

## NAME

EP 163 5/14/20.mp4

## DATE

October 3, 2023

## DURATION

2h 11m 54s

## 22 SPEAKERS

Del Bigtree

Sen. Rand Paul MD

Jefferey Jaxen

Mayor Eric Garcetti, Los Angeles

Anderson Cooper

Dr. Robert Levin, Health Director, Ventura County Public Health

Scott W. Atlas, MD, Senior Fellow at Stanford's Hoover Inst.

Avik Roy, President of the Foundation for Research and Equal Opportunity

John Ioannidis, MD

David L. Katz, MD, MPH, FACP, FACLM

Asm. Jamel Holley, NJ Legislative District 20

Various speakers

Dr. Anthony Fauci

Sen. Lamar Alexander, US Senate health committee Chairman

Various news reporters

Matthew McConaughey

Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD

Natasha Robinson, Health editor

Dr. Deborah Birx, Coronavirus Response Coordinator

Questioner

Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care

Michael Spicer

## START OF TRANSCRIPT

**[00:00:06] Del Bigtree**

Did you notice that this show doesn't have any commercials? I'm not selling you diapers or vitamins or smoothies or gasoline. That's because I don't want corporate sponsors telling us what to investigate and what to say. Instead, you're our sponsors. This is a production by our non-profit, the Informed Consent Action Network. If you want more investigations, more hard-hitting news, if you want the truth, go to [icandecide.org](https://icandecide.org) and donate now.

**[00:00:46] Del Bigtree**

Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. Wherever you are out there in the world, it's time for us all to step out onto The HighWire. You know, as things go, we are starting to think more and more here on this show how brilliantly we named it, The HighWire. For those of you that are brand new, what does it mean? Well, never before has it been more precarious to tell the truth. It's truly becoming a death-defying act to tell the truth in America. I think about how I was raised. My parents would say, just because everybody else is saying it's okay, because everybody else is doing it, doesn't mean it's okay for you. Two wrongs don't make a right. Well, in fact, in the world now, as we're going to prove today, one right is about the best way to be wrong. Luckily, there's still people that are out there telling the truth, calling it like they see it, calling it like it is, and letting us all know, we're not alone. We still have morals, we still have ethics, we still have brains, and we can understand what's going on, and I think that's the point that was really well put by Rand Paul in one of the Senate hearings, of which we are going to talk all day about today. Just take a look at what Rand Paul had to say about our favorite, yours truly, Dr. Anthony Fauci.

**[00:01:58] Sen. Rand Paul MD**

We need to observe with an open mind what went on in Sweden, where the kids kept going to school. The mortality per capita in Sweden is actually less than France, less than Italy, less than Spain, less than Belgium, less than the Netherlands, about the same as Switzerland. But basically, I don't think there's anybody arguing that what happened in Sweden is an unacceptable result. I think people are intrigued by it and we should be. I don't think any of us are certain when we do all these modelings. There have been more people wrong with modeling than right. We're opening up a lot of economies around the US, and I hope that people who are predicting doom and gloom and saying, oh, we can't do this, there's going to be this surge, will admit that they were wrong if there isn't a surge, because I think that's what's going to happen. In rural states, we never really reached any sort of pandemic levels in Kentucky and other states. We have less deaths in Kentucky than we have in an average flu season. It's not to say this isn't deadly, but really outside of New England, we've had a relatively benign course for this virus nationwide.

**[00:03:00] Sen. Rand Paul MD**

And I think the one size fits all that we're going to have a national strategy and nobody's going to go to school is kind of ridiculous. We really ought to be doing it school district by school district, and the power needs to be dispersed because people make wrong predictions. And really the history of this, when we look back, will be of wrong prediction after wrong prediction after wrong prediction, starting with Ferguson in England. So I think we ought to have a little bit of humility in our belief that we know what's best for the economy. And as much as I respect you, Dr. Fauci, I don't think you're the end-all. I don't think you're the one person that gets to make a decision. We can listen to your advice, but there are people on the other side saying there's not going to be a surge and that we can safely open the economy and the facts will bear this out.

**[00:03:43] Del Bigtree**

Amen is what I have to say to that. I mean, yeah, we could listen to the advice, but at this point, I'm not sure why we are. How many times can a person be wrong, wrong, wrong again, let me fix that, let me be wrong again, let me be. I mean, it's getting absolutely absurd. Why is Dr. Anthony Fauci making the decisions for this country when he ran off of the wrong models, he's not talking about any of the real numbers that are out there. He seems to refuse to talk about the fact that the death rate is flattened and is right on par with the flu as we look all the way around the world. I mean, these are incredible moments. But I want to remind everybody, as we go through the show, we're going to go through both of the Senate hearings. This really has been this week the tale of two Senate hearings. On one hand, you had a Senate hearing with all of the people that don't work for government, all the top scientists in the world that don't work for government, speaking out and saying that they think we have done this all wrong. And then you had a Senate hearing with all the people that are working for our government. Why are they so vastly different? Why are they seeing things totally in a different way? But I want to make this point right up front as you look at this show. When we talked about flattening the curve three months ago when all of this started, the entire reason we were flattening the curve was simply to be able to give our hospitals a break. It was understood that herd immunity would be necessary, like every other flu or anything else we get, that eventually everyone would get this illness and we would all move on with our lives.

**[00:05:08] Del Bigtree**

So the whole idea was we need to slow the growth of the infections because we don't want our ERs and our ICUs to be overrun. There was clear that there was an acute issue going on with a very small group of people, but even a very small group of people with hundreds of millions of people in a country can be a large number when it comes to hospitals. So the whole idea was, let's just make it easier on our ERs and ICUs by using some social distancing, a little bit of a lockdown. Well, now the entire conversation has changed. You see, they moved the goal post on us. It's no longer because, by the way, the curve is flattened. There's not a single hospital that ever did get overrun. And some are losing money, staffs being laid off, so the hospitals aren't getting any work done at all. I mean, none of these people, we don't have working hospitals. We went the absolute wrong direction. But now they've moved it and said, no, no, no, no, no, we're flattening the curve until we find a vaccine or something like, until years down the road. That was not the deal. That is not what we signed up with. We're going to talk about all of that coming up, some amazing revelations at these Senate hearings. But first, let's bring you our own Jefferey Jaxen from The Jaxen Report in here to talk about what happened this week in the news. A lot of waffling going on, right?

**[00:06:27] Jefferey Jaxen**

Yeah. It appears the public officials, the latitude that they've had to speak on some of these things over the last couple of months, it appears to be coming to an end. Waffling, backpedaling, whatever you want to call it, starting with New York Governor Andrew Cuomo, he had to reverse course on a nursing home directive. Now the New York Post reporter Michael Goodwin called Cuomo's original March 25th directive, quote, one of the deadliest policy mistakes in New York history. So what happened? The policy on March 25th said basically nursing homes had to accept patients, either readmissions or admissions. They were not allowed to ask if they were positive. They were not allowed to have hospitals give them the results. If hospitals wanted to, they could, but it basically protected the rights of these patients coming in. So what happened?

