

TB Disease Causation Inquiry

This document provides a brief summary of my inquiry into the bacteria that is alleged to cause the Tuberculous Disease.

Background

Last year, we purchased a lifestyle block because we were interested in being more self sufficient and the impending government restrictions. Cows were of interest as many of our neighbors raise cows on their pastures. Our research into cow ownership in New Zealand lead us to read about the [National Animal Identification & Tracing Act 2012](#). The act states in Section 3 Purpose (d)

manages risks to human health arising from residues in food, food-borne diseases, and diseases that are transmissible between animals and humans

Section 5 'Power to give directions' allows a NAIT officer to force insane treatment of animals like slaughtering animals both on and off Schedule 1 and Section 56 provides the NAIT officer with legal immunity.

Tuberculosis

In 2018, [New Zealand forced farmers to slaughter 150,000 cows](#) to reduce the spread of Tuberculosis Bovine (TB-B) or also known as Mycoplasma Bovis. To take such an extreme measure, surely the New Zealand government would have definitive proof that bacteria cause respiratory issues in animals. In order to eradicate the bacteria, they would also need to prove the origins of the bacteria to even begin to theorize that killing the cows would indeed result in the eradication of the bacteria.

Unscientific Experiments

A scientist colleague presented the "Aerosol delivery of virulent Mycobacterium bovis to cattle" (see [Palmer_2002_TB_Aerosol_Transmission.pdf](#)) as evidence for disease causation. Note, this paper does not satisfy Koch's postulates. Despite Koch's postulates, I wanted to verify if their methodology is logical and reasonable.

I found the following paragraph in their methods section.

"Twenty, healthy, Maine Anjou cattle (female and castrated male) aged 4 months, were randomly assigned to four groups. Two groups were experimentally infected with nebulizer produced a particle with approximately 5 mm diameter. 14 Compressed air (25 psi) was used to jet nebulize inoculum (2 ml M. bovis in PBS) directly into the holding chamber. Upon inspiration, the nebulized inoculum was inhaled through a one-way valve into the mask and directly into the nostrils. A rubber gasket sealed the mask securely to the muzzle preventing leakage of inoculum around the mask. Expired air exited through one-way valves on the sides of the mask. The nebulization process continued until all of the inoculum, a 1 ml PBS wash of the inoculum tube, and an additional 2 ml PBS were delivered (approximately 12 min). Experimental infection was done inside a biosafety level 3 (BL-3) building with personnel wearing appropriate personal protective equipment, including full-face respirators with HEPA-filtered canisters to prevent exposure to aerosolized M. bovis. The BL-3 animal housing had negative air pressure as compared to the outside. Airflow was such that air was pulled out of animal rooms towards a central corridor, preventing air exchange between rooms. The airflow was adjusted to produce 11.4 air changes per hour. Cattle were

housed two per pen (11 m²) according to treatment group in facilities approved by the Association for the Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International (AAALAC). A protocol detailing procedures and animal care was approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) prior to the beginning of the experiment."

The glaring problem with this experiment is that there are no control groups. A control group has the same parameters as the experimental group except for the variable being tested. So in this case, there needs to be a 3rd group of cows that were in the exact same environment as the 2 experimental groups. This 3rd group of cows needs to be exposed to nebulized saline solution including the same concentration of bacteria like particles. The control group would determine if it is the process that causes the lacerations of the lungs or if it is the bacteria. It would also be good to have additional groups that have fungi and other bacteria species nebulised to exclude that it is simply very small particles causing the lacerations irrespective if the particles are bacteria or not.

They did not provide enough time for the cows to get sick. They slaughtered the cows to see if they could find the bacteria (which of course they would find bacteria since they injected it into their lungs). So slaughtering them right away doesn't make any logical sense. This experiment does not demonstrate transmission either. Either from Cow to Cow or possum to Cow.

This is scientific fraud as there is no control group. It is fraud because the experiment does not support the claims in the paper. There are countless of these examples because Robert Koch is responsible for the fraudulent business of claiming bacteria cause disease.

