently highly virulent. Our belated attempts to partially control the GCCEM have not only failed, but, by revealing how the leaders of the GCCEM could counter these attempts, these efforts have, predictably, accelerated evolution of the GCCEM-dominated society in an ever more sinister direction.

**Getting back to the relevance of the lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic:** Just as suboptimal population-level immune pressure during an active viral pandemic drives the natural selection and dominant propagation of increasingly infectious variants (due to their fitness advantage) and drives the evolution of the pandemic in a worrisome direction, suboptimal population-level pressure applied during an active pandemic of global transnational corporate capitalism accelerates the natural selection and dominant propagation of increasingly unkind corporate leaders who drive evolution of societies in an increasingly worrisome direction.<sup>41</sup> Both evolutionary courses have been predictable. Neither has been taken sufficiently seriously. In both cases, societies will be taken by surprise because they have not listened and have not taken sufficient preventative measures, including the mobilization of healthy massive public dialogue and the holding of “leaders” to account.

**Just as suboptimal population-level immune pressure during an active viral pandemic drives the natural selection and dominant propagation of increasingly infectious variants (due to their fitness advantage) and drives the evolution of the pandemic in an increasingly worrisome direction; suboptimal population-level pressure applied during an active pandemic of global transnational corporate capitalism (i.e., GCCEM) accelerates the natural selection and dominant propagation of increasingly powerful and unkind corporate leaders who drive evolution of societies in an increasingly worrisome direction.**

Again, at one time we could have prevented the GCCEM from becoming so powerful. Instead, our suboptimal resistance predictably allowed society to evolve such that the GCCEM has become increasingly powerful and entrenched. Predictably, leaders of the GCCEM have been making decisions that benefit them but not Humanity as a whole. Predictably, such leaders do not honor or seek to understand opposing points of view. As a result, Humanity is now faced with many associated major threats---not just the ongoing mismanagement of the pandemic, but also the specter of nuclear war being waged by competing practitioners of the GCCEM and the specter of a technocratic, autocratic, dehumanizing “New World Order” that is conceived by, run by, and enforced by a consortium of the most powerful “leaders” of the GCCEM--- leaders who have a warped social philosophy and, predictably, have little or no conscience and little or no inclination or interest in kind, altruistic solutions to our problems.<sup>46, 47</sup>

**Does Hypothesis #3 adequately explain the mismanagement of the COVID-19 pandemic?** The GCCEM predictably results in society evolving in an ever-worsening behavioral direction, because of the increasingly poor decisions that are generated by the model’s beliefs, values, goals, modus operandi, and preferred leaders. When the GCCEM prevails, undesirable outcomes are not necessarily due to conspiracy. Undesirable outcomes predictably occur even in the absence of planned conspiracy. They happen because of the predictable, expected sequence of events and poor decisions that occur (particularly at the level of top leadership) when society is governed by a highly flawed model, such as the GCCEM.

For example, regarding management of COVID-19 in a society governed by the GCCEM, the following sequence of events and decisions are imaginable: At some point key leaders of global corporate capitalists (GCCEM-produced leaders) became interested in funding proactive gain-of-function research on viruses, ostensibly for purposes of developing an eventual vaccine to protect humanity from future pandemics---pandemics that either develop naturally or occur as a result of a bioweapon produced and released by an enemy nation or terrorist group. Development of such vaccines, of course, could also be immensely profitable. These leaders, who tend to be far less careful and law-abiding than CHPM-selected leaders, then made reckless decisions regarding the wisdom, nature, and safety of that research. The virus then

somehow escaped from the lab. The pandemic started. Then, instead of honestly taking responsibility and humbly seeking a variety of expert opinions, these GCCEM-produced leaders hid truths, misled the public, and have continued to mismanage the pandemic ever since---all in an effort to protect themselves and their interests.

Hypothesis #3 emphasizes that such poor decision-making and such unprincipled behavior (egregious violation of many fundamental principles of science, medicine, ethics, democracy, and common decency) is to be expected when a society is governed by the GCCEM and is not expected in a society governed by the CHPEM. CHPEM-generated leaders, for example, would have been very hesitant to engage in gain-of-function research in the first place, because of the dangers involved (not to mention existing laws that curtail such research). If they were to engage in such research they would do so in the least dangerous way possible and would exercise extreme precautions. In other words, under CHPEM leadership, it is unlikely that a pandemic due to a lab leak would have occurred in the first place, much less be mismanaged after a leak.

The GCCEM-created leaders who were placed in charge of the pandemic response predictably made decisions that were based on what benefits and protects them and the corporations/corporatized governments they serve---not on what benefits and protects others (humanity in general). The twisted goals and twisted thinking of these leaders led them to excessively heighten fears, manipulate data, block potentially effective treatments (so as to obtain EUA of vaccines), censor dissenting scientists and physicians, and violate many of the most fundamental principles of science, medicine, democracy, and common decency. **These are examples of the type of decisions predictably made by “leaders” whose thinking and actions are shaped by the beliefs, values, goals and behaviors promoted and rewarded by the GCCEM.**

In contrast, CHPEM-produced leaders would have responded to a lab leak by being honest about it and by doing all they could to effectively remedy the situation. They would have consulted a variety of excellent scientists and considered a variety of recommendations. Unlike the GCCEM-produced leaders, they would not have violated the fundamental principles of science, medicine, ethics, democracy, and common decency. They would have tried to appropriately calm the public, rather than inappropriately heighten fears. They would not have manipulated data, withheld appropriate treatments, implemented a mass vaccination campaign, mandated vaccination, lied about the vaccines’ safety and efficacy, or censored dissenting voices.