**[00:07:21] Del Bigtree**

The nursing homes could not turn these patients away, even if they were positive with COVID-19, thereby bringing them into the most dangerous petri dish. We knew all around the world, we did a whole episode on this just, you know, a week or two ago talking about the fact that the one place we knew you didn't want COVID-19 going in, the one place that really should have been quarantined, the one place that really should have been locked down all around the world, was our nursing homes, for the people that are over the age of 65, most of whom, you know, that are at risk, also have other co-morbid or conditions that were life-threatening that made the risk much higher. And then but they had a law. I mean, it wasn't just like, leave it alone, right? They didn't say, just leave it alone, let's see, let's let the nursing homes decide. They actually had this law that they wrote specific to coronavirus saying, you're not allowed to stop anybody that's infected from coming in to your nursing home. Absolutely insane. So they reversed that. Tell me about that.

**[00:08:17] Jefferey Jaxen**

Yeah. Yeah. And in fact, they weren't even allowed to ask that they get tested. So the reversal said, now hospitals must do discharge tests. Patients must test negative before hospitals can return them to nursing homes. So it's an exact 180 of the policy. So you can't admit you're wrong more than that, literally changing the policy 180.

**[00:08:36] Del Bigtree**

Two months later, two months later, and how many thousands of people are now dead because of this mistake? How many of the elderly, that the most at-risk group were killed because of this decision by Cuomo? Did he come right out and say, I made a mistake? Did we actually get a politician in this country to say, I'm sorry, I effed up? I mean, is that what happened there?

**[00:08:58] Jefferey Jaxen**

Unfortunately, no. He was pressed during the press conference and he insisted that nursing homes, quote, could have resisted taking COVID patients, COVID-positive patients, if they had no ability to care for them.

**[00:09:10] Del Bigtree**

So we have a Governor saying they could have resisted the law that I wrote. You know, I mean, I think that maybe we should all take this to heart across the country. They're just suggestions. When we write laws and rules for you, they're really just suggestions. You know, it's up to you whether you want to listen to us. That's absolutely crazy.

**[00:09:27] Jefferey Jaxen**

Yeah. And it's the point was, Cuomo said, it was never really communicated, that point was never really communicated that these nursing homes could have resisted. So whoopsie, you know, a 5,000 mortality patients later in nursing homes, over 5,000 was the report so far as we talk about it today.

**[00:09:44] Del Bigtree**

What's happening on the other coast? More insanity there, too, right?

**[00:09:47] Jefferey Jaxen**

Yeah, California. So a lot of heated discussion going on with Elon Musk and Tesla motors there in Fremont, it's Alameda County. Basically what happened was when Governor Newsom was going to relax some of the stay at home orders and restrictions for businesses, he he said on top of that, counties can do their own individual rules and regulations. So Alameda County, along with five other San Francisco Bay Area counties and Berkeley, they decided to keep stricter, stricter rules in place, which meant Tesla Motors could not go back to work after the plant was shut down for two months. So we had a lot of heated discussion on this in the media. We saw Tesla, you know, it spilled out into Twitter. So you saw Elon Musk talk about this on Twitter and say basically "Tesla is filing a lawsuit against Alameda County immediately. The unelected & ignorant 'Interim Health Officer' of Alameda is acting contrary to the Governor, the President, our Constitutional freedoms & just plain common sense!" And then you saw to this, California Assemblywoman Lorena Gonzalez said, really shortly, eff Elon Musk. And it just, it just, yes, absolutely. And, you know, it escalated from.

**[00:10:57] Del Bigtree**

And his response was something like, message received, right?

**[00:10:59] Jefferey Jaxen**

That's exactly what it was, that's exactly what it was. It only escalated from there. Yeah. He, Elon Musk and Tesla motors went directly to California's northern district federal court. They filed suit. They basically said that the shelter in place order that, they wanted a permanent injunction barring the county to do the shelter in place order. And they argued that the his company fell under the definition of a critical infrastructure. So literally, like a day to two days later, they reached a deal with Tesla to reopen the factory, and there we go. So it doesn't look like Tesla motors is going to move to Nevada or Texas, I think that's where they originally said they were going to pack up and go to.

**[00:11:42] Del Bigtree**

You know, and it was really, it was quite amazing to watch it because, you know, Elon Musk really did lay down the gauntlet. I remember, you know, he was saying, I'm going to go work in that plant. I am going to stand on the front lines with my workers. And if you arrest anybody, please arrest me, right. You know, talk about taking it to them. And really and it really starts making you think again. I mean, you've got Cuomo saying, well, you didn't you shouldn't have listened to me. You've got now, you know, a law saying, well, if it's a billionaire and a company and they threaten us enough, we'll go ahead and relax on that. So, I mean, it seems like the message is, you better put pressure on us or we're just going to do whatever we want to you, right. I mean, they're asking for pressure, I guess, is what we're supposed to learn from these stories.

**[00:12:27] Jefferey Jaxen**

You know, absolutely. They seem like they have some pretty loose lips when it comes to overstepping. It always seems to err on the side of overstepping into these boundaries that are, you know, overstepping the Constitution, overstepping civil liberties, individual rights. And then they always have to backtrack this. But, you know, like you said, it relies on the pushback, whether you're Elon Musk or whether you're out in Huntington Beach protesting or whatever it is, or on Twitter or on Facebook. It's time to show these people that you have a voice, too. In LA, we had LA County stay at home order. They extended it for three months. Now this was a headline out of local ABC News 7. So, LA Public health director Dr. Barbara Ferrer, stay at home order quote will all certainly be extended for the next three months. This set up a huge backlash almost immediately. I mean, these people, it's hot out there. You know, it's, and they're already protesting.

**[00:13:23] Del Bigtree**

It's California. It's Surfin USA, right. It's aren't we supposed to be out playing, isn't that the entire point of living in California? Hiking, biking, swimming, surfing. I mean, absolutely outrageous what's going on there, and to think. And based on what science? What is three months going to do for you? I mean, what ha-, what do they think this virus does? How does it, I mean, it's, it just defies reason and we're going to get into a lot of the details about that. But even Garcetti had to jump in. I mean, he's in there trying to say, well, not exactly, right.

**[00:13:54] Jefferey Jaxen**

Yeah, he was forced literally to go on to Anderson Cooper and do the rounds on the news networks literally almost the next day and forcing to backtrack it. So here we go, backpedaling, waffling, once again. There's a video of it.

**[00:14:06] Del Bigtree**

Take a look at this, we actually, I think we have the video. Let's take a look at what he had to say.

**[00:14:09] Mayor Eric Garcetti, Los Angeles**

It's important not to overreact and not to underreact. Not to overreact today, huge headlines, it was on CNN and LA Times, when our county health officer, Dr. Ferrer, merely said that an order would stay in place for at least three more months. That doesn't mean the order stays in place exactly as it is today. But of course, we're still going to have to protect our vulnerable and our seniors. We're still going to need to wear facial coverings. We're still going to need to physically distance. And the steps that we earn each week and each month are going to be based on where the numbers are and how safe we can make spaces and places.

**[00:14:42] Anderson Cooper**

So just to be clear, there will be some sort of stay at home orders continuing through July. The exact parameter of them, the details of them, that depends on what occurs. You said you may see some adjustments. In what in what timeframe did you just say? Did you say a week or within a week or after a week? And what, do you have a sense of what the next kind of loosening might be?

**[00:15:10] Mayor Eric Garcetti, Los Angeles**

So it was announced today, for instance, that, and remember, I'm the mayor of the city, so the county, which is separate, makes these pronouncements. A lot of people called me, friends said, what did you just say? I said, I didn't say anything, but let me clarify. So each one of these steps is really both in the hands, a little bit of government, but mostly the people, to comply with those recommendations, and the public health is clear. This is still a threat to us all.

