Conspiracy Theories in the Corona Crisis

Theories

"*There is nothing more practical than a theory*", Einstein is supposed to have said. Whether real or well invented, this saying is good. This time, I want to shed light on the function of theories in normal science, but also in the Corona crisis, where – stay the hell away from me – people shout "conspiracy theory!".

So, what is the "useful" thing about a theory? Theories in the broadest sense guide our perception. They express what we expect based on our prior knowledge. The everyday theory that the sun rises in the east and sets in the west is such a bundled experience. The bundling of previous experiences into an expectation according to which we act is useful, or, to speak with Einstein, practical. For it saves us from having to develop everything all over again. Perception without theory hardly works, or at least only in specially purified states of consciousness. Husserl, the founder of phenomenology, spoke of the fact that we have to leave out all our pre-conceptions (i.e. "theories") if we want to perceive reality as it is [1]. This is a noble call, which is also made again and again by the spiritual meditation traditions: to let go of mental conditioning in order to perceive what is completely in the moment. If you meditate a lot, you can do that from time to time. But it would be too exhausting to do it all the time. We are also historical beings and bundle our experience – individual and cultural – into inner models of the world. In science, such models are called "theories".

That's why we don't have to test every time whether a glass we drop will break on a stone floor. We simply know. In science, theories combine experiences we have made systematically. In physics, for example, Newton's theory bundled both the experience that apples fall from the tree, but also that cannonballs follow a parabolic trajectory (and do not fly straight ahead), and planets revolve around each other or around the sun. Something interesting happens here: different areas of phenomena – falling apples, cannonballs, planets in space – are combined under one model and thus explained parsimoniously.

Parsimony has delighted scholars ever since William Ockham (Fig. 1) formulated his principle of parsimony in his Oxford Lectures on the Commentary on Sentences of Petrus Lombardus in about 1318, actually an axiom that he never substantiated but that somehow makes sense: *One should not assume entities beyond what is necessary* ("quia pluralitas non

est ponenda sine necessitate" [2, S. 59] – for a plurality [of entities] should not be demanded without necessity" is a classical variant). Since Ockham formulated this principle of parsimony, also known as "*Ockham's Razor*", it has been one of the guiding principles of science: parsimonious theory-building that gets by with as few theoretical constructs as possible.

That's why Newton's theory was so brilliant. Physics has refined it. Both quantum theory and relativity consist of a few equations that unite a huge amount of individual phenomena under their umbrella. And above all: such theories allow a very large amount of often completely counterintuitive predictions. Quantum theory, for example, allowed the prediction of entangled, i.e. correlated, states without the mediation of causal signs, which can certainly be generalised beyond strictly physical situations. [3]



Figure 1 – A pen and ink drawing depicting William Ockham, from an Oxford manuscript; probably the first ever portrait drawing of a philosopher.

Theories thus bundle individual experiences and map an underlying structure. This structure is of course always hypothetical. Quantum theory is a hypothetical-mathematical structure that is useful as long as it can be empirically confirmed, as long as it makes new predictions and as long as it can be used to describe certain areas of reality well. Theories are not true or false. They are useful, confirmed or disproved, or in most cases useful in some areas and less useful in others. Relativity is useful in understanding cosmic space-time

dimensions, but is quite irrelevant in our everyday lives.

In my original subject, psychology, which is still a very young science, there is a plethora of theories. These often contradict and even exclude each other. Sometimes they complement each other. Sometimes you only notice the complement at second glance and after some time. Example: The psychoanalytical theory introduced by Freud is based on unconscious impulses. They are said to be the controlling functions of our behaviour. Learning theory also assumes processes that are automatic, such as classical conditioning. But it rejects the concept of a dynamic unconscious. For decades, the argument raged about who had the better theory. When I was a student in the late 70s and 80s, it was standard doctrine at the psychology departments at universities that psychoanalysis was nonsense. I believed that myself for a long time. Until I started working practically and realised that such constructs as unconsciously acting traumas, preconscious emotional colourings, are useful to understand behaviour. The scientific tenor today is rather that the existence of unconscious processes is accepted because they have also been proven neuroscientifically, because conditioning also runs unconsciously, and that clinically a reconstruction directed more towards the past and an analysis of behaviour related to the present do not have to be mutually exclusive.

