

LET MY PEOPLE BREATHE — by Dr. J. Scheidbach (DTS)

1

*Let My People Breathe!*

The Mask Controversy: From Science to Superstition

Surgical and Cloth Masks Don't Work – a review of the science and a return to FREEDOM!

By Jerry Scheidbach, Thg., BA, MA, DTS

(Doctor of Theological Studies)

THE SCIENCE

CHAPTER ONE: *Why is there confusion about this?*

We are told to follow the science. *Some* medical doctors say we must wear masks to stop the spread! Others disagree! Here is a link to one article that cites 49 studies supporting masks as a way to reduce the spread of viruses.<sup>1</sup>

(<https://www.kxan.com/news/coronavirus/do-face-masks-work-here-are-49-scientific-studies-that-explain-why-they-do/>)

But here is another link to research that cites fifty scientific studies that conclude masks "do nothing to prevent the spread of illness."<sup>2</sup>

(<https://www.dailyveracity.com/2021/07/26/over-50-scientific-studies-conclude-masks-do-nothing-to-prevent-the-spread-of-illness-so-why-do-people-keep-claiming-they-work/>)

How can we follow the science if scientists disagree about what the science says?

---

<sup>1</sup> "Do face masks work? Here are 49 scientific studies that explain why they do" Russell Falcon, August 7, 2021, updated September 17, 2021, published by KXAN, an NBC news affiliate. (ONLINE: <https://www.kxan.com/news/coronavirus/do-face-masks-work-here-are-49-scientific-studies-that-explain-why-they-do/>). I have carefully examined every one of these research papers and not one of them proves masks protect the wearer or the community from virions in the size range of SARS-CoV-2, which are 40-140 nanometers in diameter, or droplets that are <300 nanometers, or droplets that are ≥300 nanometers to ≤5 μm sufficiently to protect from infection. See my research notes here that provide an examination of every article used by Falcon to support masks: <https://booksatdbp.com/product/let-my-people-breathe-from-science-to-superstition-behind-a-mask/>. (As of 9/20/22 the pre-print version of this book is available as a pdf for \$1 and includes my research notes. This offer ends with the publication of the eBook.)

<sup>2</sup> Compiled by Daily Veracity Staff, July 26, 2021: <https://www.dailyveracity.com/2021/07/26/over-50-scientific-studies-conclude-masks-do-nothing-to-prevent-the-spread-of-illness-so-why-do-people-keep-claiming-they-work/>

Mr. Anderson, writing for *City Journal*, examined the evidence on both sides and explained: "Medical studies on masking ... fall into one of two categories: observational studies or randomized controlled trials, dubbed RCTs."<sup>3</sup> Mr. Anderson is 100% correct. All of the over 700 studies I examined to research this subject may be characterized as either an RCT or what is called an observational study. What does this mean?

Observational studies include anecdotal evidence—stories about someone's personal experience—or observations based on more or less loosely conducted experiments. Useful to consider whether a claim is worth closer examination, these studies have not been well respected among serious scientists when used to support a scientific assertion. Among the reasons such studies are not respected is how easy it is to massage the results into conformity with prevailing bias, and the great many confounders that provide alternate explanations for the results obtained. Also, it is virtually impossible to replicate these studies and provide consistent outcomes. They depend too heavily upon correlation, and every trained scientist knows mere correlation does not determine causation.

The gold standard for scientific medical research is the Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT). A proper RCT is carefully constructed and conducted with a high degree of professional integrity. A good RCT scrupulously follows the *scientific method*. The RCT is respected because properly conducted research of this kind will minimize confounders, and produce results that can be replicated by anyone else following their methods.

---

<sup>3</sup> Anderson, Jeffery H., *Do Masks Work? A review of the evidence*, *City Journal*, August 11, 2021. [Online: <https://www.city-journal.org/do-masks-work-a-review-of-the-evidence#.YRSMsaJRXXk.twitter>]. Mr. Anderson opened his article by quoting a Tweet from then surgeon general Jerome Adams on February 29, 2020: "Seriously people—STOP BUYING MASKS! They are NOT effective in preventing general public from catching #Coronavirus." This is an excellent article, thoroughly documented, and well written. He observed what I did in my own research: "It is striking how much the CDC, in marshalling [sic] evidence to justify its revised mask guidance, studiously avoids mentioning randomized controlled trials."

So this is the first thing you need to know when trying to find the science you're supposed to follow. Fact: no properly constructed and conducted RCTs support the masks Fauci and friends recommend to protect anyone from transmitting or contracting a viral infection.<sup>4</sup>

CHAPTER TWO: *In Brief—there is zero scientific support for the proposition that a surgical or cloth facemask will protect anyone from viral infection.*

765 scientific research papers and articles were examined in preparation for this publication. More than Each was carefully examined for any science proving the masks recommended by the medical establishment for our use during the pandemic provide protection from viral infection for the wearer or for the community. All of these studies are copied to my archives and available to anyone who is interested. Additionally, I made extensive notes on these articles, and these are available as Supplementary Documentation. All of this is available for download at <https://www.brainmassage.net> find: *Let My People Breathe* Documentation and *Let My People Breathe: Supplement*.

CHAPTER THREE:

*But it seems obvious that a mask would at least help block a virus!*

---

<sup>4</sup> "No RCT study with verified outcome shows a benefit for HCW or community members in households to wearing a mask or respirator. There is no such study. There are no exceptions." Dennis Rancourt, PhD. <https://thewallwillfall.org/2020/06/23/masks-dont-work-a-review-of-science-relevant-to-covid-19-social-policy/> (Beware, some studies purport to be RCTs that are actually a species of observational study. Some are called randomized controlled group studies, and so on. No proper standard Randomized Controlled Trial with verified outcome supports masks as effective public policy for controlling, or curbing, the spread of virus.

It seems obvious that putting a filter over my mouth and nose would at least help—Right? Actually, no! Let's consider the scientifically established facts that are not disputed.

First, let's define some terms and provide a quick study on our issue.

*Mask Efficacy:* In medical terms, *mask efficacy* refers to a mask's ability to block infectious agents, such as disease bearing bacteria or virus particles. We are interested in a mask's protection against virus particles.

*Efficacy* is measured in terms *blockage* and *penetration*. *Blockage* refers to the number of virus particles a mask can capture, or block, and hold in the mask fibers. *Penetration* refers to the number of virus particles that penetrate, or pass through the mask. None of the recommended masks for public use provide blockage adequate to protect from infection by a virus particle. It's exactly what Fauci said at the beginning of all this. A typical surgical mask you buy at the pharmacy cannot protect from a virus. The virus particle is too small and passes through the mask. And that is what the science consistently shows.

*Droplets* refer to the drops of moisture that enclose one or more virion particles and carry them from host to subject. The establishment scientific community has given up any attempt to argue masks can protect the wearer from virus infection. That's because droplets that travel from host to subject are very small, called micro-droplets that are suspended in the air for long periods of time and can penetrate the recommended masks. Lately, establishment scientists have taken a fall back position, arguing that although they are ineffective as PPE (Personal Protective Equipment) they are at least somewhat effective as *source control*. This is because droplets usually begin larger, at sizes a standard surgical mask might be expected to capture with at least 80% efficiency, it is now argued masks can contribute to controlling

spread by capturing the droplet at source. The problem, however, is droplets will begin to evaporate immediately and reduce quickly to a size that penetrates the mask. Also, the accumulation of moisture on the inside of the mask provides a veritable petri dish environment facilitating the collection and growth of potentially infectious bacteria.

Establishment scientists that argue masks are adequate to provide protection for the community do so on the basis of the scientific consensus that surgical and some cloth masks are able to capture particles at the source that are  $\geq 5 \mu\text{m}$  ( $5 \mu\text{m}$ —micrometers—is equal to 5000 nanometers). Since the mask pores of a typical surgical mask are 300 nm (nanometers), it is agreed they are effective at capturing a 5000 nm droplet. However, as mentioned above, these droplets evaporate quickly and reduce in size until they are small enough to be drawn back deep into the lower respiratory tract, or launched into the atmosphere as aerosols. But there is a much larger problem with using masks as source control, and this takes us to a discussion of natural filtration.

*Natural Filtration* refers to the natural system of filtration designed by our Creator that proves to be much more efficient than artificial masks. Later I go into much more detail, but for a quick reference, consider this simple illustration. Protection from viral infections at the source depends on the masks ability to filter droplets that are  $\geq 5 \mu\text{m}$ . It so happens that your nasal passages are proven to be very effective at capturing droplet particles of this size. But your natural filtration is much more efficient. The  $5\mu\text{m}$  particle is captured by your nasal passage and immediately enclosed in mucous. The accumulation creates an irritation that requires the host to blow their nose, or sneeze ejecting the particles. Proper hygiene in sneezing or clearing ones nose is all that is necessary to protect others from being exposed to what is called the *ejecta*. On the other hand, when a  $5\mu\text{m}$  droplet is captured on either side of a

mask, inside or outside, it begins evaporating immediately. Natural respiration draws air over the droplets in inhalation and exhalation, facilitating the evaporation process. These reduce in size over the course of evaporation, which can happen within fractions of a second, reducing the droplet to a size that allows it to not only escape the mask, but also to by pass the wearers natural filtration system and enter into the bronchia. In other words, it turns out that the mask is actually helping the virus by pass our natural filtration system that works much more efficiently than any mask.

That's a quick study. In what follows, I'll show all the science supporting the above assertions and bring even more amazing details about God's amazing filtration system and how it is much superior to man made masks, when it comes to virions.

### *The Issue of Particle Size versus Mask Pores*

SARS-CoV-2 virus particles range from 40-140 nanometers in diameter, most measure at about 120 nanometers.<sup>5</sup> To appreciate what this means, consider that a meter is about 3.5 feet. A millimeter (mm) is one one-thousandths of a meter. A micrometer ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) is one one-thousandths of a millimeter. And a nanometer (nm) is one one-thousandths of a micrometer. You'll often read papers talking about particle droplets that are  $5\mu\text{m}$ , that's 5000 nm, or  $10\mu\text{m}$ , which is 10,000 nanometers. I'll talk about droplets in a moment. Let's begin with virions, or naked particles

The mask's mesh refers to the weave that provides openings that allow you to breathe. In a standard surgical mask that we might buy at a local pharmacy, the mesh has pores (or spaces) that are roughly

---

<sup>5</sup> The US National Library of Medicine—National Institutes of Health (NIH): "Morphometry of SARS-CoV and SARS-CoV-2 particles in ultrathin plastic sections of infected Vero cell cultures." [Online: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7876034/>] This study was conducted at the highest levels of scientific integrity and instrumentality and shows that the median particle size of the virus in question is "about 100 nm" (nm=nanometers) without spike proteins. Hence, the particle size of the coronavirus, including the spike protein, is generally reported to be 120-123 nanometers, which is equivalent to about 0.12 micrometers. Here is another study corroborating that "Influenza virus particles have a size of 80-120 nanometers" [Online: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021967316311335?via%3Dihub>]

300 nanometers:<sup>6</sup> that's almost three times larger than the particle size of a virus. And, by the way, we are talking about the same masks the CDC and Fauci have told us to wear. These are the masks handed to you in hospitals, doctor's offices, airports, and any Federal place of business, like a post office. The openings in these masks are almost three times larger than the virus particle they are trying to block.