Official Information

I asked several agencies of the New Zealand Government for the proof that Bacteria is the causative agent of Tuberculosis disease in both humans and animals. Koch's Postulates are a series of rules created by biologist in order to determine if a micro-organism causes disease. Unfortunately, Robert Koch (the man who the postulates were wrongfully named after) never once satisfied these postulates for any bacteria.

Request

The following is the request that I made to each organization that I thought would hold such information. The only variation is if I was asking for TB-B for animals or TB-T for humans.

===

All studies and/or reports in the possession, custody or control of the AGENCY that uses purified bacterium BACTERIA to prove causation of the alleged Tuberculosis disease in ORGANISM.

Please note that I am not requesting studies/reports where researchers failed to:

- Use valid controls
- Satisfy all 4 Koch's Postulates

The 4 Koch's Postulates are stated below:

1. The microorganism must be found in abundance in all organisms suffering from the disease, but should not be found in healthy organisms.
2. The microorganism must be isolated from a diseased organism and grown in pure culture.
3. The cultured microorganism should cause disease when introduced into a healthy organism.
4. The microorganism must be reisolated from the inoculated, diseased experimental host and identified as being identical to the original specific causative agent.

I am not seeking any records disputing Koch's postulates nor any records that attempt to justify the alleged Tuberculosis disease using unscientific methods. I am only seeking records that prove causation using valid scientific methods including valid control groups.

My request includes any study/report matching the above description, authored by anyone, anywhere.

If any records match the above description of requested records and are currently available to the public elsewhere, please provide enough information about each record so that I may identify and access each one with certainty (i.e. title, author(s), date, journal, where the public may access it). Please provide URLs where possible.

===

OIA Responses

I asked OSPRI because they are the organization that is contracted by the Government to fulfill NAIT. The Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) also works with OSPRI so they too should have this information if it exists. I inquired with ESR (a crown research institute) as they provide the testing and analysis for micro-organisms in humans. The Ministry of Health (MOH) only focuses on human disease and so I only asked about TB-T as I did with ESR.

All organizations reported they have no records for the satisfaction of Koch's postulates for:

- TB-B causing Tuberculosis in Cows or any animals
- TB-T causing Tuberculosis in Humans

The following table indicates the date of receipt, the organization that responded, and the bacteria that was requested.

Date	Organization	Bacteria
2021-12-20	OSPRI	TB-B
2021-11-29	MPI	TB-B
2021-11-29	MPI	TB-T
2021-11-23	ESR	TB-T
2021-11-19	MOH	TB-T

The attached zip contains the files categorized by organization.

OSPRI Papers

OSPRI responded to my request with 8 papers they claimed prove causation. However, they did not claim these papers satisfy Koch's postulates which they omitted from their original response. I followed up with them and they agreed they did not have any papers that satisfied Koch's.

I have reviewed the papers provided by OSPRI and have constructed the following table. The first column 'Paper' indicates the paper on their list. 'Satisfy Koch's' indicate if these papers claimed to satisfy Koch's postulates. The valid controls column indicates if these papers have control and if the controls are valid. A valid control should have the same environment as the experimental group sans the variable tested.

Paper	Satisfy Koch's	Valid Controls
1	✗	✗
2	✗	✗
3	✗	✗
4	✗	✗
5	✗	✗
6	✗	✗
7	✗	✗
8	✗	✗

1. Experimental Infection of Brushtail Possums

- Claims their male possums for experiment are from a TB Free Area without citation.
- Experiment 1 depressed their eyeballs and injected a liquid that contained the bacteria and other components. They also anesthetized and inserted a tube into their lungs which they then injected fluid that contained the bacteria.
- Experiment 2 they injected drops without depressing the eyeballs that contained the bacteria.
- The more evasive the process of injecting liquid into the possum, the sicker the possums became.
- They didn't conduct controls for experiment 1 or 2.

2. Optimal models to evaluate the protective efficacy of tuberculosis vaccines

- This paper is a review paper so does not conduct any experiments.

