

# BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS EXPLAINED

THIS IS A LETTER SENT TO FARMER KEN JACKSON CONCERNING BOXSTER  
THE PRIZE BULL AND BOVINE TUBERCULOSIS BASED ON BOVINE TB NOT  
AN INFECTIOUS DISEASE

From: John Wantling, Rochdale  
Email: [john.wantling@btinternet.com](mailto:john.wantling@btinternet.com)  
Date: Monday 27<sup>th</sup> August 2018

To: Farmer Ken Jackson  
Forlorn Hope Farm  
Grove Road  
Womersley  
Doncaster  
DN6 9BT

Monday 27<sup>th</sup> August 2018

Dear sir (Farmer Ken Jackson)

I saw you and your wife briefly at the recent Halifax agricultural show. I gave your wife a few articles on the bovine TB issue that I happen to write about. My writings claim that bovine TB isn't a so-called 'infectious' disease. In your Boxster court case, you might have raised the question, how is it possible that a skin test, which is a poison related test, meaning that it involves the introduction of foreign matter into the skin of a cow - how is it possible for this test result which is liable to cause an immune response (reactor cow), to be translated into 'infectious' language. This has to be a complete mystery!



## MAGIC AND MAKE BELIEVE

Surely we need to use an infectious disease test - not a poison-related test. The answer to this question is that we simply don't have one, and so we then have no choice in that we have to revert to magic and make-believe. I claim that this infectious translation is a scientific fraud. This is science in default mode, which means that we base our thinking on a human translation based on the fraudulent germ theory of disease, which goes back 100 years in time. This means that we believe that disease transmission, meaning the catching or the spreading of disease, comes from outside of the body.

An example of this is the bacteria (bovine TB) which we believe to be an outside-in (infectious) process. I claim that this is a theory, and that it has always been a theory. I claim that this bacteria comes from within as a response to an external stressor. In other words, when TB comes to life, this is a natural immune response. This means that TB bacteria (immune response) isn't a disease. This is why the cows that test 'positive' to the skin test are invariably healthy cows - they are not sick cows. The sick cow theory is only theoretical, unless, of course, the cow is sick. Sadly, a skin test does not tell us if a cow is healthy or sick. All it does is cause an immune response, which of course, is a poison-related response - not a so-called 'infectious' response.

The dictionary definition of disease involves signs and symptoms - not no signs and no symptoms. To slaughter a healthy cow showing a natural immune response to the introduction of foreign matter is sheer madness. It makes no sense. So an immune response is a natural response - it isn't a disease. What has happened, is that the science, which is a fake theoretical science, has performed a miracle, transforming a natural immune response into a disease, but sadly, we don't have a diseased animal, which is a bit of a problem for the science. In other words, this is a fraud, it is wishful thinking, based on a grand assumption.

*"In contrast, the current official "test and cull" policy to deal with bovine TB in the UK has been most aptly described as "survival of the shittest". This is the process by which we slaughter any cow that shows signs of mounting an immune response to the TB pathogen, thus steadily removing those animals from the population that had the best chance of surviving infection."*

Bovine TB, Badgers and a Permaculture Perspective  
Tim Green (Wednesday, 17th August 2011)

<https://www.permaculture.co.uk/articles/1608111008/bovine-tb-badgers-and-permaculture-perspective>

The first thing that we must take into consideration is that the mode of disease transmission from say badger to cow remains unknown (Professor David Macdonald). I myself add that the mode of disease transmission from cow to cow is assumed. No human on this planet has ever found the pathway of disease transmission from one animal to another. This is a scientific fact, and so any scientist or government official or any vet who claims that bovine TB is spread from one animal to another is basing his/her thinking on a belief or a myth. Every single scientist, academic or vet (throughout the whole world) who has ever stated that bovine TB is infectious, is basing their thoughts on a theory - not on a fact. This is important to understand, and this is the basic subject matter that I cover in my writings.

## DANGEROUS THREAT

Concerning your Boxster case, a 'thestar' article stated that...

*"Julie Anderson, appearing for Defra, argued the bull poses a dangerous threat of spreading bovine TB and must be destroyed."*

Bully for Boxy as he wins death reprieve ... for now Kate McNeil with Hallmark Boxster a British Blonde bull on 'death row' due to TB.