*Why do some studies say masks work, and others say they don't?*

The studies that show masks can protect us from infection don't say they block a virus particle. Instead, they talk about droplets (water, moisture) that carry the virus particles into the atmosphere when someone breathes, talks, coughs, or sneezes. You need to watch for this. A few of these studies do discuss the size of the virus particle, but then switch to droplets when showing "proof" the mask provides protection—it's a sort of rhetorical sleight of hand.

This part gets a bit technical, but I'll keep it simple.

*Surely if the mask will catch droplets, that will help at least a little!*

A standard surgical mask might indeed block a droplet, but that does not protect anyone from the virus particle passing through the mask. There are three reasons for this. But before we get into the more technical scientific stuff, I need to explain something about scientific measurement.

Scientific measurements can be confusing, but it's easy if we remember that we are only concerned with relative size. For example, earlier, I showed you that the mesh in a surgical mask provides openings that are 300 nanometers in size, but the virus particle they are supposed to block is only 120 nanometers. We

---

<sup>6</sup> National Institutes of Health (NIH) of "low-cost face masks made from different cloth materials" where the pore sizes ranged from 80 to 500  $\mu\text{m}$  (micrometers), which is 800 to 5000 nanometers. However, a SARS-CoV-2 virus particle is only 123 nanometers. Additionally, these masks degrade quickly: "We found that efficiency dropped by 20% after the 4th washing and drying cycle." (Online: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31289698/>.)

know that 300 is almost three times larger than 120, and that's all we need to see that a virus particle will easily pass through a surgical mask. When you consider that the mesh of a typical cloth mask is roughly 700 nanometers, you begin to get the idea. So, when we talk about size, just pay attention to the relative size differences. I'll break it down to nanometers. That way, we are, as the saying goes, comparing apples with apples!

Now, let's look at the four reasons droplet-size does not change a mask's ability to protect you from getting sick from a virus.

First, not all droplets are the same size. For example, some micro-droplets are 0.01 mm (millimeters), equivalent to 100 nanometers.<sup>7</sup> A mask with a pore size of 300 nanometers cannot efficiently block a micro-droplet that's only 100 nanometers.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS) published an article titled "Physics of virus transmission by speaking droplets."<sup>8</sup> Their study focused on droplets ranging in size from 70 nanometers to droplets greater than 6000 nanometers.<sup>9</sup> A mask with a pore size of 300 nanometers cannot be depended upon to block a droplet that is from 70 to, say, 250 nanometers in size. What about the larger droplets? That takes us to the second reason masks blocking droplets does not protect us.

Second, from a National Institutes of Health (NIH) article on "Respiratory Droplets," we learn that evaporation begins immediately.<sup>10</sup> Of course, it depends on humidity, heat, and wind, but

---

<sup>7</sup> Broom, Douglas, Senior Writer, Formative Content, 14 Apr 2020, *This Japanese experiment shows how easily coronavirus can spread—and what you can do about it.* (Online: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/04/coronavirus-microdroplets-talking-breathing-spread-covid-19/>). This article shows that *microdroplets* are 100 nanometers, but inexplicably argue that a mask with openings that are 300 nanometers can provide effective protection. The World Economic Forum published it. For information about this forum: The World Economic Forum (WEF) was founded by one-world advocate Klaus Schwab, with Bill Gates as an "Agenda Contributor" (Online: <https://canadiantruths.wordpress.com/2020/03/30/covid-19-bill-gates-united-nations-and-world-economic-forum/> and <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/authors/bill-gates/>).

<sup>8</sup> PNAS, "Physics of virus transmission by speaking droplets" Roland R. Netz and William A. Eaton, October 13, 2020, first published September 24, 2020. (<https://www.pnas.org/content/117/41/25209>) See also (Online: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32973098/>)

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. (See also PubMed.gov (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32973098/>))

<sup>10</sup> National Institutes of Health (NIH); "Respiratory Droplets." (Online: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK143281/>) Another study used to support masks was conducted using laser lights to reveal droplets escaping when someone said "Stay Healthy." The

virtually no droplet of the sizes we are talking about will last longer than 1 to 10 seconds. So, what happens to the virus particle when the droplet evaporates?

The quick evaporation of droplets brings us to the third reason masks don't protect you from a virus! The Mayo Clinic published an article titled "Cold and flu viruses: How long can they live outside the body."<sup>11</sup> This study concluded that virus particles could remain infectious "for several hours to days, depending on where their droplets fall."<sup>12</sup>

So, even when a mask captures a larger droplet, two things need to be considered: first, as pointed out above, these droplets evaporate rapidly, and the infectious virus particle may then be easily drawn into the lungs or launched into the atmosphere from the mask.<sup>13</sup> And second, breathing accelerates evaporation of the droplet and can draw the infectious virus particle out of its droplet and into the lungs or expel it into the atmosphere.

Let's summarize what we have learned so far. The studies that support masks as an effective protection from virus depend on observational studies. The few scientific studies that support masks only show that surgical masks, and even homemade masks to a lesser extent, can block droplets. However, first, some droplets are so tiny they easily pass through these masks. Second, droplets begin evaporating immediately, and within 10 seconds or less, the virus particle is released into the atmosphere or left on the mask or

---

study fails to determine how many if any virion particles were present, and could only catch droplets in a size range from 20,000 to 500,000 nanometers, completely ignoring the science showing some infected droplets are microdroplets undetected by their study. Nevertheless, this study incidentally proves that even larger droplets evaporate almost immediately in the atmosphere. (Online: <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMc2007800>)

<sup>11</sup> Mayo Clinic, Prithi K. Tosh, MD, nd, maybe November 10, 2021, viewed 12/11/21. (Online: <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/flu/expert-answers/infectious-disease/faq-20057907>.)

<sup>12</sup> IBID. Mayo Clinic: "Cold and Flu Viruses: How Long Can They Live Outside the Body." (<https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/flu/expert-answers/infectious-disease/faq-20057907>.)

<sup>13</sup> US National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health (NCBI/NIH) *Transmission of COVID-19 virus by droplets and aerosols: A critical review on the unresolved dichotomy*. "Further, there have been several transport phenomena where larger droplets become smaller through evaporation so that such smaller particles are called droplet nuclei." (Online: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7293495/>) & (Online: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7293495/>)

surface where the droplet landed. The virus particle can remain infectious for hours or days. And these infectious virus particles can easily pass through a mask.

Some argue that because the recommended masks *might* catch *some* virus particles, we should recommend everyone wear them. How many virus particles does it take to infect? One! It's something called IAH, or Independent Action Hypothesis. It says, in effect, that it only takes on active virus particle to communicate infection. And the point is if a mask blocked 80% of a hundred thousand virions, and only 20 thousand escaped capture — any one of those virions can communicate infection. Not one of the recommended surgical or cloth masks provide anything near that level of protection. Masks are not protecting you, or others, from infection from a virus.

In the footnote below,<sup>14</sup> I refer you to a study titled *Masks Are Neither Effective Nor Safe: A Summary of the Science*, which provides

---

<sup>14</sup> *Masks Are Neither Effective Nor Safe: A Summary of the Science* (<https://www.technocracy.news/masks-are-neither-effective-nor-safe-a-summary-of-the-science/>), offers the following documentation showing the ineffectiveness and dangers of masks as a public strategy to mitigate a virus pandemic: (42 citations). (NOTE: Presented as found except where docs were partial I searched for full text, noted, and discovered 4 duplicated articles, 1 retracted, 1 foreign language article, and one accessible with subscription only.)

1. T Jefferson, M Jones, et al. Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. MedRxiv. 2020 April 7. <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.30.20047217v2>
2. J Xiao, E Shiu, et al. Nonpharmaceutical measures for pandemic influenza in non-healthcare settings – personal protective and environmental measures. Centers for Disease Control. 26(5); 2020 May. [https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/5/19-0994\\_article](https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/5/19-0994_article)
3. J Brainard, N Jones, et al. Facemasks and similar barriers to prevent respiratory illness such as COVID19: A rapid systematic review. MedRxiv. 2020 April 1. <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.01.20049528v1.full.pdf>
4. L Radonovich M Simberkoff, et al. N95 respirators vs. medical masks for preventing influenza among health care personnel: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA. 2019 September 3. 322(9): 824-833. <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2749214>
5. J Smith, C MacDougall. CMAJ. 2016 May 17. 188(8); 567-574. *Effectiveness of N95 Respirators* <https://www.cmaj.ca/content/188/8/567>
6. F bin-Reza, V Lopez, et al. The use of masks and respirators to prevent influenza transmission: a systematic review of the scientific evidence. 2012 Jul; 6(4): 257-267. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5779801/>
7. J Jacobs, S Ohde, et al. Use of surgical face masks to reduce the incidence of the common cold among health care workers in Japan: a randomized controlled trial. Am J Infect Control. 2009 Jun; 37(5): 417-419. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19216002/>
8. M Viola, B Peterson, et al. Face coverings, aerosol dispersion and mitigation of virus transmission risk. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.10720>, <https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/2005/2005.10720.pdf>
9. S Grinshpun, H Haruta, et al. Performance of an N95 filtering facepiece particular respirator and a surgical mask during human breathing: two pathways for particle penetration. J Occup Env Hygiene. 2009; 6(10):593-603. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/15459620903120086>
10. H Jung, J Kim, et al. Comparison of filtration efficiency and pressure drop in anti-yellow sand masks, quarantine masks, medical masks, general masks, and handkerchiefs. Aerosol Air Qual Res. 2013 Jun. 14:991-1002. <https://aaqr.org/articles/aaqr-13-06-0a-0201.pdf>