3. Experimental Mycobacterium bovis infection of cattle ...

- Claims their cows for experiment are from a TB Free Area without citation.
- 20 cows is a small sample size, larger groups and repeated studies are necessary.
- 4 Groups of cows: low dose, high dose, pregnant high dose, and a control.
- The authors claimed the high dose cows were inoculated 'in a similar manner' to the low dose.
 - Are there differences between the high dose and low dose inoculation? If no, why use similar instead of the word 'same'?
 - We need to ask the authors what was different about the inoculation between the low dose and the high dose groups.
- The author wrote 'The remaining five animals (control group) received an equivalent volume of Tween albumin broth intratracheally'
 - Why did the author not specify the actual quantity and instead use the word equivalent?
 - Did they inject 1.5ml of liquid into the control animals' lungs?
 - Note, they did not use the words 'innoculated intratracheally' for the control and instead used the words 'received'.
- The authors describe their process for intratracheal inoculation which is
 - Cattle were anaesthetised

- The cows mid neck was cut and the trachea exposed
 - A tube was inserted into the trachea where the liquid was injected
 - Then additional sterile saline equal to 1.5 times the volume of dead space of the tube was injected.
 - Antibiotics were injected into the cows.
- The intratracheal inoculation process bypasses the upper respiratory tract which never would happen in nature.
- There is no valid control for the high dose or low dose group where the control would substitute the quantity of bacteria with bacteria like particles injected in the cow's lower respiratory track.
- Was analysis of cows performed double blinded?
 - If not, than there could be bias in the results.
- All animals were slaughtered up to 171 days after inoculation and so no observation was made if the animal would recover or die.

4. Effect of oral vaccination of cattle with lipid-formulated BCG on ...

- Does not prove causation.
- Was the analysis of cows performed double blinded?
- The paper does not indicate if the un-vaccinated cows were given an injection which is required for this to be considered a valid control.

5. Tuberculosis in ruminants: characteristics of intra-tonsilar ...

- "in addition, groups of control animals (N ¼ 10 deer and N ¼ 2 cattle) that were not exposed to *M. bovis* were maintained under *similar* conditions."
 - Not the *same* conditions.
- Challenge Regime
 - Sedated the animal
 - Syringe injected liquid into the left tonsil crypt
- No mention of the control groups receiving an injection into the left tonsil crypt with saline, or any other liquid with the same sedimentation.

6. Percutaneous interdigital injection of *Mycobacterium bovis* ...

- Challenge
 - All animals sedated
 - Removed young from pouches if found (how does this effect the health of the mothers)?
 - All animals were injected under the skin.
- The control group was not injected with anything. This isn't a valid control as the same process applied to the experimental group was not applied to the control group.

7. *Mycobacterium bovis* infection in the brush-tailed possum ..

- "The control possums were in poor condition"
- Since the control possums were also in poor condition, then the results are inconclusive.
- The control design was not exactly the same as the experimental group design.
 - The control needed to have 2 sets of possums where 1 set was injected in the thigh with a substance similar to the experimental group.

8. Tuberculosis in the brushtail possum (*Trichosaurus vulpecula*) after ...

- The control group was not injected with an equivalent mixture (as they did not substitute bacteria for bacteria like particles).
- The injection process is not natural (inserting a tube deep into the trachea).

Summary

No New Zealand Government organization was able to provide records that proved bacteria causes the Tuberculosis disease in animals or humans. The NAIT Act provides 'legal' power for organizations to harm animals, farms, farmers, and animal owners for something that has never been scientifically proven. NAIT provides immunity to those that are responsible for harming others.

I believe that NAIT is a blueprint for the future of how New Zealand will track and trace humans. We need to expose acts like NAIT to the public and to show that the New Zealand Government has no proof for the claims they make regarding disease. If farmers knew that bacteria does not cause disease, would they go along with the slaughtering of their live stock? Or if Poultry Farmers knew that salmonella doesn't cause disease, would they allow their chicks to be slaughtered in the name of food health and safety? This happened to a bay of plenty farmer recently (Nicki's Eggs).

OIA responses like above can be used as protection for businesses the Government Seeks to penalize. Or at least provide them with a starting point to object to the cruel and harmful behavior enabled by NAIT. If enough farmers know about this, then OSPRI will simply lose its authority by default.