Theories can therefore sometimes, even if they appear to be contradictory, eventually cross-fertilise, converge and perhaps merge into a new theory. This fusion has yet to take place in physics, for example, where relativity theory and quantum theory seem to stand side by side, unconnected. We can look forward to the further theoretical development, because this will open up new possibilities. [4]

Theories in the Corona Pandemic

Theories in science are often numerous and in competition. This competition is useful and necessary. For it opens up new vistas. If psychoanalysis had had no competition from behavioural theory, we would have a very one-sided and probably also factually unhelpful psychology. The plurality of theories reflects the diversity of perspectives.

I noticed right from the beginning of the Corona crisis that a plurality of opinions, let alone theories, was “banned” during the pandemic. Not by explicit decree, but by public branding. The mainstream narrative of the killer virus had to be kept pure: this just happened to come out of the wild, burst upon us and must be fought with all force, especially with lockdown and vaccinations. Anyone who challenged this narrative by asking questions or even offering alternative explanations was a “conspiracy theorist”. The term “conspiracy theory” is a cipher for a ban on thought. It denotes the idea that what we see and the way it is generally interpreted – by the press, politicians, many professionals and the executive – does not

represent the whole of reality. It also denotes the unwillingness to believe this narrative. And as such it defines a certain form of social deviance. This was communicated very quickly: Whoever is a conspiracy theorist is stupid, right-wing, tends to be malicious, because he could pose a danger to the others. Nobody wants that. So, it's better not to have a conspiracy theory. Just the one, true, real theory. Within that, there are also a few smaller variants and deviations. But the big gap is between the idea that people with evil intentions have joined forces in the background, and the idea that such a thing would never happen. Because if it did, then all our politicians, the clever editors of newspapers radio and television, the clever people of our academic academies would either not be as clever as we think, or they would somehow have been taken in by a trick and don't want to admit it. After all, who likes to admit that they have been fooled?

I would now like to call upon you to put aside all prohibitions on thinking and consider which theoretical model fits better in order to understand what happened in the pandemic. My guess is that it is an amalgam of different models that fits best. But let's wait and see.

The Term Conspiracy Theory

The term "conspiracy theory" is older, but is usually mentioned in connection with a CIA document, Dispatch 1053-960. This document was sent by the CIA to all its agents and operators. Its content was how to counter the criticism of the Warren Report. The Warren Report was the official report of the Warren Commission into the assassination of John F. Kennedy and concluded that Lee Harvey Oswald was a lone assassin who had murdered the president and that other assumptions were false and improbable. Unfortunately, Lee Harvey Oswald could no longer be questioned, because he had been killed shortly after his arrest. The story is very knowledgeably described by Talbot [5]. In general, this book "The Devil's Chessboard" can be recommended to all those who want to understand conspiracies and corresponding theories, especially to those who believe that such conspiracies are usually false. Talbot convincingly shows in his analysis that the story presented by the Warren Report does not hold water for several reasons.

Dispatch 1053-960 had the task of instructing agents all over the world to work to dispel doubt about the theory of the Warren Report: by influencing the press, public opinion, politicians, by calling anything that runs counter to it a "conspiracy theory". Since then, anyone who expresses such a theory is considered nuts. And no one in the legitimate press wants that, and certainly no politician. Therefore, the call or accusation "conspiracy theory!" is the most effective means to exclude dissenting opinions or to narrow theories down to only one, namely the prevailing opinion.

Interestingly, this action was not very successful with the Warren Report. Until well after

2015, the majority of Americans were convinced that Oswald was not the lone perpetrator the report portrayed him as, but probably had accomplices (https://www.sc.edu/about/offices_and_divisions/research/news_and_pubs/caravel/archive/2019/2019_doubt.php; https://www.history.com/news/9-things-you-may-not-know-about-the-warren-commission). We may never know the truth, perhaps only in the future when more data comes out of the archives. But the example shows: The term "conspiracy theory" is a ban on thinking imposed from above. And that doesn't always work well, especially when it is used to cover up a lie.

In order to classify conspiracy theories well, it is necessary to distinguish between theories that are wrong and those that name correct aspects or are even correct overall. Not every theory is wrong just because it talks about a conspiracy. And not every theory that believes that what we see is always wrong is right. I had already referred to the very useful book by my colleagues Alan Schink and Andreas Anton, who differentiate this well. [6]

There are a number of good examples of absolutely false conspiracy theories that have been proven to be false, such as the narrative used by the Nazis of a Jewish world conspiracy, for which a forged document of the "Wise Men of Zion" was conjured up, or other, off-the-wall ideas such as that aliens have already infiltrated us.

