


24th April

## Bill Gates Analysis



[[https://1.bp.blogspot.com/-](https://1.bp.blogspot.com/-IMPErupT2UI/XqKiEXZ2oRI/AAAAAAAAAQs/hWAhVaf30N84fjRON5OLGt5Bj34X4Xu5ACLcBGAsYHQ/s1600/Bill%2BGates.jpg)

[IMPErupT2UI/XqKiEXZ2oRI/AAAAAAAAAQs/hWAhVaf30N84fjRON5OLGt5Bj34X4Xu5ACLcBGAsYHQ/s1600/Bill%2BGates.jpg](https://1.bp.blogspot.com/-IMPErupT2UI/XqKiEXZ2oRI/AAAAAAAAAQs/hWAhVaf30N84fjRON5OLGt5Bj34X4Xu5ACLcBGAsYHQ/s1600/Bill%2BGates.jpg)]

### Bill Gates

The global lockdown continues on into the end of April with different countries having varying numbers of infected and dead. Most people have been extremely accepting of lockdown although some now are beginning to question whether it should now be cautiously lifted.

Bill Gates has been on television repeatedly discussing a vaccine for COVID19.

This is a segment from an interview he did with the BBC posted online on April 12th.

### Bill Gates BBC Interview segment April 12<sup>th</sup> 2020

***“And the thing that will get us back to the world that we had before corona virus is the vaccine and getting that out to all 7 billion people and we’ll need to fund about 10 the 10 most promising constructs because we won’t know in advance which one will prove to be safe and effective, and being effective for older peoples immune system is weak is a huge challenge. If you really amp up the vaccine to do that then you can run into safety issues. The people like myself and Tony Fauci are saying 18 months. If everything went perfectly, we could do slightly better than that but there will be a trade-off. We’ll have less safety testing than we typically would have and so governments will have to decide you know do they indemnify the companies and really say let’s, let’s go out with this ahh when it’s, we just don’t have the time to do what we normally do.”***

Interviewer

*So, as I understand it then what you’re saying is that it may be that there needs to be some compromise in some of the safety measures that normally be expected to create a vaccine because time is so crucial?*

***“Well of course if you want to wait and see if a side effect shows up 2 years later that takes 2 years so we will I think be able to get some safety indications but it, this is a public good and so you know those trade-offs, the governments working on a cooperative basis will be involved in a decision to say hey the regulators says go ahead even though you haven’t taken the normal time period”***

## Questions for analysis

1. Does Gates have a specific vaccine in mind?
2. Does he expect the vaccine to be safe without detrimental side effects?
3. Is there anything else within the language of interest?

*“And the thing that will get us back to the world that we had before Corona Virus is the vaccine and getting that out to all 7 billion people,”*

1. The subject (Bill Gates) identifies one thing that is needed to get us back. This is the vaccine. It is not, “what will get us back” or “the steps that will get us back” it is the vaccine. No other options are in the mind of the subject. Herd immunity is not a consideration in the perception of the subject.
2. The subject uses the article “the” for a vaccine. This can be an indication of prior knowledge. For example, if a shopkeeper reporting a robbery says “the man pulled **the** gun on me” it is an indication that the subject knew of the gun before it was pulled on him. This may mean he is an accomplice in the robbery. Articles are important indicators in Analysis.

What has caused the article “the” in the verbal perception of reality for the subject? The expected is “a vaccine”. At this point, the article “the” is an indicator that the subject has knowledge of a vaccine. Is this because there is one showing more promise than others, that he has in mind or does he know which one will be used? We do not know.

3. Can the article “the” be appropriate in that the subject is describing the cure to a specific virus? The Corona virus.

*and we’ll need to fund about 10, the 10 most promising constructs **because we won’t know in advance**which one will prove to be safe and effective*

1. Who is “we’ll” regarding the funding? Does the subject wish to be involved with all of the most “promising constructs”? He does not say the most promising constructs will need to be funded. He wishes to be involved with all.
2. The subject then gives us the reason why 10 need to be funded. This is an indication of sensitivity.
3. The subject tells us in the negative making it doubly important. How else could this be said? The subject could have said, “we will need to fund about 10 to find the safest and most effective”. The negative and unnecessary wording increases the sensitivity.
4. “in advance” is unnecessary wording. The sentence works without these words. Unnecessary words may seem unnecessary to us, but they are doubly important to the subject. Why does he have the need to tell us he would not know in advance?

Combined with the article “the” for “the vaccine” and now the need to use the unnecessary words “in advance”, the question of whether the subject knows which vaccine is to be used becomes stronger. Does Gates know what vaccine is to be used?

5. The word “one” is also unnecessary. Is it not possible that more than one will prove to be safe and effective? Why are the ten being singled down to one this early on in the process of finding a vaccine? Is

this another indicator that “one” in particular has been singled out or is the subject simply moving forward in his mind to where only one will be needed?

6. Note the order of what “we” are looking for. Safe and effective. This is good.

*and being effective for older people’s immune system is weak is a huge challenge. If you really amp up the vaccine to do that then you can run into safety issues.*

1. When speaking of older people’s immune systems, which the subject describes as “weak” the word “safe” has been removed.
2. The challenge of being effective on older people is qualified by the word “huge” and it will need to be “really amped up”.
3. What is “amping up” a vaccine? Whatever it is, it has caused the subject to remove “safety”.
4. The subject has changed from “we” to “you” at this point in the statement. He is distancing himself from the “amp up” of the vaccine.
5. The distancing continues with the word “that” within the sensitive reason why. We distance ourselves from “that” and we bring ourselves close with the word “this”.
6. Note the pronouns. The subject continues with the distance. Who can run into safety issues. Not “we”. It is “you”.