<https://www.thestar.co.uk/news/bully-for-boxy-as-he-wins-death-reprieve-for-now-1-3290856>

But to make a grand statement such as this, Julie Anderson needs to find proof that TB is spread from one animal to another. Being as this remains unknown or assumed, then this statement she has made isn't based on scientific fact. This statement is a mixture of consensus, myth and wishful thinking. She has no evidence to back up her claims simply because no evidence can possibly exist. In a court of law, under oath, a court would bring in an expert, such as Macdonald, Krebs etc., who could explain the route of disease transmission. If they were being honest, they would say that this remains unknown. This would suggest that Julie Anderson is either telling lies or that she has made a fatal mistake.

*"The great tragedy of Science - the slaying of a beautiful hypothesis by an ugly fact."*

Thomas Henry Huxley

<http://www.goodreads.com/quotes/1263651-the-great-tragedy-of-science-the-slaying-of-a>

## THEORETICAL CONSTRUCTS AND MATHEMATICAL MODELS

Professor David Macdonald et al has stated that *"Exactly how M. bovis is transmitted between badgers and cattle is unknown"*. If we cannot find a route of disease transmission from badger to cow, it goes without saying that we have not found it from cow to cow. This is an example of a theoretical concept, a mathematical model, including a deeply entrenched dogmatic system of belief. In other words, this is fake science simply because there exists an unknown - an ugly fact! This means that we believe that something exists, but this 'thing' is something that no human has ever found.

*"Exactly how M. bovis is transmitted between badgers and cattle is unknown."*

The State of Britain's Mammals - a Focus on Disease

<http://ptes.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/SoBM-2014-low-res-for-web.pdf>

Sadly, very few people take my writings seriously - it is outside of their comprehension. Most farmers will not listen, some think I represent a badger group. In fact, I condemn the badger groups for jumping on the infectious bandwagon, for getting lost in the politics, and then basing their thinking on vaccination, which is yet another hoax, simply because there is no 'infectious' disease. Period. For example, flu and the common cold are signs of a detoxification process. The theory that we 'catch' a cold or flu from another person is theoretical, not factual, although there may be triggers, which is another matter. This is another example of the deeply flawed germ theory of disease. We have been indoctrinated with this theory that we 'catch' diseases from germs for 100 years, but I claim that this isn't true. See Professor Bechamp on the following page...

**PASTEURIAN GERM THEORY vs BECHAMP CELLULAR THEORY**

by Walene [James](#)

<b>GERM THEORY (PASTEUR)</b>	<b>CELLULAR THEORY (BECHAMP). <u>Pleomorphism</u></b>
1. Disease arises from micro-organisms outside the body.	Disease arises from micro-organisms within the cells of the body.
2. Micro-organisms are generally to be guarded against.	These intracellular micro-organisms normally function to build and assist in the metabolic processes of the body.
3. The function of micro-organisms is constant.	The function of these organisms changes to assist in the catabolic (disintegration) processes of the host organism when that organism dies or is injured, which may be chemical as well as mechanical.
4. The shapes and colours of micro-organisms are constant	Micro-organisms change their shapes and colours to reflect the medium
5. Every disease is associated with a particular micro-organism	Every disease is associated with a particular condition.
6. Micro-organisms are primary causal agents.	Micro-organisms become "pathogenic" as the health of the host organism deteriorates. Hence, the condition of the host organism is the primary causal agent.
7. Disease can "strike" anybody.	Disease is built by unhealthy conditions.
8. To prevent disease we have to "build defences".	To prevent disease we have to create health.

The above image (Walene James) pasted from <http://whale.to/v/germ.htm>

In fact, the germ comes 'after' the disease, because the role of the germ (microbe) is to generate bacteria to clean up the disease, to clean up or to wall off any foreign matter or poison that enters the body of an animal or human. This is why when we introduce foreign matter into a cow's skin (skin test), the immune system comes to life and detects this matter, and then generates bacteria (TB) from within, to clean up or to wall off that foreign invader. This immune response has to happen, sometimes a weak response, sometimes a strong response, but then, of course, there is a human interpretation of this test result, which isn't black and white. This is the basic story of TB bacteria. The germ (TB) comes 'after' the cause, not before. The cause of TB is the skin test itself because it is setting off a natural disease process based on a healthy immune response. This is why the theory of infectious disease is a hoax, it has always been a hoax.