There are a number of half-true theories. That attempts have been made now and then to influence the weather can be read in the scientific literature [7]. That therefore all contrails from aeroplanes are "chemtrails" that blow some kind of toxins into the atmosphere is certainly an exaggeration. That would be an example of a conspiracy theory with a true core but a broadly false aura.

There are many examples of conspiracy theories that were initially treated as such but turned out to be correct, or conspiracies that were not even known as such but were nevertheless effective conspiracies. A well-known one from recent history is the Hitler-Stalin Pact, which contained a secret additional protocol promising parts of Poland to the Soviet Union. Another is the false attribution of the burning of the Reichstag in 1933 to Jewish conspirators. In fact and truth, it was a "false flag operation" by the Nazis themselves [8] who thereby created the basis for the Reichsermächtigungsgesetz, the Reich Enabling Act, i.e. the Emergency Laws, with which Hitler was then able to rule quite unabashedly, although the actual constitution was never suspended. A well-known conspiracy that needed no theory at all was the assassination of Caesar, preceded by long preparation and clandestine talks.

Conspiracies also occur in the Federal Republic of Germany. The famous Celler Loch, the blowing up of a wall in the Celle prison so that RAF members imprisoned there could

escape, was first blamed on the left-wing scene. In fact, as it later turned out, it was the intelligence service itself that launched this action. The CIA's secret attempts at "mind control", MK-Ultra, were also considered a "conspiracy theory" for a long time, until they were historically well examined and proven. Here, too, one can find much in Talbot [5] or Anton and Schink [6], Ganser and others [9, 10]. Or let us remember the more recent conspiracies: The "incubator lie", which was staged by the very agency that also organised parts of the PR campaign for the acceptance of the WHO's Covid-19 strategy in the USA. [11, p. 283]. There, an alleged nurse had reported how Iraqi soldiers had taken children out of incubators in Kuwait and killed them. The story caused emotions to run high, the population was ready for the first Gulf War. Afterwards, it turned out that the story was a lie. The alleged nurse was the daughter of the Kuwaiti ambassador to the USA (https://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/pr-agentur-hill-knowlton-schmutzige-sprechblasen-1.179920).

Such conspiracies also exists in the medical field: the tobacco industry, and later the oil industry, have always tried to deceive the public through the same people and mechanisms. [12] I have often referred to Peter Gøtzsche, who in his books cites plenty of evidence of how the big pharmaceutical companies have deliberately, knowingly and very purposefully deceived the public, the authorities, the end consumers about the problematic nature of their products. Gøtzsche's "Hall of Fame" of fraudsters is headed by Pfizer. The corporation paid the highest fine ever for lying, bribing the authorities, making false statements and covering up dangerous side effects: 2.9 billion dollars in 2009. [13, p. 25] These are not conspiracy theories, these are real conspiracies.

My point is that the call "conspiracy theory!" is nothing other than foolish. Because it implies a ban on thinking. Often conspiracy theories are stupid and wrong. But often they are also correct. And in many cases, they are a mixture. The more far-fetched the conspiracy, the harder it is to get to the bottom of it, and the "evidence", as in the case of the CIA's MK-Ultra experiments, often only becomes visible decades later, when the archives are opened or those in power have lost interest in secrecy.

Corona – Conspiracy?

And it is precisely because I have been following all this background for years that I am now quite inclined to see the Corona crisis as a conspiracy rather than a coincidence, and the well-behaved reaction of politicians to a catastrophe. I don't see the whole pattern and it may also be a very complex mixture of coincidence and intention. As I said, a theory is a way of ordering perceptions, experiences, sensory impressions. You have to adjust it when new data appear. You have to discard it when clear evidence to the contrary emerges. And above all, you have to have enough tolerance for ambiguity not to run in one direction and forget

everything else.

Here, in tabular form, is my thinking out loud or in writing about what speaks for and against a conspiracy or how the phenomena can also be seen. This list is certainly not complete and perhaps in some respects also due to my own lack of imagination or bias, but perhaps it will inspire better models.