- 
11. C MacIntyre, H Seale, et al. A cluster randomized trial of cloth masks compared with medical masks in healthcare workers. *BMJ Open*. 2015; 5(4) <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/5/4/e006577.long>
  12. N 9 5 m a s k s explained. <https://www.honeywell.com/us/en/news/2020/03/n95-masks-explained>
  13. V Ofsteddu, C Yung, et al. Effectiveness of masks and respirators against infections in healthcare workers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Inf Dis*. 65(11), 2017 December 1; 1934-1942. <https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/65/11/1934/4068747>
  14. C MacIntyre, Q Wang, et al. A cluster randomized clinical trial comparing fit-tested and non-fit-tested N95 respirators to medical masks to prevent respiratory virus infection in health care workers. *Influenza J*. 2010 December 3. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21477136/> (This link was updated 4/26/22)
  15. M Walker Study casts doubt on N95 masks for the public. *MedPage Today*. 2020 May 20. <https://www.medpagetoday.com/infectiousdisease/publichealth/86601>
  16. DUPLICATE from No. 14. C MacIntyre, Q Wang, et al. A cluster randomized clinical trial comparing fit-tested and non-fit-tested N95 respirators to medical masks to prevent respiratory virus infection in health care workers. *Influenza J*. 2010 December 3. IBID see No. 14. This is a repeat of an earlier entry.
  17. N Shimasaki, A Okaue, et al. Comparison of the filter efficiency of medical nonwoven fabrics against three different microbe aerosols. *Biocontrol Sci*. 2018; 23(2). 61-69. [https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/bio/23/2/23\\_61/\\_pdf-char/en](https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/bio/23/2/23_61/_pdf-char/en)
  18. T Tunevall. Postoperative wound infections and surgical face masks: A controlled study. *World J Surg*. 1991 May; 15: 383-387. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2FBF01658736>
  19. N Orr. Is a mask necessary in the operating theatre? *Ann Royal Coll Surg Eng* 1981; 63: 390-392. [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2493952/pdf/annrcse015\\_09-0009.pdf](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2493952/pdf/annrcse015_09-0009.pdf)
  20. N Mitchell, S Hunt. Surgical face masks in modern operating rooms – a costly and unnecessary ritual? *J Hosp Infection*. 18(3); 1991 July 1. 239-242. [https://www.journalofhospitalinfection.com/article/0195-6701\(91\)90148-2/pdf](https://www.journalofhospitalinfection.com/article/0195-6701(91)90148-2/pdf) (This article is only available to paid subscribers. The cost is \$540.00 for 12-month access. I elected not to subscribe and so do not have a hardcopy pdf version of the article.)
  21. C DaZhou, P Sivathondan, et al. Unmasking the surgeons: the evidence base behind using facemasks in surgery. *JR Soc Med*. 2015 Jun; 108(6): 223-228. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4480558/>
  22. L Brosseau, M Sietsema. Commentary: Masks for all for Covid-19 not based on sound data. *U Minn Ctr Inf Dis Res Pol*. 2020 Apr 1. <https://www.cidrap.umn.edu/news-perspective/2020/04/commentary-masks-all-covid-19-not-based-sound-data>
  23. N Leung, D Chu, et al. Respiratory virus shedding in exhaled breath and efficacy of face masks *Nature Research*. 2020 Mar 7. 26,676-680 (2020). <https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-16836/v1>
  24. S Rengasamy, B Eimer, et al. Simple respiratory protection –evaluation of the filtration performance of cloth masks and common fabric materials against 20-1000 nm size particles. *Ann Occup Hyg*. 2010 Oct; 54(7): 789-798. <https://academic.oup.com/annweh/article/54/7/789/202744>
  25. S Bae, M Kim, et al. Effectiveness of surgical and cotton masks in blocking SARS-CoV-2: A controlled comparison in 4 patients. *Ann Int Med*. 2020 April 6. <https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/M20-1342>
  26. DUPLICATE: see No. 24. S Rengasamy, B Eimer, et al. Simple respiratory protection – evaluation of the filtration performance of cloth masks and common fabric materials against 20-1000 nm size particles. *Ann Occup Hyg*. 2010 Oct; 54(7): 789-798. <https://academic.oup.com/annweh/article/54/7/789/202744>
  27. DUPLICATE: See No. 14, 16 C MacIntyre, H Seale, et al. A cluster randomized trial of cloth masks compared with medical masks in healthcare workers. *BMJ Open*. 2015; 5(4) <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/5/4/e006577.long>
  28. W Kellogg. An experimental study of the efficacy of gauze face masks. *Am J Pub Health*. 1920. 34-42. <https://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/pdf/10.2105/AJPH.10.1.34>
  29. M Klompas, C Morris, et al. Universal masking in hospitals in the Covid-19 era. *N Eng J Med*. 2020; 382 e63. <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMp2006372>
  30. E Person, C Lemerrier et al. Effect of a surgical mask on six minute walking distance. *Rev Mal Respir*. 2018 Mar; 35(3):264-268. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29395560/>
  31. B Chandrasekaran, S Fernandes. Exercise with facemask; are we handling a devil's sword – a physiological hypothesis. *Med Hypothese [sic]*. 2020 June 22. 144:110002. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32590322/> (Abstract Only)
  32. P Shuang Ye Tong, A Sugam Kale, et al. Respiratory consequences of N95-type mask usage in pregnant healthcare workers – A controlled clinical study. *Antimicrob Resist Infect Control*. 2015 Nov 16; 4:48. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26579222/>
  33. T Kao, K Huang, et al. The physiological impact of wearing an N95 mask during hemodialysis as a precaution against SARS in patients with end-stage renal disease. *J Formos Med Assoc*. 2004 Aug; 103(8):624-628. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15340662/>
  34. F Blachere, W Lindsley et al. Assessment of influenza virus exposure and recovery from contaminated surgical masks and N95 respirators. *JViro Methods*. 2018 Oct; 260:98-106. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6482848/> (Full Text)
  35. A Rule, O Apau, et al. Healthcare personnel exposure in an emergency department during influenza season. *PLoS One*. 2018 Aug 31; 13(8): e0203223. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6118374/> (Full Text)
  36. DUPLICATE: see 34 F Blachere, W Lindsley et al. Assessment of influenza virus exposure and recovery from contaminated surgical masks and N95 respirators. *JViro Methods*. 2018 Oct; 260:98-106. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6482848/>
  37. A Chughtai, S Stelzer-Braid, et al. Contamination by respiratory viruses on our surface of medical masks used by hospital healthcare workers. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2019 June 3; 19(1): 491. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6547584/> (Full Text)
  38. L Zhiqing, C Yongyun, et al. *J Orthop Translat*. 2018 Jun 27; 14:57-62. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30035033/>

a list of more than thirty studies addressing whether masks are effective and safe. (I offer my observations from analysis of these studies in chapter three under DOCUMENTATION.)

So that's the science! To summarize: the only studies that show support for masks are based on observational science. Scientists don't put much confidence in these sorts of studies. Scientists will tell you Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) are the gold standard of scientific research. Every properly conducted RCT shows that masks are not an effective way to stop the spread of something so small as a virus. Just like Fauci said in an email: "The typical mask you buy in the drug store is not really effective in keeping out virus, which is small enough to pass through the material."<sup>15</sup>

I should point out that reputable medical doctors warn that wearing masks, especially for extended periods, can be harmful.

CHAPTER FOUR: Reasons we cannot trust the current government medical establishment

What is the government medical establishment?

I'll explain why I believe we cannot trust the medical establishment. But first, I need to define what I mean by *government medical establishment*. I am talking about those employed in our government health departments. Of course, I can't know if every government-employed medical professional is untrustworthy. But the leadership knows the information I presented in chapter one, so they are certainly accountable, and those down the chain of command are either too fearful of speaking out or accept without

---

39. DUPLICATE: See 14, 16 C MacIntyre, H Seale, et al. A cluster randomized trial of cloth masks compared with medical masks in healthcare workers. *BMJ Open*. 2015; 5(4) <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/5/4/e006577>

40. A Beder, U Buyukkocak, et al. Preliminary report on surgical mask induced deoxygenation during major surgery. *Neurocirugia*. 2008; 19: 121-126. <http://scielo.isciii.es/pdf/neuro/v19n2/3.pdf>

41. D Lukashev, B Klebanov, et al. Cutting edge: Hypoxia-inducible factor 1-alpha and its activation inducible short isoform negatively regulate functions of CD4+ and CD8+ T lymphocytes. *J Immunol*. 2006 October 15; 177(8) 4962-4965. <https://www.jimmunol.org/content/177/8/4962>

42. A Sant, A McMichael. Revealing the role of CD4+ T-cells in viral immunity. *J Exper Med*. 2012 June 30; 209(8):1391-1395. <https://europepmc.org/article/PMC/3420330>

<sup>15</sup> <https://nationalfile.com/fauci-told-former-obama-admin-official-in-a-private-email-dont-wear-a-mask/>

question the official position dictated to them by government "experts."

Fauci is presently at the head of the medical establishment. He is the highest-paid bureaucrat in the American government (400k+ p/y). Many claim his power and influence exceed that of the President.<sup>16</sup>

The medical establishment also includes all private medical contractors connected to the government through grants or subsidies or whose employment/income is received substantially from the government.

A second tier of what I call the *medical establishment* includes all medical persons who habitually depend on the government for guidance in their medical practice. Frankly, much of this arises from laziness on the part of doctors overwhelmed by the intensity of their professions. There is a sort of invisible hierarchy in the medical profession, with Fauci at the top and the FDA and CDC serving as supports, combining government influence with scientific "authority." The CDC is a US government-funded agency that receives massive additional funding from Gates and pharmaceutical companies, raising concerns about a conflict of interest.

Virtually all of the push for masking comes from this medical establishment under the direction of Fauci.

*Why can't we trust the medical establishment today?*

In today's politically charged environment, there is good reason to be concerned the medical establishment is not acting in the interests of the American people, or even in the interests of the science of medicine, but instead, promoting some other agenda. Here is the evidence.

---

<sup>16</sup> Even Biden recently joked that Fauci is the real POTUS: New York Post, Steve Nelson, December 2, 2021; see <https://nypost.com/2021/12/02/biden-jokes-fauci-is-real-president-as-he-shares-covid-plan/>

Not one western medical professional recommended masks as public policy for controlling the spread of a virus before the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak. None! Not even Mr. Fauci.

As late as February 2020, in an email addressed to Obama's former Health and Human Services Secretary, Sylvia Bruwell, Fauci recommended against wearing a mask, writing, "The typical mask you buy in the drug store is not really effective in keeping out virus, which is small enough to pass through the material."<sup>17</sup> It's the reason every box of masks you buy has a disclaimer. Here is one example: "Masks are not designed or intended to prevent, mitigate, treat, diagnose or cure any disease or health condition, including COVID-19/Coronavirus."<sup>18</sup> According to Webster's Dictionary of the English Language, to mitigate means to "make less severe, intense, harsh, rigorous, painful," etc. Yet, the CDC, the WHO, and Fauci have repeatedly declared masks help mitigate the spread of COVID-19.<sup>19</sup> Why would Fauci say masks don't work in February of 2020, and a few months later start insisting everyone wear them?

At the beginning of the outbreak, Fauci scoffed at the suggestion that Americans would be wearing masks.<sup>20</sup> After he changed his

---

<sup>17</sup> <https://nationalfile.com/fauci-told-former-obama-admin-official-in-a-private-email-dont-wear-a-mask/> Here is the full text of Dr. Fauci's email referenced in this article: "Sylvia: Masks are really for infected people to prevent them from spreading infection to people who are not infected rather than protecting uninfected people from acquiring infection. The typical mask you buy in the drug store is not really effective in keeping out virus, which is small enough to pass through the material. It might, however, provide some slight benefit in keep [sic] out gross droplets if someone coughs or sneezes on you. I do not recommend that you wear a mask, particularly since you are going to a very low risk location. Your instincts are correct, money is best spent on medical countermeasures such as diagnostics and vaccines. Safe travels."

<sup>18</sup> <https://teepublic.zendesk.com/hc/en-us/articles/360047284753-Masks-Legal-Disclaimer-for-Customers> Note: the N95 is the only mask rated to help block a particle as small as a virion (a complete infective form of a virus particle), but CDC expressly recommends against its use by the general public: see <https://www.canopusgroup.us/pages/disclaimer-for-face-mask-n95>. The reason is 1. These need to be fitted professionally to provide the protection they offer, and 2. Medical professionals need these masks, and there is concern about general use creating a shortage.

<sup>19</sup> See CDC publication titled "Mitigation measures for COVID-19 in households and markets in non-US low-resource settings." July 7, 2021. See <https://nypost.com/2021/12/02/biden-jokes-fauci-is-real-president-as-he-shares-covid-plan/>. NOTE: "Key points: To protect themselves and those around them from the spread of COVID-19 in densely populated neighborhoods and market settings, individuals can use personal controls such as **masking**, physical distancing, and ensuring proper ventilation." (Bold added for emphasis.) The mask manufacturers flatly contradict CDC, Fauci, et al.