*"Defra says; "We have decided not to appeal. ...our immediate priority is to continue to work with the owners of Boxster to resolve the TB problem in their herd." This claim by Defra, implying they have been "working with the owners" obviously hit a raw nerve for Mr Jackson who told the Yorkshire Post: "I haven't got a TB problem."*

Boxster, Yorkshire's prize bull is officially TB free.

[https://www.bovinetb.co.uk/article\\_print.php?article\\_id=56](https://www.bovinetb.co.uk/article_print.php?article_id=56)

The statement above isn't exactly true, as you say that you have not got a TB problem on your farm, but because the skin test sets off the TB bacteria, then you do have a TB problem on your farm, but caused by the skin test itself! This is a self-fulfilling prophesy. In my writings, I compare this to searching for a coin in a money box, but putting the coin into the money box beforehand, so that we are sure to find it. For example, would a woman or a doctor use a pregnancy test that introduces seminal fluid into her reproductive system to discover if she is pregnant? This is highly unlikely, but the skin test is on similar lines. We then translate this immune response into infectious language, which is political, meaning that we have just thrown pure science down the drain. The skin test does not provide any evidence of a so-called 'infectious' disease. If we were to start off by seeing an immune response as the beginnings of tuberculosis bacteria that is generated by each individual animal because of an environmental stress (including the skin test itself), we would then be making sense out of our own thinking, but this is the last thing on our minds. So you didn't have a TB problem on your farm, your animals were healthy creatures, but as soon as DEFRA walked through the door, armed with a government policy (based upon theoretical or fake science), you do have a TB problem on your farm simply because they bring that problem along with them. This is politics gone mad!

Moreover, Kate McNeil then states in her book that...

*"We felt Ms Anderson (DEFRA) was now clutching at straws. She said there was no test, after all this time, that could now prove that Boxster was TB free."* Boxster's Story by Kate McNeil.

So Ms Anderson was saying that there is no test that could prove that any cow that has ever been slaughtered were TB free. So we have a test to 'prove' that a cow has TB, which actually gives TB to the cow, meaning foreign matter followed by an immune response (reactor cow), but no test to prove that a cow hasn't got TB. Indeed, this is very worrying because it is implying that all the cows that we ever slaughtered may well have been healthy animals, which is a monumental blunder in science and politics. In England alone, between 2008 and December 2017, due to the fraudulent TB testing, 277,341 cattle have been culled. (TB Free England)

Share the Facts

<http://www.tbfreeengland.co.uk/share-the-facts/>

Let's now look at this August 2010 article titled 'Boxster, Yorkshire's prize bull is officially TB free'...

*"The outbreak at Forlorn Hope Farm came less than nine months after the declaration of an official TB 'hotspot', around three neighbouring farms in the Denby Dale area, 20 miles away. The neighbours had infected each other but the original route of the TB was never established. Defra had been watching for possible escapes from this hotspot since last July and would have some explaining to do if the Jackson farm cases were traced back to it. But so far, nobody knows what the explanation is. Many cases in Yorkshire are eventually attributed to cattle moved from further south, where TB cannot be stamped out. Cattle farmers fear it will make another jump north."*

Boxster, Yorkshire's prize bull is officially TB free.

[https://www.bovinetb.co.uk/article\\_print.php?article\\_id=56](https://www.bovinetb.co.uk/article_print.php?article_id=56)

The above article claims that your neighbours had infected each other, which is theory, not a fact, but that the route of 'disease' transmission was never established, which is hardly surprising. Let's not forget that when we use the word 'disease', or 'hotspot', or 'outbreak', this doesn't mean that the cows were showing any signs of sickness, and so these words are inappropriate - they are a misnomer. The reason why our bravest vets and scientists, who may I add are no longer independent, cannot find the original route is because there was never a route to find. It says nobody knows what the explanation is, but my writings offer an explanation. They then go on about cattle movements, TB jumping north etc., which is also based on the catching and the spreading of disease theory. Once again, this isn't factual. This is a mere belief, an old wife's tale. So what I am saying is that TB comes from within, it is an internal metamorphosis, an immune response to a stress in the animal's environment. This means that the only thing 'jumping north' is the skin test itself, along with the fraudulent translation of that test.

Taken from the same article...

*"Mr Jackson believes he bought an infected heifer from Carlisle, which somehow scraped through pre-movement testing. It was the only animal to fail the skin test. Six, including the bull, then failed the blood test. But no confirmatory lesions were then found in the five sent for slaughter..."*

Boxster, Yorkshire's prize bull is officially TB free.