Phenomenon	Explanation conventional	Explanation conspiracy
SARS-CoV2 has a furin cleavage site not found in this type of virus in nature in bats, making it dangerous to humans [14-16]	Random mutation with very low a priori probability	Inserted or created by laboratory passage through human cell lines in the laboratory.
Peter Daszak's Eco-Health Alliance, a close partner of the Wuhan lab, has long funded corona virus research in Wuhan with money from the US (DARPA, NIAID), outsourcing research that had been banned in the US [11, 17]	Well, that can happen	Targeted and deliberate research was conducted on the evolution of pathogenic viruses from corona virus strains
Even before the laboratory hypothesis was publicly voiced, it was loudly opposed by the crème de la crème of virologists [18, 19]	One wanted to avoid panic	They wanted to cover up the possible laboratory accident
However, all those involved knew about it; this is proven by declassified documents [17]	Cover-up	Cover-up, lie
Bill Gates has already been investing in BioNTech since autumn 2019	Confidence in the technology	The technology should be available in time; by involving a small German company with know-how, the technology can be exported to the USA and Angela Merkel can be satisfied at the same time

A whole series of simulation games since 2001 at the latest have been preparing the world for an emergency; in the Corona pandemic, exactly the actions specified there are being carried out [20]	Thank God we were well prepared	Through detailed and repeated briefing, the necessary mechanisms were practised
Early in the crisis, the phrase of “liberating vaccination” was repeated	Because it is the case	Because the introduction of the new vaccination technology was the actual goal
Bill Gates gets about 7 minutes on the evening show in TV on 12/4/2020 to explain how vaccination can defeat Corona: when we have vaccinated 7 billion people, the crisis will be over	He is right and he is a man who knows well	Gates has gained the power to express his opinion on public TV through many donations to all kinds of media houses and foundations.
The focus on new vaccines is without alternative	Because it is so	Because the aim was to introduce such new vaccines
mRNA drugs have been around for about 20 years; they have never made it to regulatory approval because the dose of the final product they produce cannot be controlled	Now the pandemic has changed the situation	Only a global emergency situation can get these substances through emergency approval
Emergency approvals for new vaccines are legally possible only if there are no treatment options available	This is exactly the case: there is no treatment option	There is a plethora of early treatment options [21], but these have been eliminated or made irrelevant by clever administrative and PR measures.
The mRNA vaccines use nanoparticles as transporters, which themselves do not have drug approval because they are toxic [22]	In the pandemic it is just different	Without a pandemic, it would never have been possible to bring such substances onto the market

All phase 3 efficacy trials were unblinded early on [23, 24]	We are in an exceptional situation; one does not want to deprive the people in the placebo group of the effective substances	This is the only way to disguise potential side-effects and cover up long-term ineffectiveness
All references to possible problems of vaccinations – side effects, deaths – are fought very fiercely [z.B. 25, 26, 27]	It's not good when people get irritated	The poor efficacy side-effect profile of vaccines is an Achilles' heel that must be concealed for as long as possible
A statutory reimbursement fund executive who publicly says he sees many side effects of Covid-19 vaccines in his data is summarily dismissed	That is good	See above
Despite emergency approval of the vaccines, there are no regulatory requirements to conduct a long-term safety monitoring study	So what? We do not need them	This is the only way to keep the potential side effects under wraps for as long as possible
Although the infection fatality rate of SARS-CoV2 infection is not much different from that of severe influenza, the state of emergency continues long after this is known, and there is discussion about compulsory vaccination. [28]	Because other factors – preventing the spread, preventing severe courses and relieving the burden on the health system play a role	Only if you let people feel the effects long enough will they go along with vaccination
Although the data is wrong, scientists claim the lockdown was necessary [29-31]	You have simply made a mistake	Without these lockdowns, there would never have been so much pressure to present vaccination as the no-alternative solution

Even though there were definitely bottlenecks in individual hospitals: across all hospital and intensive care units there were no bottlenecks in Germany in 2020 [32, 33]	But there could have been some without lockdowns	Only talk of overloading the system made it possible – legally and politically – to push vaccination as a salvation
Lockdowns were ineffective measures [34, 35]	But we did not know	Helped scare people into getting ready for vaccination
There is little to be said for the protective effect of masks, but relatively much to be said against their use, except in high-risk situations [36-38]; nevertheless, they are increasingly becoming a requirement in all kinds of situations.	Better safe than sorry – maybe it will help after all	Masks are a perfect nocebo: they are a constant reminder of impending danger [39]
Official figures have been reported unstandardised since the beginning of the pandemic	It is important that people understand how many infections take place	Only through unstandardised reporting can sufficient fear be generated
In the Corona crisis, extremely functional counting mechanisms (dashboards) sprang up very quickly that were well funded and prepared for a long time	Thank God someone thought of this in time	Without this visibility there would be no pandemic [40]
Early on, testing facilities were provided [41]	Without tests we would have been in the dark	They were central to the functioning of the pandemic machine
The tests are hypersensitive and relatively non-specific [42]	You don’t want to miss anything	This is the only way to control the number of cases (upwards).