**So, yes, Hypothesis #3 could explain the mismanagement of the pandemic as a predictable outcome of the GCCEM---because the pandemic has been managed by GCCEM-produced leaders, rather than CHPEM-produced leaders.** When the GCCEM prevails, undesirable outcomes predictably occur even in the absence of planned conspiracy.

**Although Hypothesis #3 may explain the mismanagement of the pandemic does it explain the appearance of the pandemic in the first place?**

If Hypothesis #1 is correct, which is very unlikely,<sup>32</sup> Hypothesis #3 would, of course, not need to explain the appearance of the pandemic.

Hypothesis #3 does not preclude the possibility that at least a few of the most powerful GCCEM leaders have acted deliberately and nefariously to try to steer matters in their preferred direction. After all, as repeatedly pointed out in this essay, a major intrinsic flaw of the GCCEM is that it widely populates positions of power with people who are prone to exercise the most self-interest oriented capacities of our Human Nature. It is, therefore, not too much of a stretch to imagine that at least a few of the most highly placed GCCEM-produced leaders might be prone to nefarious intentions and might have deliberately planned the pandemic and encouraged its mismanagement.

At least for the sake of completeness, it is important to consider the following: It is possible that most of the GCCEM-associated scientists and physicians were well-meaning and innocently thought they were serving humanity by participating in gain-of-function research on viruses. But it is also possible that a few highly placed and powerful individuals were not so innocent and planned the pandemic from the beginning and/or facilitated escape of the virus from the lab, and then adversely influenced the management of the pandemic thereafter, to serve their goals. After all, it is naïve to think there are no such “evil people” in the world (think of the many evil acts that have been committed in world history), and **it is naïve to think that the GCCEM does not increase the likelihood that such people can ascend to positions of great power.** See Hypothesis #5 for further discussion of whether the pandemic might have been planned, at least by a few among the most powerful leaders of the GCCEM.

**To summarize Hypothesis #3**---the “**intrinsically flawed economic model**” hypothesis. It views at least the mismanagement of the pandemic as a predictable outcome of the natural evolution of society when it is governed by an economic and social model (the GCCEM) that is intrinsically terribly flawed and predictably generates and empowers increasingly dangerous and highly inappropriate people to become top “leaders.” And, for completeness, Hypothesis #3 does not preclude the possibility that a few highly placed GCCEM leaders may have planned the pandemic in the first place.

Hypothesis #3 views the GCCEM as the root cause of the problem. It acknowledges the major role of the key leaders of the GCCEM, but views these leaders as the predictable product of the GCCEM. The GCCEM, itself, is the root cause. **At least the mismanagement of the pandemic (and possibly the pandemic itself) is the expected result of a social and economic model that enables dangerous individuals to attain enormous wealth, power, and control in the first place. Blaming the leaders of the GCCEM without blaming the model itself, will fail to accurately and fully explain the pandemic.** Replacing those leaders without replacing the model itself, will fail to remedy the current situation and future global disasters.

A logical extension of Hypothesis #3 is the notion that the pandemic itself might not have occurred in the absence of the GCCEM. Furthermore, future pandemics might not occur (or at least not be severely threatening or be managed poorly) in the absence of a prevailing GCCEM. Moreover, other major problems that are currently threatening humanity (e.g.,

frequent wars, the specter of nuclear war, global pollution, confusion about climate change, etc.) might not have occurred in the absence of a prevailing GCCEM. In other words, **the COVID pandemic, future pandemics, and many of the problems currently facing Humanity may be the price we are paying for passively allowing the GCCEM to prevail**—for suboptimally resisting the GCCEM and failing to replace it with a far healthier social and economic model.

**Hypothesis #3 views the mismanagement of the pandemic as a predictable outcome of the natural evolution of society when it is governed by an economic and social model (the GCCEM) that is intrinsically terribly flawed and predictably generates and empowers increasingly dangerous “leaders.”**

**The problem is the social and economic model that enabled such “leaders” to ascend to positions of such wealth, power, and control in the first place.**

#### **HYPOTHESIS #4:**

In this section I will describe Hypothesis #4 in the way strong proponents of this hypothesis would likely explain it. [Before summarily and pejoratively dismissing this hypothesis as “irresponsible conspiracy theory,” please view it as a hypothesis that deserves to be heard. We need to have healthy dialogue about this hypothesis, not automatic ridicule and dismissal of it.]

According to the proponents of this hypothesis:

The pandemic and its mismanagement have been planned and conducted by a small group of highly placed individuals---specifically, certain members of and advisors to the world’s most wealthy transnational global corporate capitalists,<sup>46, 48</sup> whose intentions are: to reduce the world population; increase their group’s own power, wealth, and control over Humanity; and fashion the world according to their technocratic vision of what is best for the planet and humanity (and, of course, for themselves).<sup>48</sup>

That is, certain members of (and advisors to) the world’s ultra-wealthy transnational corporate capitalists have deliberately planned and executed the COVID-19 pandemic---as an early step of a larger plan to create a technocratic “New World Order” that is controlled by key leaders of the transnational global corporate capitalists.