**[00:15:31] Del Bigtree**

Did you get that? Did you get that? We didn't say three more months. We said that at least three more months. Not exactly three months, but at least three months. The lockdown is not going to be there for three months, it's going to be there for about three months. I mean, you know, the people, the government isn't doing this to you, you're doing this. The people are deciding this. The government isn't doing this. The people are. The government isn't locking you down, the people are locking down. The government, you're locking down, the people are locking you down. The people are locking you down. The people are locking you down. Did you get it, folks? I mean, this doublespeak, crazy talk, he's saying, well, yeah, not exactly three months, but but pretty much like three months. Not exactly, just the older, but the older people and then maybe some others that we might have to lock, I mean, it's absolute mumbo jumbo with a giant smile on their face and people are just like beeeeeeh. It's shocking. It's shocking. At least, I mean, I guess if that's some sort of a backtrack, it certainly was not very eloquent.

**[00:16:30] Jefferey Jaxen**

Yeah. You know, and he shot himself in the foot. He was doing the media rounds that same day, just to put a cap on this story. He was on Good Morning America the same day, and he said, we'll never really completely be open until we have a cure, that was his quote. So now we have another round of backlash coming towards him because people are going to say, what do you mean by that? What's a cure? Can you even cure this thing? What if everyone already has it?

**[00:16:52] Del Bigtree**

Unbelievable. The more they talk, the more confusing this entire thing gets. And yet people, I mean, if these people get reelected, I'm going to be absolutely mind-blown. All of this is such, you know, it's really a disaster. And it's scary, right? It's scary that there's randomly three more months. What does that mean, why three months? Sweden's open folks, just as Rand Paul pointed out. Sweden is up and running, never shot down. Taiwan up and running, never shut down. South Korea up and running, never shut down. I mean, why would California need to be shut down for three more months, with all of the sun out there, all the vitamin D your body needs, and all the viruses that cannot handle being in the sun, stay locked down, absolutely crazy. What else you got?

**[00:17:36] Jefferey Jaxen**

Well, there's another story in the news you might have heard of, it was you. You were in the news this past week, causing kind of a backlash and a backtrack of sorts of the video you tweeted of the director of Ventura County Public Health threatening to take people infected with COVID-19 out of their homes and relocating them. The tweet was also picked up by the Q community, which brought a lot of attention to it. And, you know, the mayor basically said, quote, If you're living in a home with one bathroom and there are other people in the home without COVID infection, we're not going to be able to keep the person in that home. We'll be moving people like this.

**[00:18:12] Del Bigtree**

It was incredible, really, to be in the middle of this, Jefferey, because on the one hand, first of all, let's, I want to show everybody my tweet again because I've been censored like crazy. This video has been, even though it went over a million views all around, Fox News started talking about it, I want you to read the exact words because I was very careful about this. Let's just read the exact words really quick. We can't, we can't show the tweet, something's down. Hold on, hold on, hold on, let me look it up. As though I would remember, I should have memorized it, right? Here we go, let's see, hold on. There it is. Okay. But it's really small. Okay, this is what I wrote. What would you do if your six-year-old son or daughter tested positive for COVID-19 and was taken from your home to a quarantine center by Ventura Health authorities? This shocking video demands that you plan ahead. #BeBrave, #HistoryRepeating. Now, look it. They are, if you look at all the fact checking articles about this, they're saying, I said they're going to forcibly remove children from their homes. I didn't say that. I said if they removed them from your home. I didn't say, you know, all of these things. There it is, they're flagging this. Well, let's see what they're flagging. You ask me, I mean, and look, we edit it down, there it is, "Fact check: Ventura will NOT forcibly remove people infected with COVID-19..." They never said children, as that, but that was my point, right? They never said children, but they didn't not say children. You see, when you're saying, you know, well, let's go ahead and you listen to what they, what this health leader had to say in Ventura County yourself.

**[00:19:47] Dr. Robert Levin, Health Director, Ventura County Public Health**

We are beginning a program today which will certainly grow into something larger and larger, and that is a community contact tracing program. We've done contact tracing all along. That contact is a person who's been exposed to someone that we document to have the COVID infection. When we find someone who has a COVID infection, those people are immediately isolated. But we also work with them to figure out who their contacts were. But the purpose of this program is to bring on people. We may bring on up to 50 or even more as the program grows and as we see the needs for it, as we do more testing, we will find more and more people who have COVID-19. And again, we'll isolate every one of them and we will find every one of their contacts and we will make sure that they stay quarantined and we'll check in with them every day. We're going to do a more complete job and we're going to do a more meticulous job of making it less and less possible for others in the county to run into someone with COVID-19 infection. It's not just our county, there are going to be thousands of people hired who will be these contact investigators throughout the state. And this is occurring in many, many other states as well, perhaps all of the states in our country. We will be giving intensive training to these people, identifying and finding contacts. Some of the people we find are going to have trouble being isolated. For instance, if they live in a home where there's only one bathroom and there are 3 or 4 other people living there and those people don't have COVID infection, we're not going to be able to keep the person in that home. Every person who we're isolating, for instance, needs to have their own bathroom. And so we'll be moving people like this into other kinds of housing that we have available.

**[00:22:02] Del Bigtree**

I mean...

**[00:22:03] Jefferey Jaxen**

I have a question.

**[00:22:03] Del Bigtree**

...I don't know hat to say there. By the way, I heard that toilet sales in California went absolutely through the roof, sold out in Home Depot's and Lowe's. I mean, when you buy a house in California a year from now, there'll be like a toilet in the middle of the living room installed and a toilet, you know, over in the guest bedroom, right. You mean just because, oh, you mean if I have a shortage of toilets, not enough per person, then someone can be taken from my home. I mean, nowhere in there is the word voluntary being seen. Saying things like find somebody, when we find somebody, they are going to be immediately isolated. We are going to make sure that they stay quarantined. We're going to make it less possible for anyone to run into someone with COVID-19. Now, I was just speculating, right, I asked the question, what would you do if your child was taken away? Because I wanted to point out that when we were hearing him speak, I heard people saying, boy, I'd hate to be taken away if I was infected to leave my family behind. I was like, what if it's your kid? I mean, they're not delineating, they're saying any infection. And it seems to me he said, if you do not have a toilet for everybody, we're going to have to move you so that you can be quarantined with a bathroom.

**[00:23:14] Del Bigtree**

I don't know what part of that was supposed to be voluntary. I don't understand how this system works, if it's voluntary. I don't know why you need 50 or thousands of people being hired to do this, but okay, maybe it is voluntary, I never said it wasn't. All I was asking was, is everybody cool with this? What if it ends up being your child? We should probably plan ahead. And instead, fact checkers, videos being shut down. This is the world we're living, it's what I started out with the top of the show saying, right? I mean, it used to be two wrongs don't make a right or don't go along with everybody else, always tell the truth. Now, if you tell the truth, you are censored, you are shut down. But luckily, there it is. I have no idea why this is. And by the way, we're probably going to sue over this because this is insane. This cannot continue. This is not the United States of America. All we were doing is showing what a man said with his own words. Obviously, enough people, there was a huge outcry because we put out this tweet, so we've gotten a response, right. What happened?