Only through tests are you admitted to certain activities	You have to break the chains of infection	This is the only way to exert sufficient pressure and generate the necessary fear
Tracing apps and tracking are being used everywhere in an attempt to find sources of infection	Because that's the only way to control it	Because this is good preparation and training for other control procedures
Between 2010 and 2019, various foundations and NGOs have invested billions to prepare governments, the press, universities and other organisations for a pandemic; as of 2019 and during the pandemic, these foundation contributions have been very modest [11]	Preparation was important	Preparation was the aim of the exercise; because with swine flu in 2008, the vaccination campaign was a flop
All governments have promised vaccine manufacturers exemption from claims for damages and thus assumed liability [11]	That's right, because the governments wanted the vaccines	Only in this way can profit be clearly calculated and risk socialised
A large part of the population believes the mainstream narrative, is willing to vaccinate and goes along with everything more or less willingly; a clear minority, on the other hand, remains stably opposed to it [43]	The majority is usually smarter than the minority.	Some are vigilant or suspicious
The promises of liberation through vaccination have shifted time after time: first one vaccination, then two, then three, then perhaps permanently?	You couldn't know that beforehand	Could have been known, was intentional and promotes the business model

Vaccination does not prevent infection and its absolute risk reduction for real clinical outcomes (severe disease, death) is unknown because they have not been studied in randomised trials, and it is probably very low [24, 25, 44, 45]; nevertheless, compulsory vaccination continues to be discussed politically	Compulsory vaccination is helpful overall	Only compulsory vaccination can cover up the problems of vaccination and still push it forward
The deaths associated with Covid-19 vaccination are higher by at least a factor of 100 than those of all other vaccinations standardised to the same time [46]	You just have to put up with it	That is one reason why the whole thing has been covered up for so long
Although it has been known for a relatively long time that there is cross-immunity to the corona virus in a large percentage of the population, i.e. that not everyone can be infected all the time, this information has never been conveyed or taken into account in the debate	Because there is always a certain number that is vulnerable	This was the only way to maintain the myth of the menace and hopelessness of the situation without vaccination
The published opinion (radio, television, newspapers) was relatively unanimous; counter-opinions were practically only in often dubious alternative media	Because the smarter heads are in the quality media.	The mainstream media function above all systemically and are guided by what opinion is permissible [47]
Criticism of the official narrative could soon hardly be voiced without those who voiced it being denigrated as “contrarians”, “corona deniers”, “gossips” or otherwise; and indeed, sometimes it was also mainly extreme political groups who voiced the criticism particularly loudly	That’s right, a common line had to be found	Only by excluding, making invisible and denigrating criticism as conspiracy theory was it possible to retain the sovereignty of interpretation

An army of electronic and human fact-checkers keeps the mainstream narrative clean	Because it is important not to spread misinformation	The control of public opinion is central to credibility; therefore, corresponding groups were promoted early on and corresponding measures were required and practised by all simulation games
We are in year 3 of the pandemic: the Western world is at least 70% vaccinated; the vaccines are not doing what they were promised to do; the virus variants are becoming less and less of a concern. Yet the world is not moving out of pandemic mode	Only when Covid-19 is completely defeated is it possible	It's not about the pandemic; it's about selling as many vaccines as possible or about control or both
Many opportunities for participation – travelling, going to concerts or restaurants – are not possible for the unvaccinated, depending on the country.	That's right, let them get vaccinated	This is the only way to break the residual resistance and/or install an appropriate control procedure (vaccination passport)
For some time now, children have been aggressively courted to be vaccinated, even though they themselves have only a low risk of contracting the disease.	Children can infect others	Only if children are also vaccinated can the number be increased

In Search of a Suitable Theory

The characteristic of a good theory is that it explains *all* phenomena well, and as parsimoniously as possible. I do not have such a theory. The mainstream narrative is undoubtedly parsimonious. But does it cover all phenomena sufficiently well? I don't think so.

There may have been a stupid accident, which was then used extremely cleverly by some

players. The long preparations through simulation games came to the rescue. And suddenly all the mechanisms we know snap into place.