The “ultra-wealthy transnational global corporate capitalists” specifically refers to the world’s billionaire class (the 0.1% or less) and their associates/advisors. This is the group of billionaires who (along with invited guests and compliant heads of state) meet each year in Davos at the



World Economic Forum (WEF). The CEO of the WEF is Klaus Schwab. Among the most powerful participants in the WEF are the leaders of Asset Management Firms that control tens of trillions of dollars.<sup>46, 47</sup>

These key leaders of the billionaire class work in concert with a subservient World Health Organization (WHO), the Bio-Pharmaceutical/Financial/Industrial/Military/Media complex, and subservient governmental leaders who have been selected, groomed, promoted, and rewarded by the key leaders of the billionaire class and are willing to enthusiastically serve and follow the directives of these key leaders. It is highly likely that some of the highest placed key leaders of the billionaire class have little or no conscience or capacity for genuine empathy.

An important strategy of these key leaders of the billionaire class has been to populate positions of leadership throughout governments, corporations, NGOs, the media, etc. with people they (the key leaders) select, groom, promote, and financially support---people they are confident will enthusiastically embrace the beliefs of the key leaders and will effectively carry out the agenda of the key leaders. That has been the purpose of Klaus Schwab's "Young World Leaders" program, which has produced and molded people like Justin Trudeau, for example. Some of these selected leaders are young, well-meaning, but gullible and mis-educated; others, like the key leaders, have little or no conscience or empathy and/or are particularly attracted to pursuit of power, wealth, control, and/or celebrity. Suffice it to say, altruistic leaders who have a deep and kind social philosophy, a deep understanding of history and geo-politics, and practice careful critical thinking, are not welcome, not selected.

**What are the beliefs of the key leaders of the billionaire class? What is their ideology? What are the characteristic traits of these "leaders"? What is their agenda?**

First of all, these key "leaders" believe strongly in the social and economic philosophy of corporate capitalism, especially global transnational corporate capitalism. They strongly believe in the goals and principles of the GCCEM. They strongly believe in a very negative (but woefully incomplete) understanding of human nature. They have little or no faith in the kind capacities of human nature. They believe that selfishness is the dominant characteristic of humans and that this will never change.

In accordance with this view of human nature, they believe it is folly to consider social and economic models that are based on moral incentive, altruism, and faith in human goodness. They believe in the necessity for monetary incentive, and the need for fierce competition---which are basic beliefs of corporate capitalism---beliefs that corporate capitalism promotes, rewards, depends upon, and uses to justify itself. They believe that the only realistic social and economic model is capitalism. They also erroneously believe that "free market capitalism" is uniquely capable of spawning creativity and innovation and is necessary for optimal creativity and innovation to occur. (They fail to realize that the CHPEM is capable of spawning creativity and innovation to an equal or greater extent than does the GCCEM.)

These key leaders believe in an asymmetric form of “public-private partnership” in which private global corporate leaders (of the 0.1%) entice and reward national governments to help execute the agenda of the 0.1%. The 0.1% grant themselves the most power in this relationship because they feel they have demonstrated the most competence (financially, technologically, and organizationally) and, therefore, deserve the most power and control. Included in this arrangement are promises by each government to protect the interests and opportunities of the 0.1% by maintaining control over their respective nation’s population and natural resources. In return, the governments are promised investment funds that will provide a certain level of prosperity for at least a portion of the population that the governments “serve.”

In many ways, the key leaders of the billionaire class have supremacist tendencies. Most of these key leaders are billionaires or consultants to the billionaire class. They view their “success” in the corporate world as evidence of their superior intelligence, exceptional competency, extraordinary “vision,” and indispensable leadership skills. (Much like the USA views itself as the “exceptional” nation, whose leadership is “indispensable,” and whose global activities are an extraordinary “force for good”---despite the fact that, as Martin Luther King accurately pointed out, “The USA is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world.”)

They believe that the world needs their leadership, their vision, and their kind of competence. They believe that there are too many people in the world. Their vision is dehumanizing in many ways. In many ways they are anti-human. They seem to view much of Humanity with contempt. These anti-human beliefs are reflected in statements like, “the world has cancer and that cancer is man,” and by Yuval Harari’s concept that much of humanity will eventually and inevitably be comprised of “useless eaters.”

Because of their perceived superior competency, vision, and corporate accomplishments, they feel entitled to great and pervasive power, which they believe the world needs them to wield. They feel great need to control others, and they greatly fear the potential loss of that control. Because of this fear and because they have little faith in or respect for most of humanity, they feel a need for pervasive surveillance of humanity. This has resulted in the phenomenon of “surveillance capitalism.”

They have great belief in technology. They enthusiastically envision a technocratic global society that is dominated by technological advances, such as artificial intelligence (AI). This includes a fascination with the idea of blending human capacities with technological capacities--a concept that they view as “transhumanism.” They favor this idea, including its use to control humanity.