**[00:24:13] Jefferey Jaxen**

Yeah, Well, I mean, back to that, really, really quick. We're doing the work here. The people are doing the work, you're doing the work, posting this thing. We're putting their feet to the fire. Where is the media? The media is present at all of these press conferences. We see them at the Presidential press conferences, the coronavirus task force. If I'm there in the media, I have the question, hey, excuse me. So toilets are a barrier now, toilets are a determining factor of quarantine? I haven't heard that before, can you explain? Or simply...



**[00:24:45] Del Bigtree**

And by the way, in the land of socioeconomics and everybody should be equal, are you basically saying that people who have homes that do not have a toilet for every single person, which I would say is probably, other than your bank account, the best way to decide where you sit in the 1% or everybody below. Is if you have a toilet for every single human being in your house. I mean, it really is, just, oh, the rich are going to be fine. All you rich people in your mansions on the hill, don't worry about it, we're not going to bother you. But, you know, here in our sanctuary city, you better look out. Unbelievable.

**[00:25:19] Jefferey Jaxen**

Dr. Levin says, we'll be removing them. Question: who will be removing them? We'll take him to other kinds of housing. What other kinds of housing? Where are these simple questions? When people make statements like this and they're officials, where are the simple questions? These are huge sweeping statements. If you don't want a perception of misinformation out there, ask the questions. Journalists, you can stop this right where it starts.

**[00:25:43] Del Bigtree**

Right. Absolutely. So he did have to come back out, right, and correct, because so many people were, I mean, go, I saw my tweet just being popped up on the health, the website in Ventura County, and it just kept popping my tweet. This is crazy, you can't do this. So he had, Levin had to come out and make a statement, right?

**[00:26:01] Jefferey Jaxen**

Yeah. He said, quote, I either misspoke or it was misinterpreted. I'll take the blame of having misspoke. He's basically saying...

**[00:26:08] Del Bigtree**

I think we have the video, let's take a look at this, Jefferey.

**[00:26:11] Dr. Robert Levin, Health Director, Ventura County Public Health**

I either misspoke or was misinterpreted. I'll take the blame of having misspoken, yesterday at this conference at the board of supervisors, and I gave people the impression that if you were isolated, you would be taken out of your home and put into a hotel room or a motel room or sequestered in some other way. And I, if I did do that, I'm very sorry. That is an option, that's possible. If you become infected and you don't want to stay in your home, you're afraid you're going to expose other people, we'll work with you to find a place to stay and it's likely to be a hotel or a motel.

**[00:26:50] Del Bigtree**

When I said I was going to take you out of your home, I didn't mean I was going to take you out of your home. What I meant was that we were going to have you decide to be taken out of your home. When I said we had to move you out because you didn't have enough toilets to the land where there are plenty of toilets, I didn't mean that there was really a problem with the amount of toilets in your house. I just meant that, don't you want more toilets? Don't you want to leave your family? Don't you want to follow us? Don't you want to come with us and be sequestered? I mean, come on. What do we talk? People, if you just think, oh, that's it. Del was lying, it was volunteer. It was volunteer. We were all supposed to volunteer this. Because that's what we do, right? We volunteer to leave our own homes to go into some quarantine center because we don't have enough toilets. Does that sound natural to anybody? Anyway, look, Jefferey, here's what I got to say. I don't care if I get censored. I don't care if the video gets taken down.

**[00:27:48] Del Bigtree**

I think, along with Elon Musk and everybody that's pushing back, as long as we force you to get back on a camera and say, I sounded like a complete and total moron yesterday, and obviously I sounded like something out of a crazy science fiction movie, where we were really like, we were actually going to take you from your home. I mean, I don't know how you got that impression. When we said we were going to take you from your home. I'm just happy that they're having to dance. I'm happy that they're on the hot seat. And when I think about Thomas Jefferson and our founding fathers saying that the fourth estate, the fourth branch of government, is the media, is the news, and we've got to hold their feet to the fire. We've got to never be afraid to ask the hard questions. That was a hard question. Is it going to be children too? How voluntary is this? That's what I wanted to know. We found out that everybody wanted to know that, so much that we made this idiot get back out on a camera and correct himself. Although, it's again, it didn't sound like much of a correction to me.

**[00:28:47] Jefferey Jaxen**

Yeah, well, hey, the government should fear the people and, you know, they should fear these people with these egos or whatever they're doing up there, just kind of rattling off words out of their mouth that they may not be understanding what they're saying. We need to hold their feet to the fire and this is how we're doing it. So, yeah, absolutely. Let's let's see them dance and let's see them communicate a little better. You're supposed to be a public officer, public communicator, let's see some communication.

**[00:29:11] Del Bigtree**

Jefferey, great reporting. Thanks for bringing all of that to us. And you're right, if they're not afraid of the people, then they better be afraid of The HighWire because we are coming for you. We are going to continue to tell the truth. No matter how you've paid off the rest of mainstream media, guess who got no money from you last week? I got my money from the people, and that's who we're going to be fighting for. So, as always, if you're watching the show for the first time, we have no advertisers. I don't have drug companies, which is what is 70% of the money that's going to mainstream media is coming from drug companies. That's why all of your news anchors aren't giving you any of these stories, aren't showing you any of the rallies, aren't talking about the crumbling science down around the world. They are funded by pharma. I'm not funded by pharma, but I'm also not funded by a, you know, a vitamin company or a zeolite company, or anything else. Why? Because in the end, in my experience, everybody has an opinion, right? And if someone's giving you money or buying commercial space, then they want to be able to say, you know, Del, I was with you on the vitamins, I was with you on, you know, but I don't like that you were talking about chloroquine, or I don't like that you were talking about, you know, some other issue or Donald Trump or the Democratic Party or whatever it is. None of that's going to happen here. We are strictly and only focused on the truth wherever we can find it.

**[00:30:30] Del Bigtree**

You make that possible. So please, if you're out there and you've been watching this show week after week saying, how is it The HighWire is the only one that keeps predicting next week's news, is ahead of everybody else. Because we don't have any sponsors holding us back. We are accelerating to the truth because you're helping us. So please, if you can help us out. Treat us like Netflix, \$20 for 2020 is what we're asking. \$20 a month. Sign up for a recurring donation. You cannot imagine how much it's helping us, how we're being able to hire specialists and researchers all around the world, legal teams working for you. We are holding their feet to the fire because you are making that possible. All of you, you know, all of you that are now involved in donating to us, doesn't it feel good? Doesn't it feel good to tune in every Thursday and get the real news? Speaking of real news, there was a Senate hearing this week. I didn't think it got a lot of play on CNN or MSNBC or really, frankly, barely anywhere. This was a Senate hearing with the top scientists in America, from our top universities in America. And shockingly, it didn't seem like any of them agreed with our "experts" that are running the show in America. In fact, if you listen to it, it sounds like they think that these draconian measures are putting us in harm's way. Here's a Senate hearing you probably did not see.

**[00:31:54] Scott W. Atlas, MD, Senior Fellow at Stanford's Hoover Inst.**

The goal of the strict isolation has been accomplished. We need to stop under-emphasizing the actual empirical data and established medical science while instead somehow doubling down on hypothetical models. Science and logic must prevail over fear and worst-case scenarios.

**[00:32:14] Avik Roy, President of the Foundation for Research and Equal Opportunity**

One size fits all lockdowns are not based on actual evidence or science regarding COVID-19, but are instead based on fear and off-the-shelf playbooks.