How plausible is it to assume that foundations and NGOs, which are at the same time closely linked to the pharmaceutical industry, invest tens of billions over an entire decade in projects designed to prepare the world for pandemics and the corresponding behavioural patterns, only to discontinue this funding at the very moment when the pandemic arrives? Röper breaks down the relevant data very precisely in his new book [11]. The conclusion of this work is: it was all about installing this vaccination from the very beginning because it opens up a new business model and perhaps even a new model of society.

The parsimonious minimal version of a theory is that of a laboratory accident, which then triggers all the practised mechanisms practically automatically, so that not much planning is needed. This model has the charm that there are no bad guys lurking in the background, except for the laboratory researchers who have made a mess of things with their military research and belong under stricter control, as German scientists are now demanding (https://www.cicero.de/aussenpolitik/hamburger-erklarung-2022-gain-of-function-wuhan-corona-drosten-wiesendanger). However, this theory is contradicted by more recent facts:

- That the pandemic has not ended, although the drama has cooled down
- That vaccination is being pushed even though it has extremely high side effects compared to other vaccinations
- That criticising vaccination and pointing out its side effects is tantamount to lèse majesté
- That there is little variance in the reactions of at least the Western states
- That the children are advertised very aggressively.

For these reasons and more, I don't think this theoretical variant is strong enough. The mainstream narrative is not (any longer) sustainable for me. After all the phenomena listed above and the weakness of conventional explanations, can one still believe the mainstream narrative? An Israeli activist, Avital Livny, who runs a website with video testimonies of vaccination victims in Israel, the Testimonies Project (https://www.vaxtestimonies.org/en/), recently said in the Grand Jury (https://www.grand-jury.net/), which examines the likelihood of a conspiracy in a legal form, on Day 4: "*In Israel, the difference between conspiracy theory and reality is 6 months*".

A "Plandemie", i.e. a long-planned action with the aim of introducing a new medical intervention, the mRNA vaccinations, would be a theory that allows most phenomena to be understood without constraint. Even if it does not sit well with us. Because it means: our political elite is either blind or corrupt or dependent or all of the above, and our intellectual

elite, with exceptions, is equally blind and dependent, or knowing but cowardly. Not very nice either.

The manifestation of plutocracy, i.e. the rule of the rich who rule in secret and control the actions of politics through very private wires would be another model with a certain intermediate status. Here, perhaps, the trigger would be a random accident. But then very quickly come the circles of beneficiaries who realise that this "accident" can be used lucratively and begin to influence politics accordingly. This intermediate model is contradicted by the fact that certain central actions, such as Gates' involvement with corresponding companies, took place long before the outbreak of the pandemic.

Perhaps there are other variants that make our political leadership look better: that at the beginning, for example, they believed in a dangerous laboratory germ that had to be fought at all costs, and then further strengthened this belief so as not to become untrustworthy, and now the whole circus has taken on a life of its own and they have to let it continue according to the rules they have set up.

Are there other plans and ideas? Controlling the masses to introduce a new way of doing business, more online, digital and via big corporations? [48] How should we understand the fact that the WHO – supported by various billionaires such as Gates and Arsenault – is currently discussing the introduction of a central pandemic regiment that would largely subject the sovereignty of the nation states in a pandemic to the dictates of the WHO (and thus to undemocratic bureaucratic control) (https://corona-transition.org/morgen-beginnen-bei-der-who-in-genf-die-verhandlungen-uber-ein-verbindliches), a process that is so far unique in the history of the WHO?

Or are there other goals that we don't even see yet, such as masking the economic fiasco our world is in? Perhaps different actors have different goals that meet in an intersection, namely to keep the pandemic going and vaccination as salvation?

I don't think we are yet in a position to name the applicable theory. But it seems to me that a theory that dispenses with the existence of any kind of conspiracy cannot explain all phenomena well enough. At least the freeloaders in waiting who want to sell their vaccines need it. And that is actually conspiracy enough.

I think it would be wise for opinion makers to stop using the term "conspiracy theory" and instead have a more open discourse.