<sup>20</sup> On April 2, 2020, US Surgeon General Jerome Adams warned that wearing masks could "actually increase a person's risk of contracting COVID-19." Earlier, on February 29, Vice President Mike Pence said the "average American" does not need to buy a mask to protect from the virus. Fauci "warned against wearing face masks for the coronavirus" (Online: <https://www.businessinsider.com/americans-dont-need-masks-pence-says-as-demand-increases-2020-2> and <https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/fauci-says-he-doesnt-regret-telling-americans-not-to-wear-masks-at-the-beginning-of-the-pandemic/ar-BB16P84e>). When asked why they changed their mind, the official explanation was at that time they did not realize

mind about the value of masks to protect from a virus, the establishment media allowed him to explain. In his explanation, he admitted they are "largely symbolic."<sup>21</sup> Maybe that's why we have so many images of Fauci, and other leaders unmasked in public and around others. Rules for thee, but not for me?

Those telling us to wear the masks get irritated when we ask why they don't. San Francisco's Mayor, London Breed, attended a nightclub unmasked. When challenged, she said, "We don't need fun police to come in and micromanage and tell us what we should or shouldn't be doing."<sup>22</sup> I think many of us agree with the Mayor. But the point is her actions say she does not believe masks protect against the spread of a virus. Indeed, from what we see, none of these people insisting we wear masks are afraid to go about in public without them. They don't believe their own hype! And more to our immediate point, we have no reason to trust them?

Yet, according to Fauci, to attack (question) him is to question *science* itself.<sup>23</sup> Fauci said that to Senator Paul, and it's only slightly more bizarre than it is revealing. Science is the accumulation of knowledge based on conclusions derived from observations

---

how long the disease was latent—the time between contagion and the manifestation of symptoms—when patients are asymptomatic. However, as early as January 2020, alarms about asymptomatic spread were raised: "People showing no symptoms appear to be able to spread the novel coronavirus" (Scientific American, *Study Reports First Case of Coronavirus Spread by Asymptomatic Person*, by Andrew Joseph, January 31, 2020 — Online: <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/study-reports-first-case-of-coronavirus-spread-by-asymptomatic-person/>. (February 4, 2020, Scientific American added an Editor's Note explaining that this story was based on faulty information. However, the faulty information was not that asymptomatic spread was not a concern. See <https://www.statnews.com/2020/02/04/high-profile-report-on-asymptomatic-spread-of-coronavirus-based-on-faulty-information-health-officials-say/>.) Warnings about "GHOST CARRIERS" were circulating publicly during the period these professionals were telling Americans they did not need to wear masks (Online: <https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/11281433/asymptomatic-coronavirus-without-symptoms/>). Another reason Fauci and friends gave for warning the general public of the dangers of using a mask for protection against a virus and advising the general public not to "buy a mask" was to protect the supply. Of course, this means they were lying to the public to manipulate them. According to their present position on masks, they were knowingly advancing a policy that threatened public health.

<sup>21</sup> Cape Charles Mirror, Fauci says Masks largely symbolic, 2nd wave of corona may not happen, by Wayne Creed, May 31, 2020.

<sup>22</sup> <https://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2021/09/20/san-francisco-mayor-london-breed-defends-criticism-after-video-dancing-maskless-night-club/> (the hypocrisy of the "elites" is a clear proof they know the masks are useless).

<sup>23</sup> When Rand Paul challenged Fauci over his flip-flopping messaging about mandates, "including mask-wearing," Fauci retaliated by claiming he represents science. So to attack him is to attack science. See <https://news.yahoo.com/rand-paul-blasts-fauci-apos-194202690.html>, Yahoo News, Peter Aitken, Jon Brown, November 28, 2021, "Rand Paul blasts Fauci: 'Astounding and alarming' to declare 'I represent science.'" For Fauci's attempt to explain his surprising declaration, see also <https://usclocknews.com/politics/rand-paul-slams-fauci-astounding-to-hear-him-declare-i-represent-science/> said that to attack him is to attack *science*. See <https://nypost.com/2021/06/21/fauci-attacks-on-him-are-actually-criticizing-science/>, New York Post, Lee Brown, June 21, 2021.

tested through carefully controlled experiments. These experiments must be made public and verifiable by any who replicates the experiment. *Science* is not the mere statement of a scientist.

For example, the following is not a *scientific* statement: "As SARS-CoV-2 continues its global spread, it's *possible* that one of the pillars of Covid-19 pandemic control — universal facial masking — *might* help reduce the severity of disease and ensure that a greater proportion of new infections are asymptomatic."<sup>24</sup> (Italics added for emphasis.) Such a statement is an opinion that perhaps reflects the views of some scientists. But such *declarations*, even when made by scientists, are not by themselves *science*. Scientists are human and susceptible to bias, blackmail, bullying and other motivations to make assertions that are not supported by *science*.

Here is another dramatic example of political bias in the medical establishment. The World Health Organization (WHO) admitted they discouraged using Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) to treat COVID

---

<sup>24</sup> The New England Journal of Medicine, Perspective, October 29, 2020, *Facial Masking for Covid-19 — Potential for "Variolation" as We Await a Vaccine*, Monica Gahnhni, MD, MPH, and George W. Rutherford, MD (Online: <https://www.nejm.org/doi/pdf/10.1056/NEJMp2026913?listPDF=true>) 4/15/21 (Read through this entire article and note the use of such expressions as the following: "If this hypothesis is borne out," "masking seemed to be a possible way," "suggested ... a strong relationship between public masking and pandemic control," "facial masking *may* also reduce ... ," and "The possibility is consistent with a long-standing *theory* of viral pathogenesis," "If the viral inoculum (—volume of virions present, ed.) matters ... an additional *hypothesized* reason ... ," "masking *might* reduce the (—volume of virions, ed.) that an exposed person inhales," and "might contribute," and "if this theory bears out," and the idea that if something *could* and *might* reduce infection and transmission it should therefore be tried is very short sighted. No consideration is given to the number of deaths by suicide arising from despair caused by the lockdowns, which are associated with the masking strategy, together with the sometimes severe reactions of some vulnerable persons to wearing masks for extended periods, such as is addressed in the respected Journal of Primary Care & Community Health article titled, The Effects of the Face Mask on the Skin Underneath: A Prospective Survey During the COVID-19 Pandemic, first published October 21, 2020, authors and contributors are identified by initials only. Also, notice the more positive claims: "Past evidence ... can also protect the wearer ... by blocking viral particles from entering the nose and mouth" and follow up by reading the supporting documentation, which turns out to be another opinion piece written by the primary contributor to this article, Gandhi M. with Beyrer C and Goosby E. published in J. Gen Intern Med 2020 July 31 (Epub ahead of print). These doctors turned to Asian studies unsupported in Western medicine until Covid-19, which we now know originated in Wuhan, China. The CCP is highly interested in controlling information about this virus and is the chief influence presently dominating our establishment medical community. A study involving hamsters used to model simulated masking offered some hopeful results. Unfortunately, this study is not referenced. And then there are the statements that are challenged by more current data: "asymptomatic infection rates are reported to be higher than 80% in settings with universal facial masking," followed by "Countries that have adopted population-wide masking have fared better ..." are challenged by more up to date data that informs us States that have removed lockdowns and mandated masking are faring much better than those that continue those extreme mitigation strategies. All observations that depend on asymptomatic infectious rates as proof only support the more broad truth that this disease was simply not as lethal as was first believed or reported.)

patients based on a fake study published in the *Lancet*.<sup>25</sup> The scandal has gotten so little exposure in the EM (Establishment Media, aka, Main Stream Media) that some don't know the study was proven to be fake science. The *Lancet* website retracted the article and rebuked its author. Keep in mind that this study provided the authority of *science* to prohibit the use of HCQ as early COVID-19 treatment with the quiet acquiescence of Fauci. I can't find that Fauci has ever acknowledged the study was not authentic but debunked as fake. Nor can I find that he has retracted his negative statements against the use of HCQ. How can we trust such dishonest people?

The one mask that can help block something as small as a virus particle is the N95. But that's the mask Fauci and the CDC repeatedly say we should not to use. The establishment medical professionals don't recommend the N95 because while they are rated to block about 95% of particles as small as 100 nanometers, they don't work unless carefully fitted. Then the seal is easily compromised, which requires refitting. Additionally, no one recommends wearing these masks for more than two hours. Many medical professionals can't tolerate them for more than thirty minutes to an hour.

That leaves us with your typical *surgeon's* mask or cloth masks. We've discussed these above: the science does not support using these masks to protect from a virus particle.

Fauci, the CDC, the FDA, and the WHO are aware of the above information. We already read Fauci's email betraying his knowledge of this long before the pandemic. What about the CDC?

A May 2020 study published by the CDC concluded: "In our systematic review, we identified 10 RCTs [Randomized Controlled Trials] that reported estimates of the effectiveness of face masks in

---

<sup>25</sup> Yahoo News, June 4, 2020 (Online: <https://in.news.yahoo.com/controversial-lancet-study-linking-hcq-063453924.html> — printed — 4/15/21) See also <https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736%2820%2931180-6/fulltext>, where you can read the faked report and see that Lancet RETRACTED the entire article.

reducing laboratory-confirmed influenza virus infections in the community from literature published during 1946-July 27, 2018. In pooled analysis, we found NO SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION IN INFLUENZA TRANSMISSION WITH THE USE OF FACE MASKS."<sup>26</sup> In other words, the CDC looked for any RCT research that supported using masks and couldn't find any. The reason is that flu (or influenza) virus particles are between 80 and 120 nanometers. The openings in a surgical mask are 300 nanometers. The typical cloth masks have openings that are about 700.<sup>27</sup> By the way, remember the virus causing COVID is 120 nanometers. Do the math!

So what accounts for the dramatic change in the *opinions* of *some* medical professionals? Whatever agenda the medical establishment is pushing, it's not about science, and it's not about health. And at this point, we cannot trust them.

## CHAPTER FIVE: THE DOCUMENTATION

*What do we find in the studies that show masks do not work?*

Many experiments have been done to determine whether or not masks effectively protect wearers from the transmission or contagion of diseases caused by a virus. The best method used is called Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs). I provide access to several of these studies in the links listed in footnote no. 12. Study these and the other documentation I provide, and you will notice the following:

---

<sup>26</sup> [https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/5/19-0994\\_article](https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/26/5/19-0994_article) Note: This article explains that "Disposable medical masks (also known as surgical masks) are loose-fitting devices that were designed to be worn by medical personnel to protect [against] accidental contamination of patient wounds, and to protect the wearer against splashes or sprays of bodily fluids."

<sup>27</sup> [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258525804\\_Testing\\_the\\_Efficacy\\_of\\_Homemade\\_Masks\\_Would\\_They\\_Protect\\_in\\_an\\_Influenza\\_Pandemic](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258525804_Testing_the_Efficacy_of_Homemade_Masks_Would_They_Protect_in_an_Influenza_Pandemic) Note: This study purports to help readers determine what is the best mask to wear to protect against an influenza pandemic: "Testing the Efficacy of Homemade Masks: Would They Protect in an Influenza Pandemic." It was prepared in 2013, before the COVID pandemic. The study stipulates it tested for microorganisms from 0.95-1.25  $\mu\text{m}$ , or micrometers. One micrometer is 1000 nanometers. They also tested for Bacteriophage MS2, which is 23 nanometers. [CHECK — need to finish research on the effect of bacteriophage and masks, did this study conclude masks blocked these 23 nm particles???