**[00:32:24] John Ioannidis, MD**

While lockdowns were justified initially, their perpetuation may risk many lives. While treatment advances and vaccine efforts may be successful eventually, lockdown measures cannot be prolonged until we find treatments and vaccine.

**[00:32:39] David L. Katz, MD, MPH, FACP, FACLM**

If we're ever going to get our lives back and not be on the indefinite timeline of maybe there will be a highly effective vaccine mass-produced, we actually need the virus to circulate among people who can safely get it, get over it, make antibodies, which historically, before the advent of highly effective vaccines, was how pandemics ended.

**[00:32:58] Scott W. Atlas, MD, Senior Fellow at Stanford's Hoover Inst.**

It is not logical that younger age groups must somehow be isolated or maintain a six-foot spacing from each other. If infection in low-risk groups is still prevalent, which it is, socializing represents the opportunity for developing the widespread immunity, eradicating the threat to the vulnerable.

**[00:33:16] David L. Katz, MD, MPH, FACP, FACLM**

The problem with an interdiction strategy that starts and ends with flattening the curve is you can never stop. Everybody's been kept away from the virus, everybody's been sheltering in place. Nobody has immunity. And so if there's any level of viral circulation, asymptomatic carriers, for example, everyone remains vulnerable. The minute you release those clamps, you get the spike you thought you had prevented.

**[00:33:42] Scott W. Atlas, MD, Senior Fellow at Stanford's Hoover Inst.**

This total isolation policy prevents broad population immunity. We know from decades of medical science that the population develops immunity while acquiring antibodies.

**[00:33:55] David L. Katz, MD, MPH, FACP, FACLM**

You have to allow the virus to circulate and those who can safely get through it to develop herd immunity. But that's the problem with flattening the curve. Absolutely a critical tactic to avoid overwhelming a medical system at a given place in a given time, but it really can only be phase one of a multi-phase plan.

**[00:34:13] Scott W. Atlas, MD, Senior Fellow at Stanford's Hoover Inst.**

Hundreds of thousands of people have serious diseases that are not being treated. Transplants from living donors are down 85% from last year. In the US alone, 150,000 new cancer cases arise every single month. These patients are not being seen.

**[00:34:31] John Ioannidis, MD**

Deaths from common chronic diseases and treatable conditions, such as heart attacks, may increase as patients avoid hospitals from fear, as interaction with their caregivers is disrupted.

**[00:34:43] Avik Roy, President of the Foundation for Research and Equal Opportunity**

30 million Americans have lost their jobs, and the CBO estimates that second quarter GDP will be 40% lower than it was at this time last year.

**[00:34:53] John Ioannidis, MD**

Unemployment may create more marginalized citizens without health insurance. Mental health can be affected with increases in depression, suicides, domestic violence, and child abuse.

**[00:35:04] David L. Katz, MD, MPH, FACP, FACLM**

Food insecurity hurts people. Desperation hurts people. Depression, addiction. We've seen spikes in everything from gun sales to domestic violence to suicides since the advent of this pandemic.

**[00:35:17] Scott W. Atlas, MD, Senior Fellow at Stanford's Hoover Inst.**

And contact tracing, although an important part of the overall preparation for potential future outbreaks, is not critical right now and is not as valuable after a disease is already widespread, infecting tens of millions of people.

**[00:35:33] John Ioannidis, MD**

It is unrealistic to expect a complete contact tracing would need to be feasible before reopening, where you have 30% of New York already infected at the moment, or 5% in other states or 10%, when you have a sizable portion of the population already infected, they have been exposing almost everyone else.

**[00:35:49] David L. Katz, MD, MPH, FACP, FACLM**

There's an alternative to contact tracing, and that is to say, we identify people at higher risk and we carefully protect them from exposure to the virus, and people at low risk, we actually expect the virus to circulate, so contact tracing in that group almost defeats the purpose.

**[00:36:05] Scott W. Atlas, MD, Senior Fellow at Stanford's Hoover Inst.**

Treating COVID-19 at all costs is severely restricting other medical care and instilling fear in the public, creating a massive health disaster.

**[00:36:16] Del Bigtree**

Does anyone else out there wish you could vote on like who's going to run this country since clearly Presidents aren't and Prime Ministers aren't, around the world. Now it's doctors, then we should be allowed to vote, right? I want to vote out Fauci and Birx and maybe vote in Atlas, Katz, Ioannidis, and Mr. Roy, all of these people, brilliant scientists that have established medical schools in this country, I'd like them making the decisions in this country, wouldn't you? Well, at the center of that conversation, obviously, a lot of brilliant things have been said, most of which have been covered on The HighWire over the last ten weeks. But contact tracing is the big story of the week, right? Are we going to track you in some way or another and figure out how many people have this illness? You know, this is really scary stuff. It's scaring a lot of us citizens thinking, where is our government at on this? Well, I want to talk to someone in our government that I think is just as freaked out about this as I am and wants to do something about it. Of course, I'm talking about Assemblyman Jamel Holley, who is, I mean, Holley, Jamel Holley, sorry about that, is coming to us from New Jersey. Jamel, how are you doing?

**[00:37:25] Asm. Jamel Holley, NJ Legislative District 20**

I'm good, big brother Del, how are you?

**[00:37:27] Del Bigtree**

I'm doing really good, man. You wrote, you got involved in an article. You're saying you want hearings when it comes to contact tracing. Why? Why is it bothering you?

**[00:37:38] Asm. Jamel Holley, NJ Legislative District 20**

I mean, because I have a great concern on how someone's medical information is going to be shared across applications, that individuals from Google and Microsoft has access to. And quite frankly, all of this is being done under executive orders, limiting major public participation, public hearings. No conversations with elected officials such as myself, who served on the Health Committee and is vice chair of Homeland Security. None of this is being discussed, and it's all being done under executive orders and I think that if we're going to be providing medical information to anyone, that the public has a right to have their say in this, and the public has a right to appear in public to voice their concerns, or if they support it or not, and none of this is being done. And I have a concern about privacy. I have a concern about constitutional rights. And quite frankly, I don't think medical information should be out in just cyberspace. I mean, look how many times, we hear story after story on credit card data and it's information being breached. I mean, now our medical information could have the potential of being breached, this is a very serious concern for me, and I'm going to be fighting this tooth and nail until someone hears me and tries to stop this until we can get some answers on it.



**[00:38:57] Del Bigtree**

I mean, it seems to me this is almost like we're almost all getting an ankle bracelet as though we were being jailed at home to track us everywhere we go, to track who we're talking to, to see, I mean, how do free, why would free citizens agree with this? What possible benefit? And the idea that we're seeing articles coming out from Apple and Android, saying they're essentially going to attempt to just install this into our phones without us even knowing about it, if they can get away with it. I mean, apparently now, if you just take an upgrade, you're ready to upgrade your iPhone, you do it, and now you are being contact traced by essentially, I guess, the government of the United States. But it's going through Google, it's going through these giant data collecting server empires. But they're telling us, oh, don't worry, we're not looking at it. Be as you are, we're passing through, but we're all wearing blindfolds. Does anybody believe that?

**[00:39:53] Asm. Jamel Holley, NJ Legislative District 20**

I don't think so. I think people are awake. I think people are paying much more attention to this issue more than ever. Everyone's home now and they're glued into their TVs and shows like you who are speaking the truth. And, you know, the further concern I have with this contact tracing is when does it stop? I mean, is there an expiration date? I mean, what goes next? I mean, these companies that do contact tracing, I mean, they're in it for a reason, they're in it to make money. Businesses incorporate themselves to make money. So what is the beneficial and monetary value of someone's contact tracing medical information? What is the, what is it? And that's the question, that's what I want to get to the bottom of.