Sources

1. Husserl E. Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie. Hamburg: Meiner; 2009, orig. 930.
2. Ockham Wv. Quaestiones in III Librum Sententiarum. In: Kelley FE, Etzkorn GI, editors. Opera Theologica, Vol 6. St.Bonaventure: Franciscan Institute; 1982. p. 43-97.
3. Atmanspacher H, Römer H, Walach H. Weak quantum theory: Complementarity and entanglement in physics and beyond. Foundations of Physics. 2002;32:379-406.
4. Schwarzer N. The Theory of Everything: Quantum and Relativity is Everywhere – A Fermat Universe. Singapore: Jenny Stanford; 2020.
5. Talbot D. The Devil's Chessboard: Allen Dulles, the CIA, and the Rise of America's Secret Government. London: Collins; 2015.
6. Anton A, Schink A. Der Kampf um die Wahrheit: Verschwörungstheorien zwischen Fake, Fiktion und Fakten. München: Komplett Media; 2021.
7. White DG, Mitchell WS, editors. Geoengineering: Technology and Governance, Assessments of Climate Engineering. New York: Nova Science Publishers; 2012.
8. Sutton AC. Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler. Sudbury: Bloomfield Books; 1976.
9. Ganser D. Imperium USA. Die skrupellose Weltmacht. Zürich: Orell Füssli; 2020.
10. Ross CA. Bluedbird: Deliberate Creation of Multiple Personality by Psychiatrists. Richardson, TX: Manitou Communications; 2000.
11. Röper T. Inside Corona: Die Pandemie, das Netzwerk und die Hintermänner. Die wahren Ziele hinter Corona. Gelnhausen: J-K Fischer; 2022.
12. Oreskes N, Conway EM. Merchants of Doubt: How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming. London: Bloomsbury; 2012, orig. 2010.
13. Gøtzsche PC. Deadly Medicines and Organised Crime: How Big Pharma Has Corrupted Health Care. London: Radcliff; 2013.
14. Ambati BK, Varshney A, Lundstrom K, Palú G, Uhal BD, Uversky VN, et al. MSH3 Homology and Potential Recombination Link to SARS-CoV-2 Furin Cleavage Site. Frontiers in Virology. 2022;2.
15. Relman DA. Opinion: To stop the next pandemic, we need to unravel the origins of COVID-19. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2020;117(47):29246-8. doi: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2021133117.
16. Coutard B, Valle C, de Lamballerie X, Canard B, Seidah NG, Decroly E. The spike glycoprotein of the new coronavirus 2019-nCoV contains a furin-like cleavage site absent in CoV of the same clade. Antiviral Research. 2020;176:104742. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.antiviral.2020.104742.

17. Kennedy Jr. RF. The Real Anthony Fauci. Bill Gates, Big Pharma, and the Global War on Democray and Public Health. New York: Skyhorse Publishing; 2021.
18. Andersen KG, Rambaut A, Lipkin WI, Holmes EC, Garry RF. The proximal origin of SARS-CoV-2. Nature Medicine. 2020;26(4):450-2. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0820-9.
19. Calisher C, Carroll D, Colwell R, Corley RB, Daszak P, Drosten C, et al. Statement in support of the scientists, public health professionals, and medical professionals of China combatting COVID-19. The Lancet. 2020;395(10226):e42-e3. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30418-9.
20. Schreyer P. Chronik einer angekündigten Krise: Wie ein Virus die Welt verändern könnte. Frankfurt: Westend; 2020.
21. McCullough PA, Kelly RJ, Ruocco G, Lerma E, Tumlin J, Wheelan KR, et al. Pathophysiological Basis and Rationale for Early Outpatient Treatment of SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Infection. The American Journal of Medicine. 2021;134(1):16-22. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2020.07.003.
22. Ndeupen S, Qin Z, Jacobsen S, Estanbouli H, Bouteau A, Igyártó BZ. The mRNA-LNP platform's lipid nanoparticle component used in preclinical vaccine studies is highly inflammatory. bioRxiv. 2021. Epub 2021/03/11. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.04.430128. PubMed PMID: 33688649; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7941620.
23. Doshi P. Covid-19 vaccines: In the rush for regulatory approval, do we need more data? BMJ. 2021;373:n1244. doi: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n1244.
24. Tanveer S, Rowhani-Farid A, Hong K, Jefferson T, Doshi P. Transparency of COVID-19 vaccine trials: decisions without data. BMJ Evidence-Based Medicine. 2021:bmjebm-2021-111735. doi: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjebm-2021-111735.
25. Walach H, Klement RJ, Aukema W. The risk-benefit ratio of Covid-19 vaccines: Publication policy by retraction does nothing to improve it. Clinical and Translational Discovery. 2022;2(1):e35. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/ctd2.35.
26. Walach H, Klement RJ, Aukema W. Retracted: The Safety of COVID-19 Vaccinations—We Should Rethink the Policy. Vaccines. 2021;9(7):693. doi: 10.3390/vaccines9070693. doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9070693.
27. Walach H, Klement RJ, Aukema W. The Safety of COVID-19 Vaccinations — Should We Rethink the Policy? Science, Public Health Policy, and the Law. 2021;3:87-99. https://www.publichealthpolicyjournal.com/general-5
28. Ioannidis JPA. The infection fatality rate of COVID-19 inferred from seroprevalence data. Bulletin of the World Health Organization. 2021;99:19-33F. doi: https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.20.265892.
29. Dehning J, Zierenberg J, Spitzner FP, Wibral M, Neto JP, Wilczek M, et al. Inferring change points in the spread of COVID-19 reveals the effectiveness of interventions.