[https://www.bovinetb.co.uk/article\\_print.php?article\\_id=56](https://www.bovinetb.co.uk/article_print.php?article_id=56)

This says that six animals failed a blood test, but when five were sent to slaughter, no lesions were found. I would suggest that a blood test is a basic non-specific antibody/protein test. This means that it may well find proteins/antibodies but it cannot pinpoint the source of those antibodies. There will be endless cross reactions, endless false positives, endless false negatives. These tests are non-specific, open to interpretation, but I fear that this is done on purpose for reasons political. Therefore, the blood testing is unreliable, as is also the human interpretation of the blood test - both are unreliable.

The skin test generates a superficial immune response to foreign matter injected into the skin, but when an animal has a bad case of TB - once again, not infectious - the immune system will be working hard to keep that animal healthy (homeostasis), and so it will be eating up the cause of TB, and also walling damaged or poisoned tissue off to one side, which we call a lesion. The animal remains healthy, unless the cause of TB (poison) is so poisonous that the immune system breaks down, and so we then have a diseased animal showing signs and symptoms. This disease is still not infectious. If this was to happen, we must pinpoint and stop the poisonous cause, whatever that poison may be.

From the same article, this is yet another example of the slaughtering of a healthy cow, mainly because of an out of control political agenda - not because the cow was sick.

*"The Yorkshire Post has found similar stories. One farmer had lost a valuable bull to a Defra test in February 2010. The bull was the only positive reactor in the herd and neither visual inspections nor tissue culture tests revealed anything after his death."*

Boxster, Yorkshire's prize bull is officially TB free.

[https://www.bovinetb.co.uk/article\\_print.php?article\\_id=56](https://www.bovinetb.co.uk/article_print.php?article_id=56)

## PLAGUE POLITICS

You may well say, this cannot possibly be true. What about the plague, when humans caught a terrible disease, but the 14<sup>th</sup> Century plague was not infectious - it was caused by earth changes, environmental upheaval, followed by famine. The rat flea theory was exactly that, a theory, it was a nonsense. Sacha Dobler covers this in his excellent research.

Black Death and Abrupt Earth Changes in the 14th century

1290-1350: Abrupt Earth changes, astronomical, tectonic and meteorological events leading up to and culminating at the Black Death period at 1348

Sacha Dobler, updated version of Jan 2018.

[abruptearthchanges.com](http://abruptearthchanges.com)

<https://abruptearthchanges.files.wordpress.com/2018/02/01-02-2018-updated-black-death-and-abrupt-earth-changes.pdf>

Black Death and Abrupt Earth Changes in the 14th century

<https://abruptearthchanges.com/2017/05/25/1619/>

One might say, what about the 1918 Spanish Flu pandemic that spread across the world? That was surely infectious, but this was epidemiological propaganda. In the US, there was a flu going around but this was initially caused by the dumping of World War I chemicals onto the public domain (food, seeds, grains etc.), and so this was the cause of the initial flu - this was a detoxification process. This process, which we call 'flu', is not infectious - it is or it was caused by a poison. We also had mass vaccinations, which means that we introduced a poison into the mass population and especially the armed forces, which created sickness and death, and then we treated the consequential sickness, including the flu symptoms, with toxic medications involving high-dose aspirin, resulting in the death (aspirin toxicity) of a vast number of people. I claim that there is no chance that the Spanish Flu was infectious. This means that the history books and also the historians who wrote those books were propagating a myth, and so totally wrong. Clearly, in the last 100 years, nothing much has changed.

1918 'Spanish Flu' - The Truth

<http://falsificationofhistory.co.uk/health/the-1918-so-called-spanish-flu-pandemic/>

So when DEFRA or any scientist or vet say that an immune response to foreign matter injected into a cow (skin test) is a sign of a so-called 'infectious' disease, they are merely repeating what they believe to be true, but if that belief isn't true, then we have got it all wrong. This is what I cover in my writings, which is good news for every farmer in the land as what that means is that we no longer test for TB and so we no longer cull and slaughter animals because bovine tuberculosis isn't a so-called 'infectious disease', and so no animal can possibly spread TB to another animal.

In the book 'Boxster's Story', Kate McNeil says this about cows... *"...there were ways in which they could have nose-to-nose contact which is how the disease can be passed on through the herd. TB is transmitted through body fluids and respiratory tracts."* Take note that Boxster didn't have a disease.

