

Fixing the COVID-19 Disaster: What is the Best Strategy?

The COVID-19 disaster is mostly the result of poor (i.e., unscientific) policies. These include Medical Establishment (WHO, FDA, CDC, NIH, AMA, etc.) endorsed actions ranging from lockdowns, to mandatory masks and mandatory injections.

Conversely the Medical Establishment failed to support actions that would have substantially reduced hospitalizations and deaths (e.g., like optimizing immune systems, endorsing a science-based early treatment protocol, etc.).

Why haven't the Medical Establishment's counter-productive responses been fixed (or self-corrected) now that we are over two years into the COVID-19 disaster?

Some possible reasons for the Medical Establishment not wanting to admit that their COVID-19 positions were wrong:

- Arrogance/saving face.
- To avoid legal liability.
- They really don't understand Science.
- They wanted the deaths and adverse consequences to occur.
- Their economic allegiances are stronger than their interest in the public's health.

Put politely, the answers boil down to either incompetence or corruption. Or both.

So what are responsible medical practitioners, scientists and educated citizens to do? Basically they have two distinctly different strategies to take: **a)** a Bottom-Up approach, or **b)** a Top-Down tactic. Each has good and bad points. Let's briefly look at both.

A **Bottom-Up path** would be to educate the public as to what is going on, and hope that public pressure results in meaningful changes. The problems with this are:

- 1 - A clear majority of the populace would likely need to be educated — which means some 200 Million people in the US. That is a LOT of people.
- 2 - To properly educate 200± million people on *any* new topic would take a huge amount of time, effort and cost.
- 3 - Since mainstream media outlets will not cooperate with accurate COVID-19 education, the amount of time and effort is increased even more.
- 4 - The situation is much harder in the COVID-19 situation, as a continuous flow of misinformation is flooding the public, from the Left-leaning mainstream media. The consequence of this is that adequately educating the public is likely ten times harder than it would normally be.

- 5 - COVID-19 is a complex science matter, and 95%± of the public is technically challenged. This makes the education part almost impossibly difficult.
- 6 - Americans are generally trusting souls, so they are naturally inclined to believe that those in authority are giving them honest and accurate information. Dispelling that belief system will be very problematic.
- 7 - Humans instinctively act to avoid threats. Bad actors know this and play on our fears to try to justify a wide-variety of self-serving actions. Dispelling carefully fabricated fears is a difficult time-consuming process.
- 8 - With these considerations, to get to the point where the majority of the public is properly educated on COVID-19 would likely take many years.
- 9 - We can't afford to wait many years in the COVID-19 matter, as by that time irreconcilable damage will have been done — including the completely avoidable killing of hundreds of thousands of American citizens.
- 10-Even after the majority of the public is supportive of the true Science position, there is questionable benefit. For example, this majority position does not assure that real Science will be reflected in federal agencies (think climate change).

A **Top-Down approach** would be to go for the head of the snake. In this case, that would mean suing the FDA. The problems with this are:

- 1 - Such lawsuits will likely be expensive — so who will pay for it?
- 2 - It can be difficult to find proper attorneys. Appropriate lawyers would be competent, aggressive people who are working on this as a matter of principle, not just as a business opportunity.
- 3 - Federal agencies have gone to great lengths to legally insulate themselves from being responsible to the public.
- 4 - Judges frequently decide cases based on legal technicalities (like standing), rather than the merits.

We are advocating the Top-Down route. The main reasons are:

- a) Two + years in and educating the public has not produced meaningful changes.
- b) The first two Top-Down liabilities have been addressed.
- c) The upside is enormous. Winning a strong EUA ([Emergency Use Authorization](#)) case against the FDA could well topple the whole house of cards assembled by the Medical Establishment.

That said, there are substantial problems with making a legal case against the FDA. These include the realities that:

- 1 - The rules for FDA EUA regulations are buried in hundreds of pages of legal jargon, that almost no one can fully comprehend.
- 2 - The statutes were written more to defend the federal bureaucracy instead of optimizing public health.
- 3 - The culpability of the FDA Commissioner often hinge on the differences between seemingly innocuous words like “shall” vs “may”.
- 4 - The judiciary gives the FDA Commissioner broad discretion, especially in times of an emergency (see [Chevron Deference](#)). Yes, *broad* does not mean *unlimited*, but judges are not inclined to draw a line as to exactly where these limits are.

Despite these obstacles, we ascribe to Margaret Meade’s insightful [observation](#):

Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has.

One last comment: despite our conviction that a Top-Down approach is a far better option, we want to make clear that we still believe that educating the public has merit. Our point is that when we are time and resource limited, that we need to focus most of our time and effort into what will give us the most bang for the buck.

John Droz. jr.

physicist

5-2-22