On the Cusp of the Aquarian Era

Dear Friend and Reader:

The world is in an interesting and delicate place as we approach the Aquarian Era. In three weeks, Jupiter and Saturn form a conjunction in the sign Aquarius for the first time since 1405. I've had to research that several times just to make sure I was seeing it right.

What is called the Great Conjunction, the one between the two largest planets, bounces all over the zodiac, running in little trends over the centuries. Two conjunctions in Aquarius (March 24, 1345, and Jan. 16, 1405) seem to ring in the Renaissance, and that's all we get for the conjunction in Aquarius until Dec. 21, 2020.*

This is the second rare conjunction of 2020. The Saturn-Pluto conjunction which took place on Jan. 12, 2020 last occurred in 1982, 1947 and 1915. However, none were in Capricorn; the most recent Saturn-Pluto conjunction in Capricorn **occurred in 1518**.

<< https://planetwaves.net/what-happened-at-the-last-saturn-pluto-conjunction-in-capricorn/

We have had a suitably strange year — a watershed year in the history of civilization, with many unprecedented events still unfolding. And where exactly do we stand? I will catch you up on the events of the past week or so, leading into the Gemini eclipse of the Moon that took place early Monday morning.

The Bifurcated Consciousness of 2020

The world has not experienced on pandemic but many related events, and many ways of perceiving it. Most people are feeling the economic impact of entire economies reshaped, school districts shut down, and tens of millions newly unemployed or out of business, nearly overnight.

I covered this in a new article called **Which Pandemic Are You Living Through?**

<< https://planetwaves.net/which-pandemic-are-you-living-through/

People are divided between those who are terrified of a novel virus, those who are taking it in stride or are a bit skeptical, and those who are tracking the official narrative falling apart day by day. I have never seen such disparity between what I see reported in the official news media, and what I know to be true from my own journalistic efforts.

Over Thanksgiving week were three of the most scientifically relevant events of the year.

First, Johns Hopkins University, in its official newsletter, reported that by its independent review of CDC data, **there were no excess deaths in 2020**. Johns Hopkins is a pillar of the medical establishment and has been one of the official voices on the issue. The notion of excess deaths is at the foundation of the claim that there is a pandemic happening.

<< web.archive.org/web/20201122214034/https://www.jhunewsletter.com/article/2020/11/a-closer-look-at-u-s-deaths-due-to-covid-19

"Surprisingly, the deaths of older people stayed the same before and after COVID-19. Since COVID-19 mainly affects the elderly, experts expected an increase in the percentage of deaths in older age groups. However, this increase is not seen from the CDC data. In fact, the percentages of deaths among all age groups remain relatively the same," the University published in its official newsletter.

"These data analyses suggest that in contrast to most people's assumptions, the number of deaths by COVID-19 is not alarming. In fact, it has relatively no effect on deaths in the United States," the article continues.

This cause such an uproar that five days later, the medical school tried to **walk back the article**, "to stop the spread of misinformation, as we noted on social media." They did not say that the article was wrong, only that other sources should also be accessed. So what exactly happened? Is nobody vetting official publications of Johns Hopkins, or did they get heat from political actors for "minimizing" the pandemic?

<< jhunewsletter.com/article/2020/11/a-closer-look-at-u-s-deaths-due-to-covid-19

Ten Million People Studied: No Asymptomatic Spread

Second, on Nov. 20, 2020, the eminent journal *Nature* published a study of nearly 10 million people demonstrating that there is **no asymptomatic spread of the virus**.

<< https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-19802-w

This involved testing every person in the city of Wuhan, where the outbreak is said to have begun. The notion of the lockdowns, of social distancing, of masking, and closing the social life of entire societies is based solely on the notion of asymptomatic spread.

While that concept has never had a solid foundation, and is based on presumptions and also computer models, and was denied by a top official of the World Health Organization in the spring, studying every person in a massive city provides insight into what is really going on.

The study used extremely stringent protocols. For example, "All asymptomatic positive cases, repositive [reinfection] cases and their close contacts were isolated for at least 2 weeks until

the results of nucleic acid testing were negative. None of detected positive cases or their close contacts became symptomatic or newly confirmed with COVID-19 during the isolation period."

Consortium of Scientists Demands Retraction of PCR Test Specifications

Finally, as if all of that were not enough, a consortium of European scientists has conducted an analysis of the specifications for the test being used to create the case count, the death count, and to conduct nearly all other research.

The group has demanded the retraction of a paper published on Jan. 23 by *Eurosurveillance*, which claimed that there was proof of a novel virus, and proof of causation of Covid disease.

The retraction demand outlined the methods being used involving a device called the polymerase chain reaction (PCR). This is a device that can find individual molecules, which is then claimed to diagnose a disease. The independent review found 10 categories of major scientific flaws in the design and use of the test protocol.

This is the same protocol endorsed by the World Health Organization and which is being used in nearly every country. Since March, smaller publications have been documenting problems with the test, beginning with **an article by Celia Farber**, who covered the issue in the 1990s. then Jon Rappoport did an **analysis of government documents** about use of PCR for 2019-n-CoV, which say that the test should not be used to diagnose disease or infection status.

<< https://uncoverdc.com/2020/04/07/was-the-covid-19-test-meant-to-detect-a-virus/

<< https://blog.nomorefakenews.com/2020/03/30/corona-creating-the-illusion-of-a-pandemic-through-diagnostic-tests/

Then in August, **The New York Times did the first of several articles** indicating that because the cycle threshold is set too high, the test may be getting 90% false positives.

<< https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/29/health/coronavirus-testing.html

This was an improvement from the 100% false positive rate that **the Times previously documented in 2007**, after an incident at Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center. The article warned that relying on the PCR could create pseudo epidemics, which according to one source in the article, "happen all the time."

<< https://www.nytimes.com/2007/01/22/health/22whoop.html

The Nov. 28 demand for retraction is the first technical analysis by molecular biologists and doctors that explains why these problems happen, and why they are worse in the case of the Covid version of the PCR. "These are severe design errors, since the test cannot discriminate

between the whole virus and viral fragments. The test cannot be used as a diagnostic for SARS-viruses," the authors write.

The authors conclude that the problems they detail "render the entire test-protocol useless with regards to delivering accurate test-results of real significance in an ongoing pandemic."

* (If we search the other direction, there was one in Aquarius in 1285, and then previously in 1226. Note, the 1226 conjunction involves Chiron, and is likely to be the gravitational event that put Chiron into its current orbit.)