This is the popular theory, but my writings claim that the spreading of disease is impossible. If an animal has TB, this means that the bacteria has manifested to clean up a stressor in its environment. They often say that unpasteurised milk caused TB (Torgerson) because the milk was infected, but this was not true. The milk (especially in the war years) was often polluted with animal waste matter, and so the milk contained a poison. Drinking this milk would poison the system and cause TB bacteria to manifest, mainly to clean up the poison. This was another example of bacteria being an effect - not a cause, and so here we have another myth, because TB wasn't caused by unpasteurised milk, it was the poisoning of the food chain causing bacteria to manifest through an internal metamorphosis.

*"An interesting comment has been received from Prof Dr PR Torgerson (co-author of the report 'Public Health and Tuberculosis: What's All The Fuss About'. He says: 'despite the fact that bTB is only transmitted to humans by milk (and my schoolboy biology suggests that the bull is unlikely to ever produce any milk), the animal is treated like it has the plague."*

Boxster, Yorkshire's prize bull is officially TB free.

[https://www.bovinetb.co.uk/article\\_print.php?article\\_id=56](https://www.bovinetb.co.uk/article_print.php?article_id=56)

To sum up, in the above statement, Prof Dr PR Torgerson claims that TB is transmitted by raw milk, but I claim that it is a pollution issue, not an infectious issue, therefore it is not unpasteurised milk that causes TB. So we drink polluted milk and then the immune system detects a pollution issue, and so TB bacteria is generated from within to address (clean up) the pollution (poison). This is not difficult to understand. TB is an individual affair. It's



a basic immune response which involves homeostasis. A natural immune response isn't a disease, but sadly the science and the government has made it a disease, but an immune response does not translate into a diseased animal, and that is the issue. There is no chance whatsoever that bovine TB is infectious - this is what I claim. This means that the science has got it all wrong, and this is why the scientists cannot understand their own thinking, the reason why the science is stagnant, going nowhere, and the reason why the scientists constantly argue amongst themselves.

## TORGERSON REPORT

Let's now look at this Torgerson report titled *'Public Health and Tuberculosis: What's All The Fuss About'*. Here are a few quotes...

*"In the UK, cattle-to-human transmission is negligible. Aerosol transmission, the only PROBABLE route of human acquisition..."*

*"The only proven case of recent transmission from cattle to humans in the UK was a cluster of two cases on a Gloucestershire dairy farm. A further case in Cornwall has been described recently which MIGHT also have been transmitted from British cattle."*

*"...therefore, other means of transmission (such as from badgers via the household dog) are POSSIBLE."*

*"It appears that transmission between these six people was LIKELY to have been by aerosol. Human-to-human transmission of bTB is an exceptional event in the absence of immunosuppression. However, four of the six patients were PROBABLY immunocompromised, and transmission LIKELY occurred through repeated contacts in confined environments."*

*"a result of the consumption of unpasteurised milk. Nevertheless, BELIEF IS WIDESPREAD that transmission from cattle to humans by aerosol is also important..."*

*The 10 cases reported by Cutbil and Lynn that were PROBABLY as a result of airborne transmission from cattle were in occupational risk groups..."*

Notice the words that I have highlighted. This kind of language (probable, might, possible, likely, belief) is littered throughout the whole of TB science. Believe me, this isn't a good sign of things to come. This is all theory containing no fact. They begin with a theory of disease transmission, but they cannot find it. No human has ever found it, and so the science assumes that it exists, and then our thinking is based on this assumption. We base our thinking on the outside-in (infectious) model but this is theory driven. I claim that this was always the wrong model, and so the inevitable has happened, the science has stagnated, it is going nowhere simply because it has nowhere to go. The end result is a great deal of confusion and conflict. Sadly, the science cannot turn around and rectify its own mistakes, because this would cause a great deal of upset - the repercussions would likely be horrific. The history and the science and the medical books would be wrong, the encyclopaedias and the dictionaries would be wrong, but more to the point, the scientists and the government and the veterinarians would be wrong. As soon as an academic, a scientist, a vet or a politician comes out with words such as this, which is a sure sign of self-doubt, we can be sure that this is politically motivated, meaning that science in its pure form has come to a dead end, replaced by a fake government science.