First, the only masks that provide protection are the masks all professionals are telling the public not to wear—the N95.<sup>28</sup>

Second, you will find that surgical masks do not provide an effective barrier to virus infection. Much is said about droplets. But as you research, you'll see that the virus carried in the droplet easily escapes through the mask as the droplet evaporates, which occurs within seconds.

Third, you will discover that cloth masks are virtually worthless for protection, but, according to some "scientists," they are helpful for two things. 1. They provide emotional security to the wearer and the frightened public. And 2. They remind people that there is a pandemic and heightened awareness encourages carefulness in other ways: washing hands, social distancing, etc. In other words, they are useful for manipulating the public and promoting fear.

Fourth, when you compare pre-COVID, COVID, and post-COVID studies, you will find that the science in all the RCTs is virtually the same. By *the science*, I mean the methods used and documented test results achieved. However, a change occurs in the recommendations and conclusions of the scientists.

Before COVID-19, no Western scientist concluded in favor of masks as public policy. During the early stages of the COVID outbreak, scientists concluded similarly. **[I need to cull out some samples.]**

But a change occurred a few months into the declared pandemic. The science did not change, but scientists' conclusions started changing. First, I noticed statements like masks *could* help, *might* help, and they *possibly provide some mitigation value*, and so on began to appear. Then, as Fauci and others began insisting on masks and politicians started calling for mask mandates, scientists began

---

<sup>28</sup> Eyewitness News, ABC, *CDC does not recommend general public wear N95's, here's why*, by TJ Parker, January 28, 2021 (Online: <https://abc7ny.com/n95-mask-cdc-recommendation-dr-rochelle-walensky-what-type-of-is-the-best/10092451/>)

including in their summaries remarks such as *masks are required by...*, and *CDC says*, and so on.

Finally, RCT studies that showed no appreciable change in the methods or results of the tests were nonetheless concluded by firm recommendations for their use as public policy. In addition, some studies cited CCP scientists and their studies that have long favored masks. In other words, on the question of the efficacy of masks as public policy to control the spread of a virus, there is a discernible transition from traditional Western medical science recommending against masks toward Eastern medical science that favors them. Particularly troubling is the shift toward reliance upon the studies created by CCP (Chinese Communist Party) controlled medicine. Science in a free society is practiced very differently than in controlled communities, like the Chinese under the CCP.<sup>29</sup>

I should point out that more recently, it has become popular to cite *observational studies* to show scientific support for masks. However, observational studies are considered inadequate and serious scientists disregard them.

*What about the study that showed masks can block particles as small as 50 nanometers in size?*

In Footnote No. 1, I offered links to 49 studies used to support wearing masks as public policy to control the spread of a virus.

Let's look at one study that suggests masks can block particles as small as 50 nanometers. As I pointed out already, none of the studies in this set is a valid RCT. This study is not an exception. However, superficially read, some might think this study proves masks work.<sup>30</sup> It's a study published by the reputable JAMA and so the first question is, why wouldn't Fauci, et al, be pushing this study front

---

<sup>29</sup> <https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/group-of-doctors-masks-are-completely-irrelevant-to-blocking-covid-19>

<sup>30</sup> <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamainternalmedicine/article-abstract/2774266>

and center in this debate? It turns out, there is a very good reason for this.

The study interested me because it tested for particles as small as 50 nanometers and insinuates surgical masks provide some appreciable protection if "simple modifications" are used. However, a close reading reveals that they achieved their results using special electret filter media (electrostatic charge), as opposed to material designed to protect against aerodynamic, or free floating particles, such as the common surgical and cloth mask we are counseled to wear. According to this study, these "nonelectret filter media" masks are penetrated by particles as large as 200 to 300 nanometers. So, a study purporting to prove masks are effective to protect against virus infection actually proves the masks we are told to wear do not work. You have to read these studies carefully and pay attention.

The researchers stipulated other limitations that virtually disqualify this study from being useful in this debate. For example, they used only one test subject and the masks tested were very carefully fitted to that subject's face. The wide variation in facial structure makes this study virtually meaningless of any practical value with regard to the question whether masks should be mandated for prevention against virus for the general public.

Additionally, the threshold of protection considered significant is above 80% filtration. To attain this required mask modifications that are totally impractical for general public use, and unsustainable.

Finally, the researchers did not present this as an RCT, but rather as a *comparative study*. In other words, it's an "observational study," betraying the fact that all their pains notwithstanding, at the end of the day, this was not what most scientists would call *science*, which probably explains why it's not being touted by Fauci, et al.

*What to look for in the studies claiming masks work!*

I do not need to provide here the close examination used above for each of the 49 studies. But I will provide some guidance for you as you work through each of these studies. I identified five criteria by which each study was evaluated. They are as follows:

Observational Study versus RCT: We have already shown that the gold standard in scientific research is the Randomized Controlled Trial, and that observational studies are not taken seriously except as exploratory research to help scientists decide whether further research is warranted. No firm scientific conclusion should ever be premised upon an observational study alone. You can legitimately dismiss any study that is observational only. That one criteria literally dismisses all the studies presented in this group (See footnote no. 1).

CCP bias: it has long been known the Chinese Communist Party exerts inappropriate government control over every aspect of life in China, including the practice of medicine. The science (RCT) does not support masks as an effective mitigation against the spread of a virus, nevertheless, the CCP controlled medical establishment in China supports their use. I think it is a mix of government interference and cultural adaptation. But CCP bias evident in a study is a legitimate reason to call it into question. (Note, not *Chinese* influence. There are many very reputable and knowledgeable Chinese scientists. Sadly, while not all, many Chinese scientists trained and working in the USA are unduly influenced by the top-down controlled society imposed on China by the Chinese Communist Party

Scientism: when a scientist makes a flat statement supporting a conclusion the authority for which is not any valid scientific experiment but only the fact that he is a scientist. I already mentioned the bizarre moment Fauci stated that to attack (question) him was an attack on *science*. This attitude is not only a display of gross arrogance, it's very dangerous to allow a sort of elite

caste system to develop in any field, but especially in a field that depends entirely on empirical evidence as it's mainstay.

Post COVID versus Pre COVID: I noticed that a flurry of studies attempting to support masks have been produced *post-COVID*. This does not alone disqualify the study, but I noted it as interesting since the results of these post-COVID studies begin contradicting Western scientific consensus based on all studies conducted before COVID. Therefore, I looked closely at post-COVID studies purporting to prove Western science had been wrong about masks for many decades.

Droplets versus virus particles: studies that talk about particle size but switch to discussing droplet size raise questions. Invariably, these studies do not address the issue of near immediate evaporation. To get that information, you must cross reference to other studies. This seems disingenuous to me. I think any study based on a masks ability to capture droplets should mention the fact that droplets evaporate very quickly and discuss what happens to the virus particle when as the droplet disappears.

Specious argument: this is a somewhat subjective criterion of evaluation. By specious argument I mean the many instances I believe the researchers are purposely attempting to fool the average non-scientific reader.

Equivocal conclusions: I noticed that in early post-COVID studies, the conclusions were presented in equivocal language, but as we got deeper into the pandemic, the scientists became more forceful in their recommendations for using masks. Nevertheless, I noticed that within the study, scientists have a difficulty breaking from their training, and will consistently use language such as *maybe, might, could, perhaps*, and other qualifying language. An empirical study that establishes facts will not present those facts with such language. An example would be the size of virus particles. They don't bother with language indicating the fact that the conclusion a COVID

particle is 125 nanometers is an approximation because it is an empirically established approximation. Therefore, they are comfortable stipulating 125 nanometers as the size. What this means is that when scientists use equivocating language, they are saying the science is uncertain.

I offer an appendix START HERE

Fifth, as you read through the RCTs in the link I provide (see footnote 12), you will know why faith in our medical establishment is broken in America. You will understand why medical professionals, such as those associated with America's Frontline Doctors, are growing increasingly concerned about the politicization of medicine. For example, you will learn that Hydroxychloroquine and Ivermectin have been in use for many decades, are harmless to patients when prescribed appropriately, and show remarkable therapeutic efficacy against the COVID-19 disease when administered early. But for what can only be explained as political reasons, the establishment doctors and politicians continue to object to the general public receiving these treatments and even attempt to keep this information from the people.

Remember, some in the establishment medical community went so far as to contrive a fake scientific study to justify passing laws against the use of HCQ as a therapeutic for COVID. You would think there would be a general cry of outrage about this. Think about it! The number of lives that honest doctors could have saved if allowed to treat their patients with these remedies is estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands.<sup>31</sup> Instead, the government medical establishment, functioning as shills for the pharmaceutical

---

<sup>31</sup> Generally accepted and highly respected AMA now admits, early treatment would have saved lives: <https://www.chattanooga.com/2021/1/30/422431/Doctors-Weren-t-Allowed-To-Use-Drug.aspx>  
<https://www.bizpacreview.com/2021/05/18/report-early-covid-treatments-could-have-saved-thousands-of-lives-but-research-was-suppressed-1075996/> <https://stuartbramhall.wordpress.com/2021/07/11/early-at-home-treatments-could-save-85-of-covid-deaths/>  
<https://www.ronjohnson.senate.gov/2021/9/sen-johnson-develop-and-offer-early-treatment-for-covid-rather-than-slandering-those-who-advocate-it> <https://www.biznews.com/health/2021/10/06/early-treatment>

companies involved in this scam, accepted a faked scientific study called the *Lancet study*,<sup>32</sup> promoting the false narrative that Hydroxychloroquine is not only ineffective for use against COVID-19 but even dangerous. It's a lie! And more importantly, Fauci and all the leadership in what I have described as the medical establishment KNEW IT WAS A LIE! Folks; they lied to us on purpose! Why?

A LOADED STATEMENT: "The government medical establishment, functioning as shells for the pharmaceutical companies involved in this ..." is a *loaded* statement. I have space for only one example of several available. Consider the following, and you decide.

The FDA sent a letter advising Pfizer on the status of FDA approval of the BioNTech vaccine—a.k.a. the Pfizer shot—presently in use, and a new vaccine called COMIRNATY.<sup>33</sup> *Please read the letter*; I linked it below. The letter does not inform Pfizer that their BioNTech vaccine (currently the COVID-19 vaccine) is fully approved. The letter expressly states its use continues under Emergency Use Authorization. *Read the letter*. The vaccine that the FDA declared to be fully approved is called COMIRNATY, and in the letter, it is made clear this was not yet available in the US. Furthermore, the letter contains very explicit trials Pfizer must complete before the US can use the COMIRNATY vaccine.