**[00:40:39] Del Bigtree**

And it seems opportunistic, doesn't it? I mean, even if, it seems it doesn't matter what the death rate of this ends up being. It's getting lower and lower and lower as we see all the data coming in. But still, they're just going to go in and install all of these monitoring systems for us, you know, as though Ebola swept the country or we have a million escaped inmates running around and we're going to have to track where they are. You know, my question, I think, is, you still, you know, you work in government. You're an assemblyman in New Jersey. Are you alone or, I mean, should we be worried? Are other politicians, people that you work with, your peers, are there questions happening in our capitals? Are there people that are saying, you know, this does seem drastic or are you all alone?

**[00:41:25] Asm. Jamel Holley, NJ Legislative District 20**

I'm alone again. And just like I was on the segregated amendment as it relates to vaccinations, when they were trying to segregate our kids in public schools versus private schools, I'm alone again on this issue. But that's okay, because at the end of the day, my goal is to ensure that people's rights and liberties and constitutional and privacy rights are protected. That's what lawmakers are supposed to do, abide by the Constitution. And so while I may be the only one in New Jersey, I'm spreading the alarm and sounding the alarm to other legislatures across this country that have individuals who want to use executive order powers to supersede public's voice and public's concern. I think the public has a right to voice their opinion on this, whether they agree or disagree with it or not. But as an elected official who has to, you know, vote on a lot of other issues and protect people's privacy and rights, I think I have a right and I'm elected to ask questions at the end of the day, and that's what I'm asking, I'm asking questions. And I want public hearings where the public has the right to come out. And we want scientists and we want data professionals, we want health professionals, we want individuals who are in this field to come and speak to us on how actually this is going to work. And until then, it's going to be an unknown. It remains an unknown until we can have these types of hearings and have a broader discussion as opposed to having these executive orders written every single day upon the weeks, and our rights are being invalidated every single time.

**[00:42:50] Del Bigtree**

You know, I want to say, for people that don't know, you've been on The HighWire before. I stood with you in New Jersey where you simply really stood up for a person's right to choose what's injected into them. I wouldn't say that your anti-vaccine, you're not against things, but you are into choice, into human rights. We know, we've seen throughout time that things can be injected into people of different races, of different creeds, that maybe wasn't something they wanted in their bodies. We can never give governments the power to override your own choice. But I want to tell you, and the thing that I have hope on with this, and you're probably already thinking this, but unlike the vaccine issue that really did seem to have this consensus and science and, you know, at least they said they did and all the politicians could get behind it, right now, as we just saw in the Senate hearing I showed, and as we're looking around the world, there's no consensus on this. In fact, it seems like the majority of scientists around the world are saying, these draconian measures not only don't work, they're dangerous. They're going, they're lowering our immune systems. We're not getting in touch with the microbes and the biome that's out there in the world. When we come out, someone's going to have to get this. The vaccine won't be here in time. All the suicides and the death from starvation and, you know, certainly you've got to be hearing that from your constituents. How are people going to survive without jobs in this country? So I think of all the issues, what is the most shocking to me is that you're saying, you're still all alone when really everybody else you're working with, all of your peers at the Capitol, are alone with about 2 or 3 scientists running our country, against hundreds, if not thousands of scientists that disagree with them around the world. Do you feel emboldened by that, at least a little bit?

**[00:44:34] Asm. Jamel Holley, NJ Legislative District 20**

I mean, I feel empowered by the people that elect me at the end of the day, they elect me to look out for them. So whether there are other elected officials that want to stand on the forefront with me or not, at the end of the day, I have a constituency that I have to adhere to, and it is my job to make sure that I continue to look out for them. And when I see their constitutional rights threatened, or if I see their privacy rights threatened, they may not be paying attention but I am. That's the role that they elected me to play and I'm going to continue to do that. So whether I'm alone, if others join me and I hope they will, whether it's other state legislatures across this country that would like to join me and I invite them to that, at the end of the day, we have an obligation to protect the people. And this contact tracing is just yet another level of rights that are being stripped to them, stripped from them day by day, and I'm going to continue to voice my opinion and voice my concerns on, as it is relative to the people who represent me.

**[00:45:33] Del Bigtree**

Alright. Well, look, I really want, I appreciate you for taking time on your day to join us. I do really appreciate that you continuously prove to us at The HighWire and those around the country that know who you are, you are standing up for the people at a time where so few are. I wish we could clone you, but I guess that would probably have its own rights issues too, so until then, I think we're just going to have to start electing more people that talk about, really right, the principles this nation was founded upon. It was about freedom. It was about the right to privacy.

**[00:46:11] Asm. Jamel Holley, NJ Legislative District 20**

I can't wait till this is all over so we can get back out there to join the people to protect their rights and protect their Constitutional rights. I'm looking forward to, when this is all said and done, but in the meantime, I'm going to be working from home and working from the offices where I can, and continue to raise the issues as they come.

**[00:46:29] Del Bigtree**

Thank you for being you, Jamel Holley, assemblyman in New Jersey. You take care. Well, I mean, it's a breath of fresh air to hear a politician that, you know, seems to be going against the grain, but with the grain and the river and the flow of the people. It's scary when you hear him say, though, he's all alone. That, you know, there's not five of you, there's not 20 of you, you're not all a little bit nervous about Microsoft and Apple and government officials tracking everywhere we go? Well, as I told you this week, it was the tale of two Senate hearings. Of course, you heard from really the most talented scientists, I think, in the country that are not working for the government. There was also a hearing of all the scientists that were working for the government. There was a lot of patting on the back, don't you love us, aren't we doing an amazing job? But really, if you were to sort of boil the entire hearing the day of our experts working for the government down, you can boil it down to basically one word. Take a look at this.

**[00:47:36] Various speakers**

Doctor Fauci, let's begin with you.

**[00:47:39] Dr. Anthony Fauci**

Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccines. We can stimulate the body with a vaccine. Vaccines. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccines. A number of vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. The vaccines. Moving on to vaccines.

**[00:47:55] Various speakers**

The vaccine. Vaccine. The vaccine or hopefully vaccines. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Seven different candidate vaccines. The way we will eventually beat this virus is with a vaccine.

**[00:48:04] Various speakers**

Vaccine. Vaccine. That everyone is able to receive The vaccine.

**[00:48:08] Dr. Anthony Fauci**

Hundreds of millions of dollars into the development and production of vaccine doses before we even know it works.

**[00:48:16] Various speakers**

We've heard a lot of discussion about vaccines.

**[00:48:19] Various speakers**

Vaccine.

**[00:48:19] Various speakers**

Vaccine.

**[00:48:20] Various speakers**

With regards to vaccines.

**[00:48:21] Various speakers**

For a COVID-19 vaccine.

**[00:48:23] Various speakers**

Those vaccines, those treatments are the ultimate solution.

**[00:48:26] Various speakers**

Fully everybody in Congress and in this country wants a vaccine.

**[00:48:30] Various speakers**

Vaccine.

**[00:48:31] Various speakers**

A vaccine.

**[00:48:32] Various speakers**

For a vaccine.

**[00:48:33] Various speakers**

Vaccine.

**[00:48:34] Various speakers**

Creating a vaccine.