Many of these key leaders appear to have little conscience or empathy. They are capable of devising and dispassionately and autocratically executing heartless, dehumanizing, supremacist plans, which are, however, presented and described with words and phrases that give an impression of commitment to compassionate, progressive causes---e.g., diversity, equity, inclusion, democracy, freedom, human rights, anti-racism, environmental protection, sustainability, collaboration, collective concern for the common good---words that resonate

with those who authentically believe in progressive causes. Many followers of these key leaders are genuinely and altruistically committed to these ideals. But the commitment of the key leaders to these causes is not authentic and altruistic, as explained below.

The key leaders have a cunning type of intelligence. They have great capacity for manipulation--an almost uncanny ability to successfully propagandize and feign empathy. Edward Bernays (1891-1995) exemplified this uncanny ability to develop and heartlessly implement harmful propaganda. (Bernays, for example, is responsible for popularizing cigarette smoking, particularly among women.) That is why Bernays and his insights and strategies were highly valued by the Nazi movement in Germany before and during World War II. Although the key leaders talk about equity, inclusion, diversity, democracy, freedom, and compassion for others, their ideology and autocratic agenda (see below) are bereft of these ideals. In addition to supremacist tendencies, the key leaders exhibit authoritarian, totalitarian tendencies and extraordinary hubris and hypocrisy.

So, what is the agenda of these key leaders? The best evidence of their agenda may be found in the speeches and literature about the “Great Reset,” as articulated by Klaus Schwab. According to this “vision” of “building back better,” there is need to create a one-world corporate government (a New World Order) which is controlled by the key leaders of the 0.1%, including the subservient leaders they have selected, groomed, promoted, financed and successfully placed in positions of power throughout most countries and institutions of the world (including the WHO, e.g.). The agenda is to implement an all-powerful transnational, technocratic corporate one world government that they claim will rescue humanity and the earth itself from current threats (many of which they have created in the first place) and will bring stability and prosperity for all.<sup>48</sup> It will be an autocratic dehumanizing global government that is frighteningly short on democracy, privacy, and individual human rights and ominously long on totalitarian intolerance, control, surveillance, uncritical worship of dehumanizing technology, social credit scores, anti-human propaganda, and pseudo-altruism.

**Create chaos, high fear, division, and polarization:** Another fundamental strategy of the key leaders of the 0.1% is to create chaos and high fears; then promote division and extreme polarization among those who are affected. This promotion of polarization is the age old “divide and conquer” strategy that has consciously or less consciously been applied by conquerors throughout history. This strategy conditions the citizenry to eventually accept control they would otherwise not accept and prepares them to welcome a solution that they would otherwise reject.

According to the proponents of Hypothesis #4, it is some of the key leaders and advisors of the billionaire class who, long ago, planned the COVID-19 pandemic. They encouraged and funded the bioengineering of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. As hard as it is to believe, their plan was to deliberately release the virus (a deliberately created bioweapon) at some point, realizing that it could significantly reduce the global population. They and some of their highest-placed scientific accomplices have been the authors of the prevailing COVID-19 narrative and its directives, including the mass vaccination campaign. At least some of the key leaders knew that

the mass vaccination campaign was very dangerous and would lead to a devastating cumulative toll of injuries and deaths. The COVID-19 pandemic and its mismanagement have certainly created great chaos, enormous fears, and extreme division and polarization.

COVID-19 experiences have conditioned the global citizenry to expect further chaos and frightening events (potential World War III, additional pandemics, global economic and social collapse, and threatening “natural” disasters, e.g.) and has prepared them to eventually accept, out of desperation, the larger agenda of the 0.1%, which will be presented and, unfortunately, bought (by a propagandized public), as the best possible way to achieve much needed social order, safety, prosperity, and protection from pandemics, further war, and other disasters. The COVID-19 pandemic has simply been an initial step towards the creation and acceptance of the New World Order envisioned and desired by the 0.1%.

Hypothesis #4 contends that, indeed, the vast majority of people now in the highest positions of power throughout most of the world (corporate CEOs, heads of asset management firms, heads of state, heads of the WHO, IMF, EU, UN, e.g.) are people who are at the unkind end of the behavioral spectrum regarding capacity/expression of empathy, kindness, altruism, and honesty and seem to have the least amount of conscience. This observation is consistent with natural evolutionary “Laws of Economics and Human Nature” explained under Hypothesis #3--- that the expected result of unbridled global corporate capitalism is the eventual emergence and dominant propagation (at a population level) of top “leaders” (people in the highest positions of power) who have little or no conscience, empathy, compassion, or honesty. Such people, unfortunately, are capable of committing horrible crimes against Humanity, such as those committed by the creators and executioners of the COVID-19 pandemic and the mass vaccination campaign.

In a nutshell, Hypothesis #4 contends that the COVID-19 pandemic and its mismanagement have been “brought to you by Pfizer (and Moderna)” at the request of top leaders of the GCCEM, who have orchestrated the bioengineering of the SARA-CoV-2 virus and have asked and enabled Pfizer (and Modern) to produce and disseminate a dangerous vaccine.

#### **HYPOTHESIS #5:**

Hypothesis #5 suggests that the pandemic and its mismanagement are the result of a combination of Hypothesis #3 and a tempered version of Hypothesis #4.