Science. 2020;369(6500):eabb9789. doi: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abb9789.
30. Dehning J, Spitzner FP, Linden M, Mohr SB, Neto JP, Zierenberg J, et al. Model-based and model-free characterization of epidemic outbreaks – Technical notes on Dehning et al., Science, 2020.
31. Kuhbandner C, Homburg S, Walach H, Hockertz S. Was Germany's Lockdown in Spring 2020 Necessary? How bad data quality can turn a simulation into a dissimulation that shapes the future. Futures. 2022;135:102879. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2021.102879.
32. Lausen T, van Rossum W. Die Intensivmafia: Von den Hirten der Pandemie und ihren Profiten. München: Rubikon; 2021.
33. Frank G. Der Staatsvirus. Ein Arzt erklärt, wie die Vernunft im Lockdown starb. Berlin: Achgut; 2021.
34. Herby J, Jonung L, Hanke SH. A literature review and meta-analysis of the efffects of lockdowns on COVID-19 Mortality. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Institute für Applied Economics, Global Health, and the Study of Business Enterprise, 2022.
35. Kepp KP, Bjørnskov C. Lockdown Effects on Sars-CoV-2 Transmission – The evidence from Northern Jutland. medRxiv. 2021:2020.12.28.20248936. doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.28.20248936.
36. Kisielinski K, Giboni P, Prescher A, Klosterhalfen B, Graessel D, Funken S, et al. Is a Mask That Covers the Mouth and Nose Free from Undesirable Side Effects in Everyday Use and Free of Potential Hazards? International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2021;18(8):4344. doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18084344.
37. Kappstein I. Mund-Nasen-Schutz in der Öffentlichkeit: Keine Hinweise für eine Wirksamkeit. Krankenhaushygiene up2date. 2020;15(03):279-97. doi: https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1174-6591.
38. World Health Organization (WHO). Mask use in the context of Covid-19. Geneva: WHO, 2020.
39. Amanzio M, Howick J, Bartoli M, Cipriani GE, Kong J. How Do Nocebo Phenomena Provide a Theoretical Framework for the COVID-19 Pandemic? Frontiers in Psychology. 2020;11(2805). doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.589884.
40. Everts J. The dashboard pandemic. Dialogues in Human Geography. 2020;10(2):260-4. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820620935355
41. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DK, et al. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR. Eurosurveillance. 2020;25(3):2000045. doi: doi:https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045.
42. Borger P, Malhotra RK, Yeadon M, Craig C, McKernan K, Steger K, et al. External peer review of the RTPCR test to detect SARS-CoV-2 reveals 10 major scientific flaws

at the molecular and methodological level: consequences for false positive results. Zenodo. 2020;4298004. doi: http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4298004.
43. Walach H, Ofner M, Ruof V, Herbig M, Klement RJ. Why do people consent to receiving SARS-CoV2 vaccinations? A Representative Survey in Germany. Research Square. 2022. doi: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1216502/v1.
44. Franco-Paredes C. Transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 among fully vaccinated individuals. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2022;22(1):16. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00768-4.
45. Kampf G. The epidemiological relevance of the COVID-19-vaccinated population is increasing. The Lancet Regional Health – Europe. 2021;11:100272. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100272.
46. Seneff S, Nigh G, Kyriakopoulos A, McCullough P. Innate Immune Suppression by SARS-CoV-2 mRNA Vaccinations: The role of G-quadruplexes, exosomes and microRNAs. Authorea (Preprint). 2022;Jan 21. doi: https://doi.org/10.22541/au.164276411.10570847/v1.
47. Meyen M. Die Propaganda Matrix: Der Kampf für freie Medien entscheided über unsere Zukunft [The Propaganda Matrix: The Fight for Free Media Decides our Future]. München: Rubikon; 2021.
48. Schwab K, Malleret T. COVID-19: The Great Reset. Cologny, Geneva: Forum Publishing; 2020.