**[00:48:35] Various speakers**

Vaccine.

**[00:48:35] Various speakers**

When the vaccine comes.

**[00:48:37] Various speakers**

A vaccine.

**[00:48:38] Various speakers**

We need a vaccine.

**[00:48:39] Various speakers**

We're all hoping for a vaccine, obviously.

**[00:48:47] Del Bigtree**

Can you believe that? I mean, seriously. We did a word search on the entire day. You know that the word vaccine was said 111 times. Just in case, you know, in case you missed the messaging from our government, from the people that are running our government right now, our scientists, it's all about the vaccine. Just to give you a comparative, 111 times they said the word vaccine. 15 times they stated the term social distancing. 13 times they said the word safety, and 30 times the word treatment. And I would guess that treatment probably came before vaccine most of the time that that word was stated, so clearly, folks, if it's not obvious, there's an agenda here. And when you think about an agenda, I mean, we are talking about the main word stated all day long by everybody that was going to be on a camera, is something that doesn't even exist on this planet yet. Okay. I get it. I know you all have a lot of faith in science, but I'm still calling this the vaccine unicorn. Folks, they've been attempting to make a coronavirus vaccine for decades. They've been attempting to make an RNA vaccine for anything now being combined with the coronavirus for decades, total and complete failure. Now, all of a sudden they figure if we pour hundreds of millions of dollars, as Tony Fauci described it, into this, surely we are going to come to an answer. But I really want to talk about the fact that why, why is this the only comment? When we're seeing article upon article, and a new study out of New York just said, hydroxychloroquine, "Drug combo with hydroxychloroquine promising" in a New York study.

**[00:50:32] Del Bigtree**

This is another study using zinc and azithromycin. We have shown you these studies all over. "39 elderly Texans successfully complete hydroxychloroquine treatment for COVID-19, doctor says. Patients completed a five-day treatment and their doctor said none of the patients experienced side effects." You know, it goes on and on, you get the idea. There are other treatments out there, but the word treatment is only used 30 times. Why vaccine? Well, first of all, you have to know, if you've been watching this show or you've ever marched for your freedom to decide what's injected into your body, the WHO has made it a top priority to force vaccinate everyone in the world. Here it is on their own website. We want to "TRACK each individual's immunization status, leveraging immunization registries, electronic databases and national identification numbers systems." We know that on our own website at Health and Human Services, "The vision is for adult immunization is to protect the public health and achieve optimal prevention of infectious diseases and their consequences through vaccination of all adults." And by the way, here's the EU, the Commission was a proposal "for a common vaccination card," a passport of sorts. All of this was written before we ever saw a coronavirus or pandemic start. This was a goal. They stated it to the public. I've been shouting from stages all over the world.

**[00:52:00] Del Bigtree**

Look out, pharma is going to try to take over the world to achieve one thing. Now, I could be wrong. Maybe it's just a perfect coincidence that the coronavirus came along and, you know, all of a sudden 2 million people were going to die in America and half a million people were going to die in the UK. Oh, wait a minute. Oh, wait, that was wrong. We got that wrong. All of those models failed. We're back down to the same death rate as the flu. Oh, but that doesn't matter, you see, because that's what an agenda does, it doesn't care. It moves with its blinders on. We have one goal. We're sticking to the goal. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. Vaccine. But probably even more troubling is who is saying it to us and who is running our country. Okay, maybe a vaccine really is our only way out of this two years from now, even though SARS disappeared within two years and MERS disappeared within two years. So this is going to be gone before we have a vaccine, but I guess that doesn't matter. But why is Fauci so interested in a vaccine? Well, perhaps there's a conflict of interest. Would it matter to you if there was actually a conflict of interest, if Fauci and people around him very close to him had something to gain, would that make you worry about the fact that the only word you heard from him and, you know, through a whole day Senate hearing, and we keep hearing our lives only get back to normal is once we have a vaccine?

**[00:53:28] Del Bigtree**

Would it bother you if you knew there was a conflict of interest? Because there's a big one. There's a big one. Because the laws broke down in the United States of America. You see, it used to be that regulatory agencies like Health and Human Services, which oversees all of our health agencies, which include National Institute of Health, the FDA, the CDC, HRSA, all of them under this umbrella. But the National Institute of Health is where Fauci works, specifically in the group working at NIAID. Well, at NIAID, guess what? They have patents. They're allowed to hold patents as scientists. Yeah, we pay for their work. We pay them as government officials. They do that work for us. But if they come up with a patent, guess what? A private company that makes money with that patent or turns that into a product has to pay them. So they get a little bonus kickback in the tune of like 150,000 a year per patent. Well, guess what? Maybe the reason Fauci really likes a vaccine is because the number one contender for a vaccine right now is at Moderna. It was the first one to get into trials, the first one. And guess where the patents for that coronavirus and mRNA approach is coming from? You guessed it, NIAID. Not just even NIH, right underneath Fauci. Here they are. There's the list, the patent trademark itself. We looked this up.

**[00:54:59] Del Bigtree**

Can I see their photos? I think we need to know who these people are. Barney Graham, MD. Kizzmekia Corbett, PhD. Gordon Joyce, PhD. Hadi M Yassine. Dr. Masaru Kanekiyo, or however you say it, PhD. And Olubukola Abiona. Look, I have no problem with the fact that these people are smart. I have a problem that they're supposed to be working for our government and now they stand to make millions of dollars working with Tony Fauci to push forward a vaccine. You see, that is a conflict of interest. I thought Fauci was telling us that vaccines really are the only way out because he has a totally objective position. He works for the government. He doesn't side with any of the industry professionals around him or the companies. He is agnostic and just simply saying, the vaccine is the best way to go. But now I find out that not only do those scientists make money, the NIH collects huge paychecks. Remember how much this thing is going to make. I'm calling it, The Amazing Race. We have Bill Gates and everybody saying, we're going to forcibly inject this. We even have Donald Trump now saying he's going to use the military to go around with 300 million vaccines to all of our homes. Kind of scary thoughts. But look at the money that these scientists are going to make. There it is, "Trump says will mobilize US military to deliver coronavirus vaccines." Probably. And they're even saying in the article, most likely before the safety studies are even done, maybe even as soon as the end of this year.

**[00:56:34] Del Bigtree**

Well, if the vaccine is like \$100, which would be a really cheap vaccine, then that means we give it to 7.5 billion people, that's something like, what is that, \$750 billion to be made. So when I find out that scientists that are making the decisions for us and government agencies that are in line to make millions and millions and millions of dollars, I'm starting to get skeptical. But that, you know, call me crazy. But for those of you that aren't skeptical, why don't we just turn the table a little bit? Let's take it outside of vaccines, which you happen to think are perfectly safe and I know are not and that's why my non-profit's won lawsuits against the National Institute of Health, Health and Human Services, the FDA, CDC, and, by the way, more and more coming down the pipe as we speak. But I want to talk about this. Let's look at in terms of let's say the National Transportation Safety Board or the FAA. Can you imagine if the FAA had patents in airplanes? Can you imagine if you found out that the FAA, who was supposed to be investigating things for safety, making sure that planes were safe, that they actually had patents to maybe the autopilot system or the fuel injection system? Well, think about that when we look back just a couple of months to the disaster we had with an airplane, this was the max 737, remember?