This is the reason why in my writings, I cover the pitfalls of propaganda, and how easy it is to condition humans to think in a certain way, through our so-called 'education' system, through politics and media hype. The reason why this Torgerson report uses this kind of language is because they have no other option because the science that they use isn't real. It is merely a mishmash of possibilities, probabilities, grand assumptions, empty theories, perhaps, we think that this might happen, we all tend to agree, etc. As a consequence, this Torgerson report is full of holes. It is a classic example of consensus in science. What this report should have done is to first of all find this illusive mode of disease transmission, and then put a report together based on that. But this didn't happen, they assumed disease transmission, and then jumped ahead of themselves, and that isn't good science, and so shame on Torgerson et al for doing that. I am no scientist, but I know that a science that contains a missing link is not good science, until, of course, we can find that missing link. This has never been found by any scientist on the planet Earth, and I claim that it will never be found because it does not exist. This is an example of fake science. Assuming that humans do not self-destruct, one can predict that in the far distant future, we will look back at this report and see it as a product of the dark ages of science.

*"Beliefs are not true. They are constructs around which we organise our behaviours. So we each behave as if our beliefs were true. And for this reason all our beliefs come true, for beliefs, whether empowering or limiting, are self-fulfilling prophecies."* (Sue Knight)

The Power of Words by Ruby Brown

Posted by Holistic Journal | Apr 4, 2012

<https://www.theholisticjournal.org/the-power-of-words/>

Below is an email I sent to Steven C. Le Comber. So far he has never responded. Perhaps he knows that he must defend a lie, which he does not want to do, and so he takes the easy option. They say that silence speaks louder than words. The possible reason for this lack of response is that I have more or less spelled it out that his research is based on an empty theory, which may well have hit a very sore nerve. They assume that there is a pathway from outside of the body, but I claim that this remains an assumption.

---

## MATHEMATICAL MODEL

On the subject of the mathematical model, here we have a 2015 paper titled "Spatial Targeting for Bovine Tuberculosis Control: Can the Locations of Infected Cattle Be Used to Find Infected Badgers?". The authors are Catherine M. Smith, Sara H. Downs, Andy Mitchell, Andrew C. Hayward, Hannah Fry, and Steven C. Le Comber. This is an example of fake theoretical science where we base our thinking on an assumption that TB is an infectious disease. This paper is a product of a program or an image that has been implanted into the collective consciousness. Take note, none of these academics are independent, none are critical thinkers, none are searching for the truth, and none have ever found any proof of disease transmission from animal to animal, so basically this is another paper based on consensus/myth - not on pure science. This means that we have a rotten system, and so by default, we fit into that rotten system regardless of the consequences. Take note that they don't put out a mathematical model on the reason why disease transmission has never been found, simply because there is no disease transmission, and so the easy option is to base their thinking on the theory that there is, and so these academics, who are merely theoreticians, are basing their thinking on what happens to be popular at this moment in time. Basically, this mathematical model isn't worth the paper that it is written on. I emailed (August 2018) the following comment to Steven C. Le Comber...

.....  
Steven, you have co-written a paper based on a mathematical model based on a theoretical construct. The paper is titled...

"Spatial Targeting for Bovine Tuberculosis Control: Can the Locations of Infected Cattle Be Used to Find Infected Badgers?"

<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/authors?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0142710>

You begin by stating that "Bovine tuberculosis (TB) is a chronic infectious disease of cattle caused by *Mycobacterium bovis* that can also infect humans and a range of other species."

But surely *Mycobacterium bovis* is an environmental bacteria, and so why relate that to a disease or a theoretical disease in a badger or cow? This seems highly irrational. When you begin your document stating that bovine TB is an infectious disease, surely you first of all need to establish the mode of transmission, which according to Professor David Macdonald remains unknown. I think Professor John Krebs has also stated that it remains unknown. So before you state that Bovine TB is infectious and before you come out with such a statement, you should ascertain that there exists a mode of disease transmission. Because disease transmission remains unknown, then the first thing you must do is to find it, not to assume that it exists and then to put together a research paper based on a mathematical model based on a grand assumption, based on disease transmission that you cannot find or perhaps doesn't even exist. This is a fatal error on your part.

Don't forget that the cows that they slaughter that display an immune response are not sick animals, the badgers they cull are not sick badgers! An immune response test is a poison-related test, not a so-called 'infectious disease' test. The infectious translation is based on theory, not on fact. These are not diseased animals - they are theoretically diseased.