Using the above mentioned FDA letter as evidence that the Pfizer vaccine has received full FDA approval is outrageous fraud. How is the FDA implicated in this fraud? The FDA has refused to go public and expose the lie repeatedly told by the EM (MSM), which is that

---

<sup>32</sup> This is not an opinion; it is a fact: <https://ahrp.org/the-lancet-published-a-fraudulent-study-editor-calls-it-department-of-error/> See the following for documentation that Lancet retracted this study when it was exposed as fraudulent: <https://thefederalist.com/2020/06/04/lancet-formally-retracts-fake-hydroxychloroquine-study-used-by-media-to-attack-trump-inbox/> See also <https://in.news.yahoo.com/controversial-lancet-study-linking-hcq-063453924.html>

<sup>33</sup> <https://www.fda.gov/media/151710/download> — This is the actual letter sent from FDA to Pfizer. Also, see this examination of the two letters used to support the lie that the FDA has approved the Pfizer shot: <https://miningawareness.wordpress.com/2021/08/25/fda-only-renewed-emergency-use-authorization-for-pfizer-approval-was-for-biontechs-comirnaty-with-years-of-additional-safety-studies-required-thru-2027/>

the Pfizer shot is fully FDA approved. This is a matter of such importance it is impossible to believe the FDA is unaware of how the establishment media reported on these letters. It is equally impossible to believe their silence in the matter means anything other than that the FDA is complicit in the fraud. Furthermore, it is impossible to excuse the EM (Establishment Media) for their gross negligence and dereliction of their duty. Only a fool can fail to see the so-called legacy media intentionally defrauded the public with disinformation.

As pointed out above, the "scientific" study created to show Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) was ineffective and unsafe against COVID-19 was fully exposed as a fraud. The truth is that HCQ and other remedies have proved to be helpful. And now we know that doctors could have saved many lives if the politicians had not interfered, and if the establishment government-connected big-pharma doctors had not allowed themselves to become advocates for corporate pharmaceutical corporations and, for profit, violate their oath to above all else "do no harm."

Go here to view a random collection of RCTs on the efficacy of masks.<sup>34</sup>

Go here to view a document published by the respected *Journal of Primary Care & Community Health* showing concerns about skin rashes and other problems caused by masks.<sup>35</sup>

**CHAPTER SIX: RETURN TO TRUTH / RETURN TO FREEDOM:**  
Jesus said the truth shall make you free. — *John 8:32*

---

<sup>34</sup> Masks Are Neither Effective Nor Safe: A Summary of the Science (<https://www.technocracy.news/masks-are-neither-effective-nor-safe-a-summary-ofthe-science/>), Individual document links: <https://swprs.org/face-masks-evidence/> // See also: <https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/5/4/e006577> (To view a break out of the specific studies referenced, see FN 12.

<sup>35</sup> <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2150132720966167> See also: Face masks can increase vulnerability to COVID-19 <https://www.businessinsider.com/americans-dont-need-masks-pence-says-as-demand-increases-2020-2>

Science is about the pursuit of *truth* — what corresponds to what is. The fact that the Bible refers to a species of science it calls *science falsely so-called* is an affirmation of science *rightly so-called*.

God affirms science! Biblical Christianity has never been at war with *science*. But *science* has developed a very hostile bias against biblical Christianity.<sup>36</sup> Many would say science's war with religion began with Darwinian Evolution and the controversy that arose over introducing that theory into our classrooms. Academic freedom, it was argued, demanded our schools expose our children to this new theory of origins. But where is "academic freedom" now? Honest and well-trained scientists have gathered a significant body of scientific evidence supporting Intelligent Design (Creation). Yet, government schools refuse to expose students to this scientific information because they deem it religious instruction. Biblical Christians do not demand the many variants of Evolutionary theory be forbidden. They ask only that alternative points of view be allowed free expression. So, who believes in academic freedom today?

Amazingly, well-respected news sources, such as Forbes, advocate against people doing their own research: "You Must Not 'Do Your Own Research' When It Comes To Science."<sup>37</sup> What? Such a statement hails back to the days of the Roman Catholic Dark Ages when they forbade people to read the Bible for themselves but insisted they let the priest caste tell them what it says. We threw off this yoke of bondage long ago, and will we turn around and put ourselves under a new "priest caste" — the *Scientist*?

I grew up in a home where the Bible and science were highly regarded. Some are surprised to discover that the Bible is not contrary to science. One of the greatest prophets, Daniel, was

---

<sup>36</sup> A vital distinction differentiates biblical Christianity and other species of religions that co-op the name.

<sup>37</sup> <https://www.forbes.com/sites/startswithabang/2020/07/30/you-must-not-do-your-own-research-when-it-comes-to-science/?sh=4ecd5b21535e>

reputed to have been a man knowledgeable of science (Daniel 1:4). Job is famous for his advanced knowledge of science: millennia before the *modern age*, Job spoke of the Earth as hanging in space upon nothing (Job 26:7). Another prophet, Isaiah, spoke of the Earth as being spherical (Isaiah 40:22)—700 years before the birth of Christ. Moses wrote that the life of the flesh is in the blood millennia before modern science made the discovery (Leviticus 17:11). However, as I pointed out above, the Bible also warns about science *falsely so-called* (I Timothy 6:20).

Science falsely so-called is *fake science*. Like *fake news* has nothing to do with news and everything to do with propaganda, fake science is not about science at all. Fake science is all about pushing an agenda. Fake news spins news into a narrative that advances some ideological agenda. Fake science serves the same end. Today, unscrupulous scientists advance *fake science* in the way dishonest journalists do *fake news*. Like the priests of the Dark Ages, we must accept their pronouncements without question. But, as pointed out already, the statements of scientists are not science. The rigorous collection of data, forming a theory, and then using experimentation to confirm it, leaving to peers all the information needed to replicate the experiment and confirm the conclusion — that's science.

What do you say? How about let's return to true science. And true science tells us that the recommended masks do not help control the spread of any virus, and in fact, they do more harm than good.

## CHAPTER SEVEN: THE BIBLICAL PERSPECTIVE

The American perspective on human rights that has shaped our culture and guided our civil institutions arose from biblical principles and precepts.<sup>38</sup> Our most cherished values come from the Bible; for example, innocent until proven guilty comes from the Law

---

<sup>38</sup>. Dr. Benjamin F. Morris collected in one major resource over 1000 pages of documentation attesting to this fact: *The Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States*, Benjamin F. Morris, American Vision, Powder Springs, GA, [www.AmericanVision.org](http://www.AmericanVision.org). See also, *The Bible and the Bill of Rights*, Dr. Jerry Scheidbach, [www.booksatdbp.com](http://www.booksatdbp.com)

of Moses. And the foundation of our liberties in America, "All men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights," is based on a biblical view of man. Other notions, like bodily autonomy, freedom of thought, and speech, also are rooted in our Christian heritage. But unfortunately, as our nation moves "out from under God," we are losing these values and the protections they have provided against tyranny. So let's take a moment to consider a biblical perspective on the issue of mask mandates.

First, God gave us breath! God breathed into Adam's nostrils and man "became a living soul" (Genesis 2:7). Because man's life originates from GOD, every man has a natural, inalienable "right to life." Upon the same principle, because man's breath originates with GOD, every man has a natural, inalienable right to breathe. For any other man or entity to take by force control of that right, and attempt to exercise authority over it and regulate and restrict it, is a violation of our natural and inalienable rights under GOD. Every man has a right to breathe. Forcing a mask mandate that restricts our natural right to breathe is an infringement of that right, a violation of human rights.

Second, our health, ultimately, comes from GOD. The Bible instructs us what to do if any are sick among us (James 5:14). We are to turn to God in prayer and call the church's elders for anointing. The Bible also affirms the use of physicians (for example, Luke—Colossians 4:14) and natural remedies (I Timothy 5:23). But we must never shift our ultimate dependency from the LORD to physicians (II Chronicles 16:12 — where we read of God's rebuke against King Asa because "in his disease he sought not to the LORD, but to the physicians.")

A balanced approach to addressing our sicknesses includes spiritual and physical measures: we pray, seek the LORD for healing, and discreetly use doctors and medicine. We "trust the LORD" with

all our heart, and man only in so far as we may be confident he is trustworthy. Therefore, we cannot give away our responsibility to exercise autonomy and discernment in managing our health. We cannot yield to government coercion in this matter. To do so would forfeit responsibility for our health, sacrifice our freedom, and remove our body from under the Sovereign rule of our Creator. Jesus taught us to yield to Caesar what is his, but reserve to GOD what is HIS. Our health, and our body, belongs to GOD.

Third, our body belongs to God and not to men. He created us (Genesis 1-2)! Hundreds of scripture references show that GOD holds each individual responsible for what they do in their body and with it. Add the many references indicating each person is personally responsible for its care. Furthermore, God appointed us the steward of our body and has not given this power to any other. Therefore, it is the right of each person to decide what measures they will take to answer their physical needs, trusting GOD for the outcome. This is especially true of Christians, whose body God has purchased and made His temple. When we consider the price, Christ's blood, shed on Calvary, our jealousy regarding God's Sovereignty over our body is enhanced! So the believer's body belongs peculiarly to the LORD (I Corinthians 6:19-20; 7:23; Romans 12:1-2). For this reason, the believer cannot be forced (compelled, coerced) to surrender control over his or her body to any other person without violating his or her conscience and betraying a sacred trust God has given to mankind generally and to His own children particularly.

Please understand what is truly at issue here. Freedom! Personal bodily autonomy and our rights of conscience are at risk. Consider what is at stake: the right to think for ourselves and decide what is in our best interests in our pursuit of happiness. It's about freedom — freedom from intrusion against one of our most personal rights — the right to breathe freely.

## CHAPTER EIGHT: ON THE QUESTION OF PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR OTHERS

I must address the false notion that Christians must allow the government to direct in the manner of fulfilling Christ's command to *love our neighbor as ourselves* and *do unto others as we would have them do unto us* (Luke 10:27; Galatians 5:14; Matthew 7:12).

The argument goes something like this—you must wear a mask to protect others, or at the very least, out of respect and compassion for their fears, you should accommodate them. They tell us this would be doing to others as we would have them do to us and loving our neighbor as ourselves. Another argument used is taken from Romans 13:1-6, and I Peter 2:13. Because the Bible says we are to obey every ordinance of man and that governments are "ordained of God," Christians are obliged to obey mask mandates.

We have a responsibility to *do unto others as we would have them do unto us*. But those of us who insist we have a natural right to breathe freely would freely yield the same right to others. However, some will say dismissing the argument in this way is disingenuous since the point is that because Christians are under the command of Christ to exercise charity toward others, we should yield to the mandates out of love for our neighbor. So let's consider this argument charitably and honestly!

First, our responsibility to love our neighbor is to GOD and His CHRIST. No one should presume to prescribe for others how they are to obey Christ's commandment to love our neighbors. It is dangerous to give the government power to decide what we must do to obey Christ's commandment to love our neighbors. It yields to government power over our conscience, intrudes into our personal relationships, and puts the government in place of Christ in our lives. The believer cannot surrender their conscience to the government without displacing Christ.

Give the government the power to decide for the individual what is the right way for people to discharge their responsibility to Christ for loving his or her neighbor, and you give the government the power of tyranny. Our present case offers an illustration!

Today, the government is attempting to direct how we should love our neighbor in response to this pandemic. Since we are concentrating on the issue of mask mandates, consider the folly of granting the government power to decide how we are to love our neighbor.