According to Hypothesis #5, both the mismanagement of the pandemic and the pandemic itself are results of **a)** the natural and expected evolution of society when it is governed by an intrinsically flawed economic model (i.e., the GCCEM) and **b)** acceleration of that evolution and worsening of its direction and outcomes because a small group of particularly dangerous members of and advisors to the ultra-wealthy transnational corporate capitalists has become extremely powerful and is exploiting opportunities (afforded by the intrinsically flawed GCCEM) to impose their extremely unhealthy vision and plans for Humanity .

This hypothesis honors the importance of Hypothesis #3 and is open to the possibility that at least certain members of the ultra-wealthy and ultra-powerful transnational corporate capitalists have made matters far worse by developing, funding, and actually implementing plans that they may believe are necessary and good for Humanity, but, in fact, are terribly harmful to Humanity. Unfortunately, they envision a world that is highly technocratic, highly autocratic, and highly dehumanizing, as described earlier in this essay (under Hypothesis #4). Their central beliefs include the notion that there are currently far too many people on earth.

An important question is whether these particularly dangerous members of the ultra-wealthy transnational corporate capitalists have deliberately acted in a diabolical fashion or, in their own twisted and deranged way, do they genuinely think they have been doing humanity and the planet a favor by using their erroneously perceived superior competence and intelligence to save both? Have at least a few of these individuals deliberately and diabolically created a COVID-19 pandemic and deliberately manipulated it to maximally achieve their larger goals? Or did they promote the bioengineering of the SARS-CoV-2 virus for defensive purposes (i.e., for purposes of developing protective vaccines to benefit humanity) but things, unfortunately, got out of control, and now they are exploiting the pandemic to advance their larger agenda? It seems possible that at least some of these individuals were truly diabolical, while others, though twisted in their thinking, have genuinely thought they were participating in a necessary and good cause.

That diabolic people could attain great world-dominating power should not be a surprise, when societies are governed by the GCCEM--- because **the natural evolution and expected outcome of a society that is governed by an intrinsically highly flawed economic and social model, like the transnational corporate capitalist economic model (GCCEM), is for people with low levels of empathy, kindness, honesty, fairness, altruism, and conscience to ascend to positions of extreme power.** These “leaders” then accelerate and worsen harms being done. That is, they tend to commit crimes against humanity.

It is fair to say that the values, goals, social philosophy, modus operandi, and (particularly) the criteria it uses to select its leaders, make it highly likely that the GCCEM, when dominant, will spawn at least a few highly placed and ultra-powerful leaders who will not have healthy visions and plans for humanity and will have opportunity to implement those horrible, dystopian plans. It is also fair to say that when a society is governed by the CHPEM, the values, goals, social philosophy, and modus operandi of the CHPEM, particularly the criteria it uses to select its leaders, make it highly unlikely that individuals with unhealthy visions and plans for Humanity would rise to any significant degree of power.

Again, the above does not necessarily mean that all members of and advisors to the “ultra-wealthy transnational corporate capitalist” group are diabolic in their thinking and actions. Many are probably not; many may, in fact, be well-meaning, though gullible and mis-educated--particularly some of the “young global leaders” that the WEF has selected, groomed, and financially and politically supported to be functionaries.

In short, Hypothesis #5 suggests that both the pandemic and its mismanagement primarily represent expected outcomes of the natural evolution of society when it is governed and controlled by the GCCEM---and that this evolution and these outcomes have been accelerated and worsened by some particularly dangerous key leaders of the 0.1% .

### **Which hypothesis is most likely to be both the most accurate and the most helpful?**

Of the five hypotheses, Hypotheses #3 and #5 appear to be both the most likely to be true and the most helpful. They explain why the pandemic has been so mismanaged, and are open to and can explain the possibility that a few high level GCCEM leaders might have planned the pandemic in the first place. Hypotheses #3 and #5 are also the most helpful in that they provide insights about the root cause of not only the COVID-19 pandemic but also other major challenges facing humanity---future pandemics, the forever wars, the specter of nuclear war, polarizing confusion about climate change, potential global economic and social collapse, etc.

Hypothesis #4 fails to acknowledge the high likelihood that the intrinsically flawed economic and social model (the GCCEM) is the primary root cause of the sequence of events that have eventuated in the COVID-19 pandemic. It fails to adequately consider that the behaviors and decisions of the small subgroup of particularly dangerous and powerful individuals is a secondary result of that primary root cause. Such “leaders” would not have ascended to such positions of power in the absence of the GCCEM.

Hypotheses #1 and #2 fail to acknowledge that an intrinsically flawed economic and social model (the GCCEM) has played a major role in the mismanagement of the pandemic and probably the cause of the pandemic in the first place. These hypotheses fail to adequately acknowledge and explain the fact that the key leaders of the pandemic response have repeatedly and egregiously violated the most fundamental and most important principles of science, medicine, ethics, democracy, and common decency. A society that is governed by the CHPEM would not have generated the kinds of “leaders” that have mismanaged the COVID-19 pandemic and have most likely caused it in the first place. Well-educated, competent, properly motivated scientists and physicians would never have made the mistakes described and explained in this essay and its accompanying essay (*Reconciliation---Further thoughts*).<sup>1</sup>

Hypothesis #1 is the least credible and the most likely to prevent recognition and understanding of the root cause of the pandemic and its mismanagement. Both Hypothesis #1 and #2 fail to acknowledge other threats created by the GCCEM.