You are a theoretician who base your research on theoretical constructs, mathematical models, but at the end of the day you don't have a diseased animal, all you have is an immune response. Don't forget that when the immune system is stressed, especially with a poison, then bacteria will come from within the animal to wall off or to eat up that poison, to create homeostasis. This bacteria, so we are told, infects the animal or human from outside of the body, which is germ theory approach, but this is once again theory-driven, not fact.

I am saying that you are lost in theory, disconnected from fact. I suggest you read Professor Antoine Bechamp's research that will explain why bacteria comes as a response to a stressor in the animal's environment, not the other way around, which once again remains theoretical. To assume something exists that no human being on this planet has ever found is not a bright idea. Why don't you find the mode of disease transmission first, then take your research from there. The reason being is that you will not find it based on fact, so you 'find' it based on theory.

<http://www.whale.to/v/bechamp1.html>

I once sent an email to Professor John Krebs on the link below. He did not respond, as you can imagine. This is because he knows something that he can never put down on paper for fear of a backlash, or he is in denial about something that he can never face within himself. This is why bovine TB is not an infectious disease. There is no 'infectious' disease test. There is only a poison-related test (skin test) which is then translated into 'infectious' language. Surely, in all its glory, this is politics, certainly not science.

John Wantling

[http://www.whale.to/a/wantling\\_h.html](http://www.whale.to/a/wantling_h.html)



---

## BOXSTER

I enclose a letter I once wrote to a Todmorden farmer. This also explains why the science is a fraud. I have also written to the 'Badger Trust', but sad as it may seem, they have their own political agenda, and so they will not listen. In fact, I claim that the 'Badger Trust' are government run, and that their role is to orchestrate the whole protest movement down a political path (biosecurity, vaccination), and I think that this is clear to see. The whole narrative (anti-cull protest movement) is being controlled by government. This is a deception, but few members of the badger groups can accept that because it opens up a can of worms. My comments are often censored because they cannot comprehend what I am saying. They don't like it - it leaves a very bitter taste, mainly because there is a deception in the air and they cannot face that deception. Below is one recent comment (slightly updated) from a Facebook group calling itself 'Avon against the badger cull'.

*"I think that you are out of your tree - totally and utterly. Vaccination saves lives and vaccinating badgers saves them from a horrible and painful death when they catch it from the areas where infected cattle have been." (Penny Gwynne)*

To back up her comment, she (Penny Gwynne) must have proof of disease transmission, but being as this remains unknown, and being as we don't even have a disease, then under these circumstances, to vaccinate a badger is like putting the cart before the horse. She has jumped ahead of herself and got herself lost. I made a few comments, but they were all systematically removed. I once commented on a farmers forum thread, but I was not popular, and in time the thread was closed down. No one could believe what I was saying. This is the power of propaganda, which is basically social engineering in all its glory.

But at least Boxster was not mindlessly slaughtered. It is hard to believe that you won the case against DEFRA, but you can be sure that the government will close any loophole and so prevent this from ever happening again. Your daughter, Kate McNeil, says that you placed doubt on almost everything the vets said was certain. "One thing I am sure of," she says, "is they should be taking a long hard look at the whole system." But they will never do that because they are focused on a political agenda and any scientist or vet taking a 'long hard look' would most likely lose their jobs and salary and pension and friends, and so it would not be worth their while to break the silence.



One other thing that comes to mind, is that in a court of law, we have Farmer Ken Jackson in one corner, and DEFRA in another corner. Surely the testing of animals should be an independent process, and so in no way should DEFRA be allowed to do that. This is like asking a burglar to test his own fingerprints at the scene of the crime. This is sheer madness. The judge in your case should have seen this as an open invitation to deceive.

*"...we weren't going to be able to find anyone to test him independently, that was another door permanently slammed in our faces. The independent laboratories gave us the impression that if they were seen to be working against DEFRA and Animal Health it wouldn't be their best interests..."* Boxster's Story by Kate McNeil.