We have already established that masks do not protect against something so small as a virus. Remember Dr. Fauci's email instructing government officials against wearing masks because a virus particle is so small it passes through a standard mask. But then the same voice of *government authority* says we must all wear masks, with no explanation of what changed and without pointing to any proper scientific study supporting the change. At one point, remember, we were told it is more beneficial to wear two masks. Then the government authorities reverted and allowed that one was sufficient. Then masks were to be used indoors only. Then masks were to be used indoors and outdoors. Then we were told no masks are necessary if vaccinated. Those who were dutifully vaccinated hardly took off the mask before being told to put them back on. Then we're told the cloth masks are not effective, then athletes do not need to wear the mask while on the field or court, only on the bench, but everyone in the stands watching them play must wear masks, and on and on. On top of all this, we endured the humiliation of watching our government overlords in public and private gatherings flaunting their disdain for the mandates they put on everyone else. It's an old problem: "Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers" (Luke 11:46). The current mask-mandate folly illustrates why we can't give to government the

power to decide how we practice Jesus' instruction to love our neighbor as ourselves.

Besides all that, those knowledgeable about the mask issue may rightly argue they do not wear a mask precisely because they love their neighbor.

Finally, only GOD is omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient and can intimately know every individual case. The government cannot! When Fauci makes pronouncements as he did recently that the vaccines are good for you, he is foolishly, and arrogantly, presumptuous. Dan Bongino made a good point on his show on 12/9/21 when he pointed out that Fauci has no idea if the vaccine is good for you because he has never met you; he knows nothing about your personal needs or health concerns. Another reason we cannot yield to the government the power to decide these things for us because the government can't be GOD.

To summarize my point about whether we should allow the government to dictate how we discharge our duties to GOD, consider: our responsibility to love our neighbor is to God, and the government is not God. Government cannot decide how we discharge our duty to love our neighbor without grossly infringing upon our freedom of thought and conscience. Government cannot know what is best for the health of everyone. Allowing government, or some other person, to take from us the power to make decisions regarding how we discharge our duty to love our neighbor robs us of our liberty and gives government tyrannical power over us. Throughout history, every oppressive government advanced its control over the people with the slogan — *it's for your own good*. Tyranny always follows when the government arbitrarily decides what is for the public good. It never turns out to be in the people's interest.

ON THE QUESTION OF A BELIEVER'S RESPONSIBILITY TO OBEY THE ORDINANCES OF MAN AND SUBMIT TO THE DIVINELY APPOINTED POWERS

The second objection raised by Christians who think believers have a special responsibility to obey the mask mandate is from divine authority. It goes like this. *The Bible says we are to obey every ordinance of man (I Peter 2:13). Therefore, Christians must abide by mask mandates because God ordained governments (Romans 13:1-6).*

No human authority is unlimited. When the magistrates passed an ordinance against preaching in the name of Jesus Christ, the Apostles rightly challenged the law saying, "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). We must resist any ordinance that infringes upon our inalienable rights because to yield necessarily removes us from under God. No human authority is without limitations. God has drawn the boundary of those limitations at our inalienable rights and personal sovereignty under GOD. That's where our Constitution draws them too.

Romans 13:1-6 declares God's ordained limits and purpose of government.

First, Romans 13 declares, "There is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God." The word *power* translates *exousia*, a Greek word meaning authority or right to rule. This verse does not say God ordained all who hold power. Hosea 8:4 clears this up for us: God charged Israel: "They have set up kings, but not by me: they have made princes, and I knew it not." Israel had put persons in positions of authority in their kingdom that God did not choose. God ordained the *power*, but not necessarily the *person* holding it.

Furthermore, God is the ordaining authority over all *power* He ordains; it is under God's sovereign rule. Indeed, this verse declares, "All power is ordained of God," and says there is no *power* that is not

ordained of GOD. In other words, any *power* exercised in this world that is not under the ordaining authority of GOD is by this statement declared null and void and without divine authority in the world.

Finally, on this first point, Jesus Christ has been given *all power* in Heaven and Earth (Matthew 28:18—the word translated *power* here is the same word translated *power* in Romans 13:1). Therefore, Jesus Christ is the Sovereign Lord over all *powers* in Heaven and Earth.

Second, Jesus Christ puts clear limitations on rulers appointed to exercise the divinely ordained earthly power.

Jesus Christ ordains the *power* (the government authority) to execute His justice on the Earth. Hence, "Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil." But we know some rulers are a terror to good works and promote evil. Such rulers have no authority, neither in Heaven NOR IN EARTH! Christ has commissioned rulers to use the divinely ordained power to execute wrath upon those who do evil and praise those who do good.

We must understand the concepts of *good* and *evil* in the context of these statements in Scripture. For this reason, according to Scripture through King David, "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God" (II Samuel 23:3). No ruler has the authority to be a terror to what the Bible calls good works. Likewise, no ruler who refuses to be a terror to what the Bible would call an evil work is acting under the ordained authority of Jesus Christ the Lord. Such persons have usurped the *power* and, by force, take it out from under the ordaining authority of our Lord Jesus.

Rulers are appointed to exercise the *power* that GOD ordains (Romans 13:1). And God allows us to choose our rulers (Hosea 8:4). Therefore we must select rulers that He approves. The Spirit of God complained that His people had "set up kings, but not by me: they have made princes, and I knew it not" (Hosea 8:4). We may take two

essential insights from this verse. First, although God ordains the *power*, He allows the people to put rulers into positions of authority to execute the duties of the *power*. And second, the people must put persons into *power* that satisfy Christ's criteria for leadership.

Remember that God has ordained all power, and He gave it *all* to Jesus Christ, His Son. That included any *power* exercised over heathen nations. Therefore, *all* rulers appointed to exercise the ordained *power* must serve at the pleasure of Jesus Christ. The Scriptures outline the criteria for selecting rulers. For a sampling, consider the following statements from the Bible.

Romans 15:4 and I Corinthians 10:11 show that the following Old Testament Scriptures layout criteria applicable to the New Testament era rulers: Deuteronomy 17:14-20; Exodus 18:21-25; Deuteronomy 1:13; II Samuel 23:3. Jesus offered important guidance: Matthew 20:25-27; 23:11; Mark 9:35; 10:42-44; Luke 22:25-27. I know some would limit the application of Jesus' instructions to those who lead the church. However, today there is *no power but of God*, and *all power* in Heaven and Earth is under Jesus Christ. His directions governing the exercise of authority would therefore be applicable.

Governments have forfeited divine authority when they become subversive to the divinely ordained purpose for *power*. The people have no obligation to submit to such rogue governments. When rulers usurp the *power* and turn the sword intended for divine justice against the righteous to oppress the people, they are treasonous against the rule of Christ on this Earth. The people have the divine right to remove such oppressors from their office.

Coming back to our specific issue, mask mandates: we affirm no human authority is absolute, that all *power* is ordained of GOD and under His Sovereign rule, that *all power* has been committed to the Sovereign reign of Jesus Christ the LORD, and that all mankind is

under the authority of Jesus, Who is our Creator, and by Whom we are endowed with certain inalienable rights. Upon this affirmation, we recognize no right of the government to enforce any mandate that violates our human rights. We declare human government has no legitimate power to deprive its citizens of the free exercise of their inalienable rights, including the natural right to breathe freely.

Chapter Seven: WHAT ABOUT PETER'S WARNING AGAINST THOSE WHO "DESPISE GOVERNMENTS," AND HIS COMMAND TO "SUBMIT YOURSELVES TO EVERY ORDINANCE OF MAN"?

Earlier, I addressed how some have distorted Paul's teaching on the relationship between governments and Christians. But what about Peter's command that believers "submit ... to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake" (I Peter 2:13) and his warning against those who "despise governments" (II Peter 2:10)?

*A Summary Review of Paul's Teaching On This Subject!*

As I pointed out earlier, Paul taught us that God ordained all power, which means all authority is under God, limited under His Sovereignty. We learned that God gave all this *power* to His Son (Matthew 28:18; Colossians 2:15-16). Therefore we are obliged to submit to such authority (Romans 13:2), as Peter put it, "for the Lord's sake" (I Peter 2:13). Furthermore, we saw that the men who exercise this power are "minister[s] of God" (Romans 13:4). Therefore, their authority is limited to the purpose for which God ordained the *power* (Romans 13:3-4).

Anyone exercising *power* contrary to the ordaining authority, Jesus Christ the King, is a usurper and has no legitimate right to rule on Earth. Any usurper exercising the divinely ordained power contrary to the ordaining authority should be rebuffed and resisted. Jesus and Paul rebuffed officers that abused their power (John 18:23; Acts 22:25). It's what Peter and John did when authorities ordered them not to preach in Jesus' name (Acts 5:29).

Finally, since there *is no power but of God*, we do not recognize any species of government authority that is out from under God. Because no such authority exists, "For there is no power but of God" (Romans 13:1).

This justifies Christ coming with all power and great glory (Matthew 24:30) to take all earthly kingdoms under His direct command. It's all His! The wicked have no divine right to rule; they "take the kingdom" by force and violence (Matthew 11:12). Jesus Christ will return and command all such rebels to be gathered before Him and destroyed (Luke 19:27).

So why did Peter warn that those who despise government are presumptuous and selfwilled (II Peter 2:10)? The short answer is that Peter is talking about government ordained by God, not *power* usurped by wicked rebels who hate Jesus Christ the King.

*Paul and Peter are in perfect agreement! Indeed, the scripture cannot be broken (John 10:35).*

Paul's teaching on the divine ordination of all *power (authority)* in Romans 13:1-6 perfectly agrees with Peter's teaching in I Peter 2:2-16 and II Peter 2:4-10.

The Greek word that is translated *government* in II Peter 2:10 is *kuriotes*, meaning dominion, or human governments, including the rulers appointed to exercise their power. No government has any power God has not ordained. This does not mean God ordains all authority exercised by the government. It means governments exercising any authority contrary to God are illegitimate—they are without power.

Paul said God ordained all power (Romans 13:1), and those who are appointed to exercise its authority are called the *ministers of God* (Romans 13:4). This puts all power and all who wield it under God.

Peter and Paul say the same thing about the responsibility of governments.

Paul said Divine Decree charges governments to execute wrath against evildoers and reward the righteous (Romans 13:3-5). Peter said the same thing. After he told us to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, he went on to say, "Whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, *as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well*" (emphasis added) (I Peter 2:13-14; compare Romans 13:3-5). Nothing in Scripture says Christians should submit to evil, God-hating, Christ despising rebels. Such wicked rulers usurp the divinely ordained power and use it to reward the wicked and oppress the righteous.

Jesus commands His followers to respect authorities that exercise divinely ordained power to execute wrath against evildoers and reward the righteous. We are to honor them, pay their tribute, and submit to their ordinances (Romans 13:7; I Peter 2:13-16). We must submit to these authorities. But we are expressly commanded to *resist the Devil and wrestle against his powers*.

*Christians must resist devils and tyrants, their human counterparts!*

The Spirit commands us to *wrestle* against principalities, powers, the rulers of the darkness of this world, and spiritual wickedness in high places (Ephesians 6:12). The word *wrestle* means we grapple, throw down, and resist. And notice that the Spirit repeats the word *against*: we *wrestle against* principalities, *against* powers, *against* the rulers of the darkness of this world, and *against* spiritual wickedness in high places. Christians are at war *against* principalities, powers, rulers of darkness, and spiritual wickedness.