### **What is the next step?**

A fundamental principle of science and medicine is that, after constructing a variety of plausible hypotheses, the next step is to thoroughly evaluate each hypothesis, to determine which holds

up best under careful scrutiny.<sup>2</sup> To thoroughly evaluate each hypothesis it is necessary to call for and engage in rigorous, respectful, healthy dialogue about each hypothesis. All points of view should be welcomed and honored in that dialogue. Further investigations are often needed and should be encouraged. Such is the tradition of science and medicine.

A major benefit of such dialogue is that those who hold different views have an opportunity to have their views carefully critiqued by others. In this way each participant in the dialogue has opportunity to learn whether they need to amend and, thereby, improve their view. Without such dialogue, would-be-participants have less opportunity to change, improve, and grow. At the very least, families and friends should engage in healthy dialogue---especially if COVID-19-created rifts have occurred within families or among friends.<sup>1, 49</sup>

Such dialogue is not the tradition in totalitarian societies. In totalitarian societies only one narrative is allowed. Presentation and dialogue about a variety of plausible hypotheses are not allowed. In fact, those who merely raise alternative ideas and hypotheses are portrayed as “enemies of the people” and are silenced, censored, demonized, ridiculed, persecuted, often prosecuted or otherwise punished, often severely so. In totalitarian societies many fundamental principles of science, medicine, ethics, democracy, law, and common decency are egregiously violated.

Have the leaders of the COVID-19 response honored the fundamental principle of constructing and welcoming dialogue about a variety of plausible hypotheses regarding the root cause of the COVID-19 pandemic and its mis-management? Have the leaders of the COVID-19 response encouraged a full and accurate scientific and social understanding of the COVID-19 pandemic? Has more than one narrative been allowed? Has healthy dialogue about a variety of plausible hypotheses been encouraged? Have scientists and physicians who have had questions about the safety, efficacy, and wisdom of the COVID-19 mass vaccination campaign felt free to voice those concerns?

**Have the leaders of the COVID-19 response honored the fundamental principle of constructing and welcoming dialogue about a variety of plausible hypotheses regarding the root cause of the COVID-19 pandemic and its mis-management?**

The next step is to call for rigorous, respectful dialogue about plausible explanations for the COVID-19 situation and the other major problems currently facing Humanity. Such dialogue could include consideration of how the evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic can inform us about evolution of society when it is governed by certain economic and social models---how we need to pay attention to “Laws of Nature” and “Laws of Economics and Human Nature.”

**Note to Readers:**

I realize that the hypotheses and opinions presented in this essay may be unsettling and upsetting to some (even many) readers. Hypotheses #3, #4, and #5 certainly challenge cherished core beliefs that many have long held and trusted. I hasten to again add that my criticism of capitalism is primarily directed at transnational global corporate capitalism, not “Mom and Pop” capitalism and small-moderate sized businesses.

But, as uncomfortable as it may feel, it is high time that we challenge the Global Corporate Capitalist Economic Model (GCCCEM) and the culture and problems that it has predictably created. We must not be afraid to critically evaluate long held beliefs. If that results in disillusionment, that is okay, particularly if old inaccurate beliefs can be replaced with healthier and more accurate beliefs. Besides, it is not healthy to lead a life that is based on illusions. We must not be afraid to listen to alternative views that challenge our own. We must not be afraid to become dis-illusioned. Disillusionment can be liberating and lead to growth. Those with alternative views must not be afraid to share their honest opinions. Those with dissident views must not remain silent out of fear of being ridiculed as “conspiracy theorists” or receiving other derogatory labels.

**As uncomfortable as it may feel, it is high time that we challenge the Global Corporate Capitalist Economic Model (GCCCEM) and the culture and problems that it has predictably created. It is not healthy for individuals or a nation to lead a life that is based on illusions.**

All should worry about the absence of healthy dialogue. For if we do not engage in dialogue, we will not grow, we will remain polarized, and we will be at the mercy of the horrible decisions and plans of the leaders who have been spawned by an economic and social model (the GCCCEM) that does not have faith in human goodness, does not respect the vast majority of human beings, and, predictably, has created enormous social problems (not just the COVID-19 situation, but also continuous wars, the specter of nuclear war, global instability, polarizing confusion about climate change, likely global social and economic collapse, just to name a few), and is leading Humanity down a path towards dehumanizing dystopian technocratic totalitarianism.

The good news is that there are alternative social and economic models to consider, including the Children’s Hospital Public Economy Model (CHPEM), that has been affordably practiced for decades by pediatricians in children’s hospitals throughout the world, to the great benefit of Humanity.<sup>39, 40, 43, 44</sup> I have personally had the privilege to practice pediatrics in children’s hospitals throughout the past 50 years.<sup>39</sup> I can personally and confidently attest to the uplifting spirit and deep sense of meaningfulness that the altruistic CHPEM creates, for all involved.<sup>43</sup> I can also personally attest to the soul-crushing experiences and harms that have predictably been created when children’s hospitals have been corporatized.<sup>39, 40</sup>



It is time to encourage widespread dialogue about the GCCEM and alternative models, such as the CHPEM.