This is sending out the message that the so-called 'independent' laboratories are not independent at all. It is saying that if they were to perform an independent test, that this would cause an awful lot of trouble. If a second test was taken and the result was different to the first test, which is possible, this would cause a backlash. No one would ever trust that test ever again. This is perhaps one reason why DEFRA refuse to test again. Let's look at the reality, the government have control of the science, the farmers, the vets, the labs, the badger groups, the Badger Trust, and so the government have total control of almost everything. This is why we need a new system where we totally remove government control. We need this because we cannot trust DEFRA, we cannot trust the science, we cannot trust the government politicians, we cannot trust the test, we cannot trust the translation of the test, simply because it is all based on a fake. Basically, DEFRA are lost in politics - not searching for truth - but they are certainly not alone. Under these circumstances, I don't think that we can expect a fair trial, but at least you were fortunate to have a judge who had not been bought off by the State, which is now a very rare thing. Sad as it may be, I don't think this would ever happen in the present political climate because the legal system are now virtually all bought off.

*"As she made her submissions, the judge told her (Julie Anderson): 'I don't like the strident manner in which this case is being put from the beginning.' He likened it to 'we know best - the nanny state knows best'. He was also extremely concerned over the way Defra was putting the case simply as 'black and white', which it definitely was not. The judge said the Defra case 'might be right - might be wrong'"* Boxster, Yorkshire's prize bull is officially TB free.

[https://www.bovinetb.co.uk/article\\_print.php?article\\_id=56](https://www.bovinetb.co.uk/article_print.php?article_id=56)

In a political sense, I tend to feel that this TB issue is about one thing only, and that is the theft of £100m from the public purse to fund what is little more than a manufactured political disease. My guess is that the government use that money as a political slush fund. I would like to know where every penny of that money goes because it must go somewhere. If I was in charge of government, I would close DEFRA down. Period. I would dig a deep hole and bury DEFRA into that hole. Their role is to defend a lie, and so they are a threat to every farmer (and his animals) in the land, in that they are slaughtering healthy animals on a mass scale, based on a scientific hoax, based on a dependent science - not on an independent science. On the basis of an immune response, we then have a human translating this response into infectious language, which remains theoretical. This is what bovine TB is all about - pure unadulterated politics supported by consensus, and a fear of punishment for not fitting into the rotten system. To put it another way, it is science sold out!

If the government were rational, they would be saying, we will not base a policy costing £100m a year that is based on an 'unknown', based on a science that is not sure of itself, but they have other things on their mind, and sad as it may be, this ends in the victimization of the farmer and his precious animals. The main cause being human greed and self-preservation, and this is what bovine TB is all about. No £100m on the table, no interest in bovine TB. £100m on the table, the circulating vultures will surely gather, and those vultures have no concern for the farmer and his animals. They will lie their heads off and slaughter anything to get their hands on that money. This is why we need to dismantle the present system and build another system that is not open to corruption. We must remove that pot of gold, we must remove government control, and we must go back to independent science, not science where a government official is sandwiched between the science and the scientist, between the vet and the animal, doing what he is told for fear of punishment. The only science to emerge out of this is science by numbers - junk science of the political kind, which is why the animals that are slaughtered and culled are only theoretically diseased, theoretically infectious. It is no wonder that farmers say that there is no real proof that an animal has been culled or slaughtered for the right reason...

*"This time we were recorded as having 5 positive reactors. At post mortem all 5 showed no visible signs of lesions. It felt like we were having our herd culled for no good reason. Whilst 'no visible signs of lesions' does not mean the animal was not infected, it seems to us and other farmers that there is no real proof that your animal has been culled for the right reason."* Boxster's Story by Kate McNeil

So whenever anyone says that they do not agree with my writings, which is quite common, then my answer to this kind of response is that we base our thinking on our education, on the knowledge that we have gathered. I am saying that this knowledge has been built on wrong information, on a theory with no fact, but we have been raised in this wrong environment since the day that we were born and we have accepted it on face value without a thought in the world. The history books and the medical books all believe that we 'catch' diseases and that germs are the cause of disease, but I claim that this is a mixture theory and propaganda and disinformation and

deception. The information that we have gathered - through the government education system and societal norms - forms an image and so we then see through that conditioned (infectious) image, and so we reject anything that does not correspond with that image. In other words, we see what we want to see, we see what we are conditioned to see. That image is preventing a pure untainted perception and so it is preventing any form of critical thinking. My writings are based on critical thinking. If we are not thinking critically, what remains is a conditioned response. In science, this is an accident waiting to happen, but the bad news is that this accident has already happened.

John Wantling

[http://www.whale.to/a/wantling\\_h.html](http://www.whale.to/a/wantling_h.html)