Satan used to be the "prince of the world," but Jesus cast him out (John 12:31; 16:11). The Spirit tells us now Satan is the "prince of

the power of the air" (Ephesians 2:2). This was a demotion! He wants his authority back. So this "prince of the power of the air" is "the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience" (Ephesians 2:2). The children of disobedience refuse to obey the gospel. The gospel commands all men to repent and confess Jesus Christ is Lord (II Thessalonians 1:8; see I Peter 4:7; see Acts 17:30 and Romans 10:9-13). Satan can take these children of disobedience captive at his will (II Timothy 2:26). Those who join forces with Satan in his rebellion against Christ are agents of Satan working his will on this Earth.

The Bible tells believers to submit to God and *resist the Devil*, not assist him (James 4:7). If the Devil is the spirit working in and through these "children of disobedience," then we must resist what Satan is trying to do through them. We cannot yield to their usurpation of the divine power without aiding and abetting Satan's bid to take the kingdom out from under God by force.

Is our warfare limited to the spiritual forces operating behind the men and women who serve him, or do we have an obligation to resist these agents of Satan?

*Paul said we do not wrestle against flesh and blood. Doesn't that mean this is entirely a spiritual resistance and not physical?*

A *principality* refers to a realm governed by a prince or a ruler. A *power*, in this context, refers to the organized exercise of authority to enforce compliance with the mandates of rulers. The *rulers* of the darkness of this world refer to the devils appointed to control territory gained by Satan in this world. Spiritual *wickedness* in *high places* refers to the activity of Satan and his angels in and through the principalities, powers, and rulers of the darkness of this world. However, these spiritual entities act in this world through their counterparts in the physical world.

This is where the spiritual intersects with the physical: Satan works his evil into the world through people under his control. These people are called children of disobedience.

When the Bible says, "We wrestle not against flesh and blood," it means we are not fighting against mankind. Instead, we are at war with the malevolent spiritual forces at work through them.

But that does not mean there is no conflict between the personalities aligned with Satan and those of us aligned with Christ. So let's look at what it means to wrestle against principalities, powers, etc.

First, we wrestle *against principalities*. The Bible teaches that Jesus created all principalities and powers (Colossians 1:15-16), which necessarily includes those He commanded us to wrestle! So why do we wrestle against principalities created by Jesus Christ?

Even stranger, if Jesus created all principalities, why would He come to earth to "spoil principalities and powers" by dying on the Cross (Colossians 2:15-18)? (The word *spoil* as used here speaks of when a conqueror defeats an enemy and takes all that his enemy possessed into his power.)

In Colossians 1:15-17, the Spirit tells us Jesus created *all principalities*. In Colossians 2:15, the Spirit tells us He "spoiled principalities"—the word *all* is not used. What principalities did Jesus spoil: those that rebelled and pulled out from under God. Which principalities were those?

Satan was "prince of this world" (John 12:32; 16:11). The world was his *principality*. The world was divided into numerous principalities when this Prince attempted to defy God at the Tower of Babel (Genesis 10-11). Satan appoints powerful devils to bring these principalities under his control. Daniel identified two of these rebellious principalities. One was called the *Prince of Persia*, and the other was the *Prince of Grecia* (Daniel 10:20). By the time Jesus came

into the world, Satan could boast that all the kingdoms (principalities) of the world and their glory were given to him (Matthew 4:8-9; Luke 4:5-8). Jesus came into the world (John 3:16-17), bound Satan (Matthew 12:29), and spoiled his principalities, taking them away from Satan (Colossians 2:15).

Jesus delivered the principalities from Satan's control, yet he continues to resist; he refuses to submit to Christ Jesus. He uses the children of disobedience to "take the kingdom" by force (Matthew 11:12; see Psalm 2:1-4 with Acts 4:25). (By the way, this expression, *the kingdom*, refers to God's rule over the Earth. Every parable Jesus taught about the kingdom described God's activity on the Earth during the time leading up to Christ's return (Matthew 13). So *the kingdom of Heaven* refers to God's work in the world today.) What *principalities* do we wrestle? Believers wrestle against every principality that refuses to submit to Jesus as LORD and sets itself as the enemy of God (see Luke 19:12-21).

Second, we wrestle against *powers*. The Bible says *all power* (exousia—authority, right to rule) is ordained by God, and we are commanded to submit to the power. So how can the Spirit here tell us we wrestle against *powers*, which translates the same word, exousia? Obviously, we submit to the divinely appointed power and resist any usurped powers that act in this world out from under God. I'm sure you begin to understand!

Third, we wrestle against *the rulers of the darkness of this world*. The *darkness of this world* refers to the power of the lord of darkness, Satan, operating in the world. Remember, he used to be "prince of this world." He lost that title, and he wants it back. He works through children of disobedience to accomplish this. He draws them into his power by blinding their minds to the Gospel (II Corinthians 4:4). False doctrines (I Timothy 4:1-4), vain philosophies (Colossians 2:8), and science falsely so-called (I Timothy 6:20) are used by Satan to keep unbelievers blinded and

under his power. Of course, it is ridiculous to suggest that we do not resist false teachers or wrestle against their false doctrines (Titus 3:10; Romans 16:17-18). Our wrestling against these spiritual forces of evil necessarily involves us in conflict with the children of disobedience Satan uses to advance his rebellion on the Earth against Christ.

And finally, fourth, we wrestle against *spiritual wickedness in high places* (Ephesians 6:12). The *high places* refer to heavenly places. Remember, Satan is now the prince of the power of the air, the heaven in which the fowl fly (Genesis 1:20; Job 35:11; Psalm 79:2; 104:12), and where the sun, moon, and stars run their courses (Genesis 1:14-17; Judges 5:20). Satan is no longer prince of this world. Still, he is prince of the power of the air, the headquarters from which Satan launches his attacks on earthly principalities, powers, and rulers. As kings and priests unto God (Revelation 1:5-6), we have authority on Earth to command devils and bind them. We have no time to discuss this here. Get my book, *God's War*, where I elaborate on this at length. But the point is, we wrestle against these powers and resist the efforts of men and women on Earth who serve them.

*The spiritual forces of Satan operate in this world through their material servants, and the Spirit of Jesus Christ works in this world through His physical servants.*

It is a spiritual conflict. However, this spiritual conflict intersects with the physical world.

Here is where the spiritual and the physical intersect. Satan is the "prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience" (Ephesians 2:1-2). This is the spirit of antichrist that John, in his day (AD 90s), said was "already in the world" (I John 4:3). The spirit of antichrist works in and through the children of disobedience. Who are these children of disobedience?

The children of disobedience have refused to obey the gospel (II Thessalonians 1:8; I Peter 4:17). The gospel commands all men everywhere to repent (Acts 17:30), confess Jesus as Lord, believe He arose from the dead, and call on His name to be saved from the wrath to come. God has determined to pour out His wrath on all who refuse to bow the knee to His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ (Romans 10:9-13; Isaiah 45:23; Romans 14:11; Philippians 2:10-11). The children of disobedience are physical, flesh and blood people that reject Jesus Christ as Lord of the Earth.

The spirit of antichrist, the spiritual, works in this world through the children of disobedience, the physical.

By contrast, the children of obedience have confessed Jesus is Lord, believed on Him, and called upon Him to be saved (Romans 6:17). The Spirit of Jesus Christ resides in the children of obedience (I John 4:13; II Corinthians 1:22; Galatians 4:6). Jesus prophesied His Spirit would move through them into the world (John 7:38-39). The Spirit of Jesus Christ works in and through the physical children of obedience. Christ manifests in and through the mortal flesh of believers in this world (II Corinthians 4:11): the spiritual through the physical.

While the war is between the Spirit of Jesus Christ and the spirit of antichrist, each battle is fought out in the struggle between the children of obedience and the children of disobedience.

You need to choose sides!

If you want to join forces with Jesus Christ against the antichrist forces, here is what you must do.

Recognize you are a sinner! This means you have broken one or more of God's laws. The Bible says all have sinned (Romans 3:10), and the wages of sin is death (Romans 6:23). After death, there is judgment (Hebrews 9:27). That judgment is hell-fire, followed by eternal confinement in the Lake of Fire (Luke 16:23; Revelation

20:13-14). Jesus said all who die in their sins cannot go to Heaven (John 8:21). To avoid dying in your sin, you must obey the gospel.

*Repentance toward God*

The first commandment of the gospel is to repent. To repent means to turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God (Acts 26:18).

To turn from darkness to light means to turn from this world's lies to God's truth. If you are a lover of truth, if you have an honest and good heart (Luke 8:15), Jesus said you would be drawn to the light of God's truth (John 3:21). This is because people hate the light (God's Truth) because their deeds are evil. They prefer to live in the darkness of Satan's lies and deceit so that they can sin without conscience. However, all that do truth are honest about their sin, accept God's reproof on their conscience, and move from darkness to the light (John 3:20-21).

To turn from the power of Satan to God, you must renounce the spirit of antichrist that works in the children of disobedience. The word *power* translates *exousia*; it refers to Satan's authority or rule. You must renounce your allegiance to Satan and this world and declare your allegiance to Jesus Christ. You do this by confessing with your mouth the Lord Jesus.

*Confess, Believe, and Call (Romans 10:9-13)*

Confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus (Romans 10:9a). Jesus is Lord, and for you to become a child of obedience, after you repent (see above), you must confess with your mouth that Jesus is LORD. This means He is our master, our ruler, and our King. It also means you acknowledge that Jesus is the rightful ruler of Heaven and Earth. All kings (rulers) and kingdoms are under His authority. And it means that there is no authority above His. This confession must be made with your mouth, meaning you must be public about your confession; it cannot be hidden or private. Jesus said any who deny

Him before men will be denied by Him before His Father and any who confess Him before men will be confessed before His Father (Matthew 10:32-33).

Believe in your heart God raised Jesus Christ from the dead (Romans 10:9b). According to the spirit of holiness, Jesus was declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead (Romans 1:3-4). Of course, a dead king is no king. Jesus lives! This means He is someone to be reckoned with now and forever. It also means He is able, ready, and willing to forgive your sins. Jesus warned us that any who die in their sins would not be allowed to enter Heaven (John 8:21). Then He said, "for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins" (John 8:24). If you believe on Jesus, He will wash away all your sins.

Call upon His name to be saved (Romans 10:13). Prayer — calling on Jesus to save you, finally expresses your repentance and confession. God has promised that you will be saved if you call on Jesus' name.

Please join forces with the Spirit of Jesus Christ against the spirit of antichrist.

If you have any questions, please contact my office and arrange a time for us to meet. Call 805.714.7731. Or go to [santamarialighthouse.org](http://santamarialighthouse.org). Visit [godswar2020.com](http://godswar2020.com) for more information about how to engage in this war for this nation under God. Visit [brainmassage.net](http://brainmassage.net) to receive my weekly Brain Massage® (airs on the radio: AM 1440 Saturday at noon and Sunday morning at 7). Engage with me on my Livestream Comfort & Counsel For the Present Distress weekly, Tuesday and Thursday through Saturday. I usually go live between 8 to 8:15 pm. Come to the Lighthouse. We assemble on Sunday: at 9:30, and 10:45 am and 5 pm, and on Wednesday at 7 pm.

God bless you! God bless America! I'll see you in church!