#### FOOTNOTES FOR FURTHER READING:

For further explanation and justification of the footnoted statements made in this essay, the reader is encouraged to access the articles listed below. These articles provide additional information about all of the statements made in this essay. Many of the articles listed below (including one with 1,078 references, most of which are peer-reviewed<sup>18</sup>) were written by Dr. Rennebohm and are posted on his website: [www.notesfromthesocialclinic.org](http://www.notesfromthesocialclinic.org)

Readers are also encouraged to access Dr. Geert Vanden Bossche's website for his deep analysis of the complex and dynamic interaction between the virus, the immune system, and vaccines: [www.voiceforscienceandsolidarity.org](http://www.voiceforscienceandsolidarity.org)

<sup>1</sup> Reconciliation---Further Thoughts:

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/reconciliation-further-thoughts/>

<sup>2</sup> Eight Fundamental Principles of Science and Medicine

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/eight-fundamental-principles-of-science-and-medicine/>

<sup>3</sup> Mead MN, Seneff S, Wolfinger R, Rose J, Denhaerynck K, Kirsch S, McCullough PA. COVID-19 mRNA Vaccines: Lessons Learned from the Registrational Trials and Global Vaccination Campaign. *Cureus*. 2024 Jan 24;16(1):e52876. doi: 10.7759/cureus.52876. PMID: 38274635; PMCID: PMC10810638. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38274635/> (With 293 references.)

**[NOTE: The above excellent peer-reviewed article by Mead, et al has recently been retracted (essentially censored) by the journal that published it (because the journal's reviewers had deemed it worthy of publication). There was no adequate scientific justification to retract the article. The journal was apparently pressured to retract it. As explained by Dr. Peter McCullough (one of the co-authors), "*The journal and its editor had the right to reject the paper at any time during the review process. Once published, it is a violation of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Guidelines to retract a paper without adequate justification.*" **This is only one example of the medical censorship that has occurred throughout the pandemic.**]**

<sup>4</sup> Igyarto B, Zhen Qin. The mRNA-LNP vaccines---The good, the bad and the ugly? *Front. Immunol*; Vol15; 07 February 2024

<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/immunology/articles/10.3389/fimmu.2024.1336906/full>

<sup>5</sup> Fraiman J, et al. Serious adverse events of special interest following mRNA COVID-19 vaccination in randomized trials in adults. Vaccine 40 (2022) 5785-5805.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2022.08.036>

<sup>6</sup> Fung K, et al. Sources of bias in observational studies of COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness. J Eval Clin Pract. 2024; 30: 1-145. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.13839>

<sup>7</sup> Lataster R. Reply to Fung et al. on COVID-19 vaccine case-counting window biases overstating vaccine effectiveness. J Eval Clin Pract. 2024;30:82-85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.13892>

<sup>8</sup> Doshi P, et al. How the case counting window affected vaccine efficacy calculations in randomized trials of COVID-19 vaccines. J Eval Clin Pract. 2024;30:105-106.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.13900>

<sup>9</sup> Lataster R. How the adverse effect counting window affected vaccine safety calculations in randomised trials of COVID-19 vaccines. J Eval Clin Pract. 2024.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jep.13962>

<sup>10</sup> The Importance of Knowing the Ct Value at Which a PCR Test is Positive  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/the-importance-of-knowing-the-ct-value-at-which-a-pcr-test-is-positive/>

<sup>11</sup> The Importance of Knowing the Ct Value at Which a PCR Test is Positive—Long Version  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/the-importance-of-knowing-the-ct-value-at-which-covid-pcr-tests-are-positive-long-version/>

<sup>12</sup> Critically examining COVID Data  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/critically-examining-covid-data/>

<sup>13</sup> Critically examining COVID Data---Long Version  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/critically-examining-covid-data-long-version/>

<sup>14</sup> Treatment of Severe COVID Illness  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/treatment-of-severe-covid-illness/>

<sup>15</sup> Treatment of Severe COVID Illness---Long Version  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/treatment-of-severe-covid-19-illness-long-version/>

<sup>16</sup> The following link is to a video compilation of intolerant behavior directed against the unvaccinated by key promoters and key followers of the prevailing COVID-19 narrative. It is a sad and instructive example of “group think” and reveals how well-meaning and otherwise kind

individuals can be swept up by a prevailing narrative (and by fear) and led to behave in astonishingly hateful, intolerant, ill-informed, and unkind ways.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zI3yU5Z2adI>

<sup>17</sup> Analysis of COVID-19---An Additional Narrative; An Alternative Response---Long Version

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/analysis-of-covid-19-an-additional-narrative-an-alternative-response-long-version/>

<sup>18</sup> An Open Letter to Parents and Pediatricians Regarding COVID Vaccination---Part I (Posted in March 2022, with 1,078 references).

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/an-open-letter-to-parents-and-pediatricians-2/>

<sup>19</sup> Vaccine Concerns.

