

Scientific Manipulation – Can the “Experts” Make You Believe?

[Scientific Manipulation – Can the “Experts” Make You Believe?](#)

by [Joe Plummer](#), [JoePlummer.com](#)

January 1, 2020

Even those who aren't paying attention, probably know by now that access to information is being blocked. Apparently, a handful of people have decided that our new normal does not include the right to speak or hear unapproved facts. To the extent possible, they're creating a digital echo chamber; where they write the official narrative, and **only those** who repeat the narrative are permitted to be seen and heard.

There's a science to making people believe things that are not true. Bertrand Russell, an expert on the topic, argued in the 1930s that "[The society of experts](#) will control propaganda...all real power will come to be concentrated in the hands of those who understand the **art** of scientific manipulation."[\[i\]](#) He noted that the population will: "[not be allowed to know how its convictions were generated.](#)"[\[ii\]](#) Hopefully, this short video will shine some light on how they generate convictions.

For those of us who understand the "art of *scientific manipulation*," because we've studied the history of those who employ it, the *COVID 19 manipulation* could not have been more obvious. Once you know the formula, it's very easy to identify: Use the media to convince the population that it faces an imminent apocalyptic threat, generate as much

hysteria as possible, and then implement your desired policies; policies that, without the hysteria, would have been politically impossible.

At this point, they've already achieved many of their desires, so let's turn our attention to one goal that they've yet to achieve: Injecting billions of human beings, multiple times, with a rushed, inadequately tested, *unproven* mRNA vaccine. Fortunately, their propaganda formula is less effective in the age of the internet. Unfortunately, they've now identified and addressed this problem by adding censorship to the mix. And it's not just Facebook, YouTube and Twitter.

When my wife and I moved back to Ohio, somebody invited us to join nextdoor.com. Unlike Facebook, where you see things that your friends have posted, nextdoor.com periodically sends an email digest of posts from people who live in and around your neighborhood. Garage sales, lost cats...recently, somebody found a chicken that flew the coop...stuff like that. In 8 years, I've only gone to the site a handful of times to comment. Last week was one of them. The post read: Will you get the COVID vaccine and why?

Clearly, I'm passionate about this topic, so I was one of the first ones to reply. I wrote: "No. You couldn't pay me enough to take a rushed mRNA vaccine for a disease that, in the vast majority of people, has a 99.98% survival rate. (And that's *IF* you catch it. Many seem to already have some form of immunity.) Add in the fact that the vaccine may only reduce symptoms, *not* prevent infection or transmission, and the idea of injecting billions of healthy people seems downright criminal."

So, that was my first post. Let me show some references to back up my claims. All links will be available in the description.

*First, my claim that "the vast majority of people have a

99.98% survival rate” is based on information from the CDC and the UN. Some of you might have seen graphics like this that use CDC data to show the survival rate based on age: <https://www.mediafire.com/view/74pgutm4b7ee8a5/CDC-Survival-rate2.jpg>

However, if you want to confirm this [on the CDC website](#), you’ll notice that the CDC presents their numbers in decimal form, and they focus on the number of people who die instead of the number of people who survive. <https://www.mediafire.com/view/xxhg7luan0ukyuy/CDC-Survival-rate.jpg> No problem. To confirm the survival rate, you only need to do two things: First, convert the CDC’s decimal format to a percent by [moving the decimal point 2 places to the right](#). You now have your infection fatality percentage. Subtract the fatality percent from 100% to see how many people will survive. In this case, 99.997% survive, and in this case 99.98% survive.

For a little more perspective, 99.98% survival rate translates to 1 death in 5,000 *infected* people. I emphasize *infected* because it appears that many people are already immune to this due to exposure to other coronaviruses. It could be that 10,000 need to be exposed for 5,000 to become infected and for 1 of those people die. Bottom line, contrary to what the pharma-funded “experts” and media want you to believe, unless you personally know at least 5,000 people under the age of 50, there’s a good chance you won’t know a single person in that age group who dies from this. How many of the planet’s 7.8 billion people are under the age of 50? According to the UN, about 6 billion.