*The people like myself and Tony Fauci are saying 18 months.*

1. The subject here distances himself from the statement of 18 months, by referring to himself as “the people like myself”. Why would he do this? Is he unsure of his timeframe?
2. He brings in Tony Fauci to buttress his words. He does not want to be alone in this prediction of time.

*If everything went perfectly, we could do slightly better than that, but there will be a trade-off.*

1. There is no room for error in perfectly. It is not “goes well”. Does anything ever go perfectly in the field of scientific research?
2. Even under everything going perfectly doing better is qualified by “slightly” and then distanced by “that”.
3. The pronoun “we” returns.
4. The word “but” minimizes or refutes what came before it.

*We’ll have less safety testing than we typically would have and so governments will have to decide, you know do they indemnify the companies and really say let’s, let’s go out with this ahh when it’s, we just don’t have the time to do what we normally do.*

1. The sensitivity increases as the subject gives us the reason why governments will have to decide.
2. The subject places the responsibility on the Governments.
3. The subject distances himself from the companies at this point.
4. Why does the subject not say “And give the people the vaccine”? He minimizes to “really say let’s, let’s go out with this”. Is this an indication of a lack of confidence in the vaccine? It reduces “the vaccine” to an expression of commitment to “go out” which the subject brings close to him with the word “this”.

*Interviewer*

*So, as I understand it then what you're saying is that it may be that there needs to be some compromise in some of the safety measures that normally be expected to create a vaccine because time is so crucial?*

*Well of course if you want to wait and see if a side effect shows up 2 years later that takes 2 years,*

1. The subject recognizes the potential for side effects of the vaccine.
2. Is the subject annoyed at this question? Is he suggesting that waiting is a ridiculous idea in the circumstances even though safety will be compromised? Note the pronoun "you". Not "we" or "I". Gates does not want to wait.
3. The subject has introduced the two-year period. Has there been side effects at the two-year period for other trials?

*so we will I think be able to get some safety indications but it,*

1. "I think" is a point of weakness.
2. "be able" is not to do. It lacks commitment.
3. "some" is inconclusive.
4. "but" weakens further the already weak assertion about the safety of the vaccine.
5. The subject self-censors his words. What was he going to say? "**But it what**"?

*this is a public good and so you know those trade-offs,*

1. This is sensitive. The reason why and then the subject self-censors again. Those trade offs what?
2. The subject distances himself from the trade-offs by his use of the word "those", as oppose to "these" or "the".

*the governments working on a cooperative basis will be involved in a decision to say hey the regulatorssays go ahead even though you haven't taken the normal time period.*

1. "will be". Is this something that has already been decided?
2. The subject only raises one outcome for the decision. There is no whether to, or not stated.
3. Who are the regulators? Who appoints them and who do they answer to?

Conclusions

**Question 1. Does Gates have a specific vaccine in mind?** It is likely at the time of this interview Gates either knows which vaccine is to be used or has a specific vaccine in mind which he believes is the one which will be chosen. There are different reasons why he may conceal this information. Safety testing, effectiveness. We don't know.

**Question 2. Does he expect the vaccine to be safe without detrimental side effects?**

From the language it is likely that Gates expects there to be safety issues with the vaccine. Gates prioritizes safety before effectiveness but then removes safety when referencing the "Huge challenge" presented by older people.


**Question 3. Is there anything else within the language of interest?**

- a. Gates offers no guarantees of either safety or effectiveness, yet he wants all seven billion people to take the vaccine.
- b. Gates linguistically removes himself from the people taking the vaccine in this interview. He does not say "All seven billion of us". He is not there. It would be interesting to hear his answer to the question of whether he and his loved ones will be taking the vaccine.
- c. Gates will likely seek indemnity for any vaccine he is involved with which will leave him out of reach for anyone who suffers side effects in both the short term and long term.

### Final Thought

From the few analysts and others I have either read or discussed this with, some will be there with their sleeves rolled up ready for the injection, whilst others will do whatever it takes to avoid the vaccine needle. The most important thing in my opinion is that we are given the freedom to make the choice ourselves with as much information as possible.

Posted 24th April by [Through the Lens](#)

 2 View comments



**togel toto123** [May 27, 2020 at 11:25 PM](#)

<http://apartamentosecasas.org/> merupakan situs agen togel online terbesar di Asia yang memiliki permainan serta bonus terlengkap

[Reply](#)



**Not Conned** [July 28, 2020 at 5:17 PM](#)

This is a tremendous piece of work. It's encouraging that they sometimes can't help revealing what they are really up to. I watched the interview at the time it went out and thought his pushing the need to vaccinate everybody in the world at a relatively early stage in the 'pandemic' was over the top. To me it indicated that the mass vaccination was in itself an important goal, and he wanted to plant it in people's

minds to get them used to the idea. It's pretty obvious that it will kill off the 'burdensome old people' and will contain things that affect the rest of the recipients in ways that serve the perpetrators.

[Reply](#)

Enter your comment...

Comment as: Google Accour ▼

**Publish**

**Preview**