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/vaccine-concerns/>

<sup>20</sup> Open Letter to Parents and Pediatricians---Part IV: The Harmful Immunologic Consequences of Vaccinating Children Against COVID

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/open-letter-to-parents-and-pediatricians-part-iv-the-harmful-immunologic-consequences-of-vaccinating-children-against-covid-19/>

<sup>21</sup> How Would Three of Canada's Greatest Historical Figures Respond to the COVID Situation if They were Alive today?

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/how-would-three-of-canadas-greatest-historical-figures-respond-to-the-covid-situation-if-they-were-alive-today/>

<sup>22</sup> Dr. Vanden Bossche's Analysis of the COVID-19 Situation---in a Nutshell

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/in-a-nutshell-dr-vanden-bosches-analysis/>

<sup>23</sup> A Brief Summary of the COVID-19 Pandemic

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/a-brief-summary-of-the-covid-19-pandemic/>

<sup>24</sup> Do the COVID-19 Vaccines Protect Against Severe Disease and Death?

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/do-the-covid-19-vaccines-protect-against-severe-disease-and-death/>

<sup>25</sup> An Armed Forces Analogy: The Immunologic Consequences of the COVID-19 Mass Vaccination Campaign

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/an-armed-forces-analogy/>

<sup>26</sup> The General's Memos—Simplified

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/the-generals-memos-simplified/>

- <sup>27</sup> Respecting the Immune Ecosystem---Slide-by-Slide Written Transcript.  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/respecting-the-immune-ecosystem-slide-by-slide-written-transcript/> (Also, you can find the actual power point presentation in the Table of Contents, “Notes on COVID-19” section of the “Notes From the Social Clinic” website.)
- <sup>28</sup> How Has the COVID-19 Mass Vaccination Campaign Made the Natural Selection and Rapid Propagation of a HIGHLY Virulent Variant Highly Likely?  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/2315-2/>
- <sup>29</sup> In Anticipation of a Highly Virulent SARS-CoV-2 Variant: An ADDENDUM  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/in-anticipation-of-a-highly-virulent-sars-cov-2-variant-an-addendum/>
- <sup>30</sup> Video-Discussion: Clinical Implications of Geert’s Predictions  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/video-discussion-clinical-implications-of-geerts-predictions/>
- <sup>31</sup> An Open Letter to Physicians and Physician Organizations  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/an-open-letter-to-physicians-and-physician-organizations/>
- <sup>32</sup> *The Strength of Evidence for a Lab Origin*. Alex Washburne:  
<https://biosafetynow.org/the-strength-of-evidence-for-a-lab-origin/>
- <sup>33</sup> Ivermectin in the Prevention and Treatment of COVID-19  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/ivermectin-a-summary-statement/>
- <sup>34</sup> Rancourt D, Baudin M, Mercier J. COVID-19 Vaccine-associated Mortality in the Southern Hemisphere: <https://www.globalresearch.ca/covid-19-vaccine-associated-mortality-in-the-southern-hemisphere/5832840>
- <sup>35</sup> On Human Nature  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/human-nature/>
- <sup>36</sup> Upregulation and downregulation of the Expression of Human Behavioral Capacities.  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/the-concept-of-up-regulation-and-down/>
- <sup>37</sup> Human Nature---A Graphic Depiction---Sowing the Seeds for Public Economy and Social Beauty:  
<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/human-nature-a-graphic-depiction-sowing-the-seeds-for-public-economy-and-social-beauty/>

<sup>38</sup> On Competition:

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/competition/>

<sup>39</sup> The Social Beauty of Children’s Hospitals. (Soon to be posted on [www.notesfromthesocialclinic.org](http://www.notesfromthesocialclinic.org))

<sup>40</sup> The Children’s Hospital Public Economy Model. (Soon to be posted on [www.notesfromthesocialclinic.org](http://www.notesfromthesocialclinic.org))

<sup>41</sup> Parallels Between the Evolution of the COVID-19 Pandemic and Evolution of Society Under the Global Corporate Capitalist economic Model (GCCEM). (Soon to be posted on [www.notesfromthesocialclinic.org](http://www.notesfromthesocialclinic.org))

<sup>42</sup> Problematic Aspects of Capitalism.

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/problematic-aspects-of-capitalism-its-malignant-nature/>

<sup>43</sup> A Most Precious Freedom.

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/a-most-precious-freedom/>

<sup>44</sup> Little Economic Story: To What extent Should Capitalism be Practiced in a Public Economy?

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/little-economic-story-to-what-extent-should-capitalism-be-practiced-within-a-public-economy/>

<sup>45</sup> The Root Cause of the COVID-19 Pandemic and its Mismanagement

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/the-root-cause-of-the-covid-19-pandemic-and-its-mismanagement/>

<sup>46</sup> Current and Potential Global Economic Plans---The Corporate Consortium

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/the-corporate-consortium/>

<sup>47</sup> Power Table X:

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/power-table-x/>

<sup>48</sup> Summoning the “Pact for the Future”. A New Global Order with a Digital Control System Run by “Trustworthy” AI. Jacob Nordangard

<https://www.globalresearch.ca/summoning-pact-future-new-global-order-digital-control-system-run-trustworthy-ai/5848534>

<sup>49</sup> Reconciliation of COVID-19-Related Rifts in Families

<https://notesfromthesocialclinic.org/reconciliation-of-covid-19-related-rifts-in-families/>