Here’s that reference. Note that the graph shows figures in thousands, so to get the actual total, you’ll have to add 3 zeros. <https://www.mediafire.com/view/ckdntmilk3mvdca/UN-under-50.jpg>

You can run the query yourself here: <https://population.un.org/wpp/DataQuery/>

Last but not least: Listen for yourself as Fauci admits the vaccine might not prevent infection, but that's OK with him as long as it reduces symptoms. https://youtu.be/xYosU50_E3c

And just for fun, here's the Nobel prize winning biochemist who invented the PCR test, Kary Mullis, giving his thoughts on Tony Fauci. <https://youtu.be/azAeXdIKW3U>

It's a shame Kary died in August of 2019, just before the so-called "pandemic" was announced. I'm sure he'd have had plenty to say about how Fauci and his friends have used the PCR test to "scientifically" create public hysteria.

OK, so when I first replied under the COVID vaccine thread, only a couple other people had posted, and they too responded with an emphatic "No way, I'm not taking it." However, the next day, somebody responded with a yes. Quoting from his post, under the question will you take the vaccine and why, he replied.

"Yes, the vaccine will be fully vetted. It will not be approved if the side effects are worse than the disease. Some people cannot take the vaccine – babies and those with preexisting conditions. By taking the vaccine you are not only protecting yourself but many other people...3000 people are dying every day from Covid-19, that's like a September 11th every day!"

I took my time and replied with the following:

I'm not trying to be confrontational; you have the right to believe what you want, but I disagree with your statements. First, the virus poses no significant risk to the overwhelming majority of the population. Therefore, the overwhelming majority of the population is not "protecting themselves" by taking the vaccine. Rather, they're actually putting themselves at unnecessary risk.

Second, Fauci himself admits that he'll be happy if the

vaccine permits infection, but simply reduces symptoms. That standard does nothing to protect the people who can't take the vaccine.

Third, more than 160,000 people die globally every day (about 60 million per year.) Approximately 25 million of that 60 million is made up of people over 70 years of age. Many of us suspect that they are "harvesting" from that enormous pool of annual deaths to inflate COVID numbers. Excess mortality data (and diminished mortality in areas like the flu), should hopefully tell the story.

Last but not least, there is no way to fully "vet" or account for potential long-term side effects that this vaccine will cause. That could easily take 5 years or more. If the risk / benefit makes sense to you, that is fine. But the idea of coercing healthy people into taking this vaccine (via restrictions on their movement, employment, insurance, or other means), is criminal.

We've already covered the survival rate for 6 billion people, and I've already shown Fauci's statement about whether or not the vaccine will prevent infection, so here's a graph showing total annual deaths at 7.6 per thousand...multiply the 2020 population estimate of 7.8 billion by .76% and divide by 365 to arrive at 160K+ deaths per day. <https://www.mediafire.com/view/ie0vr6cxz7o2ije/UN-Annual-Deaths.jpg/file>

Regarding the typical death count in the 70+ age group, this graph from the UN puts the figure at just over 25 million deaths average per year for those over the age of 70. The period in this graph is from 2015 to 2020, so to confirm, add the figures and then divide by 5 to get the total per year. It, too, is displayed in thousands, so you'll need to add 3 zeros when you're done. <https://www.mediafire.com/view/v22fmjy5vtc0vw1/Deaths-over-70.jpg/file>

Now would be a good time to point out that all of the hysteria, censorship, economic destruction, nationwide lockdowns, curfews, privacy violations and threats of mandatory vaccination have been justified based on the world reaching its normal yearly death count on December 20th 2020, instead of December 31st. And again, that assumes the 1.7 million COVID fatalities they're claiming haven't been harvested mostly from the 25 million deaths that occur every year in the 70+ age group alone.

Moving on:

After posting my reply, I saved what I wrote to my computer, and I also saved the post that I'd replied to, and I'm glad I did. I'm sure you know where this is going. The entire thread was deleted.

The last time I looked at the thread, approximately 15 people had responded. Only 3 had replied "yes, I'm going to take the vaccine" so it was 4 "no's" for every 1 "yes." Just like the first reply that I responded to, the other "yes" replies repeated the standard "messaging" of mainstream news. "We need to trust the science," and "don't listen to conspiracy theories," and "with the vaccine, we'll be able to get back to normal." With that said, I want to expose this idea of media-directed messaging, because it is just another term for scientifically crafted propaganda.

The obvious message, drilled relentlessly into our heads, is that we all face an ominous threat. A threat so great, that it warrants 24 / 7 news coverage and unprecedented governmental intervention. Slightly less obvious is the idea that we're to trust, without question, the corporate-funded, agenda-driven experts that the media puts in front of us. This tiny group of media-approved experts is not superior in any way to the far-larger group of dissenting experts. In fact, you could easily argue that the tiny group is inferior. Because their job, as

Kary Mullis noted, is to say what they're told to say. Their job is to create and maintain the illusion of consensus. If they value their prestigious positions at the WHO, the CDC, the NIH and other institutes, they will not publicly challenge the official narrative. By design, that narrative contains no context that will lead to unwanted conclusions.

In pursuit of "scientific manipulation," society has been trained to accept media propaganda for reality. The screen says there's a new killer mercilessly ravaging the earth, and they believe...they've lost the confidence to turn their back on that screen and, using their own judgement, compare its claims to the reality that they actually live in. If they could just do that, if they could turn away long enough, they'd realize that the world they live in bears no resemblance to the 24-hour fear porn they're subjected to.

Right now, we're at a stage where they want to manipulate you into taking an unproven and inadequately tested vaccine. A vaccine that doesn't even promise to keep you from becoming infected or from infecting others. How can they possibly manage to pull that off? Well, we've already covered that. They intend to manipulate you with a combination of "messaging" and censorship. If want to dig a little deeper, you can read some "messages" that Yale university is testing on the public. I'll cover a few here. Tell me if they sound familiar:

The Guilt message

This message is about "the danger that COVID-19 presents to the health of one's family and community. The best way to protect them is by getting vaccinated and society must work together to get enough people vaccinated. Then it asks the participant to imagine the guilt they will feel if they don't get vaccinated and spread the disease."

Can you count the manipulations in that short paragraph? First, we've already covered that COVID 19 isn't a threat to

the vast majority of human beings, which includes the human beings in your family and community. Second, they claim the best way to protect your family and community is via vaccination. (If out of 10,000 people, 9,990 face no serious risk, then you are only exposing those 9,990 people to *unnecessary* risk. As for the other 10 who may be at risk, it's up to them to decide whether, best case, "reduced symptoms" are a sufficient payoff for taking an unproven mRNA vaccine. Especially when other treatments, buried by the media propaganda and censorship, are available...Finally, as with most propaganda, they threaten exclusion from the circle of "good, smart, brave, proud" people, who did as they were told. You're either with the good guys who are working to get everyone vaccinated, or you'll be relegated to the status of a filthy / guilt-ridden

spreader. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/study/NCT04460703>

Personal freedom message

"COVID-19 is limiting people's personal freedom and by working together to get enough people vaccinated society can preserve its personal freedom." First of all, COVID 19 isn't limiting personal freedom, rather, it's being used as a pretext to limit personal freedom, that's an important distinction. And the idea that vaccination "preserves" freedom is just bizarre. At best, they're saying that you must surrender your freedom to decide for yourself, then, if you do that, maybe they'll give back some of what they've taken. How is that preserving freedom?

I'll just cover one more, but I'll link to the study's page in the description. Here we have the

The "Trust in science" message

"...getting vaccinated against COVID-19 is the most effective way of protecting one's community. Vaccination is backed by science. If one doesn't get vaccinated that means that one doesn't understand how infections are spread or who ignores

science.” Well, you wouldn’t want to ignore “the science!” that our scientific manipulators have chosen to put before us. Pay no mind to the 10’s of thousands of other doctors and scientists who are risking their careers (and of course, being censored), for challenging this insanity.

On that note, let’s wrap this up with a reminder from Robert Kennedy Jr. about the history of those who not only produce these drugs, but fund the only institutions and “experts” that you’re allowed to hear from.

[\[i\]](#) The Scientific Outlook, page 175

[\[ii\]](#) The Impact of Science on Society, page 41

[Truth Comes to Light Editor’s note: Original video is available at [Joe Plummer YouTube channel](#). As a service to protect truth from censorship & to share widely, mirrored copies of this video are available at Truth Comes to Light [BitChute](#), [Brighteon](#), [Lbry/Odysee](#) channels. All credit, along with our sincere thanks, goes to Joe Plummer. Please follow links provided to support his work.]

cover image credit mohamed_hassan / pixabay