**[00:57:53] Del Bigtree**

This thing crashed into the ground a couple of times. And when we looked into it, what did we find out? "Engineers say Boeing pushed to limit safety testing in race to certify planes, including the 737 MAX." You see the FAA looked the other way, removed restrictions, because we want the American company, Boeing, to beat everybody else. Sound familiar? A race to a plane, a race to a vaccine. You see, this is what happens when your regulatory agencies are in bed with the very industries that are going to make billions of dollars. And what happened when those crashed, what was the other headline we had on that? "How the FAA was the last to ground the 737 MAX." So even when this thing was a total disaster, guess what? In America, our regulatory agency was the last one to ground it. And guess, in the middle of that, they didn't even have patents in that plane. They just had a little sense of favoritism, God knows what kind of payoffs were going on. Can you imagine if they had patents in that plane? How irate would you be? Do you think people should have gone to jail if that was the case? Because that's what's being set up here. We're seeing the same headlines. Moderna is now racing, and FDA is, look at this. "FDA 'fast tracks' first coronavirus vaccine from Moderna." From the people at NIH that had the patents, our own little buddies over working for the same Health and Human Services we do. We're fast tracking that version.

**[00:59:26] Del Bigtree**

We're going to give them an unfair advantage to the other 99 companies that are making a vaccine. I wonder how this turns out. Do you think the Moderna is really going to be the failure of the bunch? I doubt it. God knows what they're going to be injecting into us, with safety studies that lasted a few weeks and had no placebo group. Folks, you're supposed to care about this stuff. Can you punch up, maybe give me the spiral. Alright. Give me the spiral really quick, can we get that? I want to do my own little brainwashing. Here we go. Wake up, people, wake up. They're not testing it for safety. There's no safety testing. There's no safety testing. There's no safety testing. Tony Fauci and his scientific team are getting patents. They're making millions of dollars. They're making millions of dollars. They're making millions and millions and millions and millions of dollars, forcing through a product that is supposed to be being defended and checked for safety, challenged by the NIH, not pushed forward. Alright. Sorry to do that to you. I'm sorry to taking you through a little bit of brainwashing, but I get so much less time than the rest of the mainstream media that you're sucking into the rest of the week. If you think it scares you, or if it doesn't scare you, let's just hear it from their own mouths. This is one of our own politicians caught in the spiral mechanism. Listen to this.

**[01:00:52] Sen. Lamar Alexander, US Senate health committee Chairman**

I expect Dr. Fauci talked to us about additional treatments that will be available to reduce the risk of death and the administration's plan to do something that our country has never done before, which is to start manufacturing a vaccine before it actually has been proven to work, in order to speed up the result in case it does work.

**[01:01:15] Del Bigtree**

Alright. Brand new territory, something our country's never done before. We're going to manufacture a product that never even was proven to be safe, just so we can make sure we get it to you fast. Because fast is more important than safe. Wait a minute, did I hear that right? I mean, can you believe this is what they're actually saying to you on your televisions? I doubt they ran it too many times on the news. And in case you thought, well, I mean, at least it's going to be safe. Fauci's confidence can be safe. Is he? Take a listen to this.

**[01:01:46] Dr. Anthony Fauci**

We'll be producing vaccine at risk, which means we'll be investigating considerable resources in developing doses even before we know any given candidate or candidates work. I must warn that there's also the possibility of negative consequences, where certain vaccines can actually enhance the negative effect of the infection. The big unknown is efficacy. Will it be present or absent, and how durable will it be?

**[01:02:17] Del Bigtree**

I mean, can you believe it, right. I'm not the one making this up, but I swear, I swear to you, if I put those two videos up right now on YouTube or Facebook, I'm going to get like a false information, Del's misrepresenting what they're saying. I mean, when they're saying that they are ramping up production right now as we speak, that they are manufacturing a vaccine that hasn't been through a safety study again, or yet, and that this is a new step for America, they didn't mean that. What they meant was we're just making sure that we're getting a very, very, very safe product to you as fast, fast, fast, fast, fast as we can. Oh, and by the way, it may be more dangerous than never having gotten anything at all. It could kill you. Or best case scenario, it has no effect at all, it's totally, completely ineffective. And for all of you that are out there waiting for the vaccine unicorn to be found. By the way, I think Bigfoot's riding on it right now as we speak. You find one, you probably got them both. Kill two birds with one stone. But while you're waiting for it, you got to ask yourself, if that's our only way back to a normal life, as Newsom and every other chucklehead that's running government agencies right now is saying, what happens if the vaccine is maybe as good as a flu shot?



**[01:03:30] Del Bigtree**

I mean, right, that'd be great. Look at all the headlines, remember. Flu vaccine is 10% effective this year. "This year's flu vaccine may only be 10% effective, experts warn." I mean, you get the idea, it went on and on. "Influenza A (H3N2) viruses predominated, and the preliminary estimate of vaccine effectiveness" --this is the New England Journal of Medicine, by the way-- "against influenza...was only 10%." What? And Fauci, by the way, Fauci even was the one writing, one of the authors on that article. But here's the point, let me ask you this. Do you think we come out of the lockdown in the minds of, you know, Gavin Newsom and Garcetti and Cuomo, do we get to come out of the lockdown with a vaccine that's 10% effective? Meaning, where are we at now? What do we have like 80,000, I forget how many deaths we have now. But somewhere in the 80,000 range, so if we can knock 8,000 of those out with a vaccine, then does that mean we can all go back to work? I mean, seriously, folks, this is the problem, right. And we're going to have the same type of issue, if not worse, because the flu shot is much like the coronavirus shot, because these are fast, these mutate very fast.

**[01:04:40] Del Bigtree**

Flu is constantly changing. They're always having to guess. And look at this. "COVID-19's potential to mutate could cause problems for vaccine development." My understanding is it's already mutated 30 times and counting. So what happens when they have a vaccine that never went through a safety study, we ramped it all up, cranked out 300 million vaccines to give the military to bring to you. And by the way, the virus we were working with is like 100 times different because it mutated 100 times. These are realities. This is the truth. I don't care if I get censored for bringing you the truth. This is how science works. We actually have a historical reference to all of this data. These are things that are not hard to understand. We would be lucky if a coronavirus vaccine was as good as a flu shot. And how long have we had a flu shot for? Like over 60 years. For 60 years of the development of the flu shot, we still, in all of that work, in all that money-making, all the billions of dollars made by flu shots, they still crank them out at about a 10% effectiveness rate.

**[01:05:39] Del Bigtree**

If you're really lucky, it might be 40%. Does that get us out of lockdown? Is that what you're hoping for? As we obliterate our economy and watch our jobs disappear? I mean, these are the types of things you wish were being said a little bit more in the media. Unfortunately, everyone's being brainwashed by the media. We all need to work together. And perhaps nobody appears to be more brainwashed to me than an actor I really used to like. You see, Matthew McConaughey has decided to make a video. He put out a video saying that basically we all have to come together. Really beautiful images of children, that one not really wearing a mask, I'm not sure why. But these guys were waving American flags, doctors fighting for on the front lines. The military, God bless America. Can't we come together as a team? This is about us, the USA. Just keep livin' with contact tracing, surveillance, masks, and quarantine. I guess we call that living. He made his circuit run across the media. This is what Matthew McConaughey was saying. I can't tell you how annoyed I was. I really did once like this guy as an actor. Take a look at this.

**[01:06:56] Various news reporters**

Matthew McConaughey, the founder of the Just Keep Livin Foundation. What made you and your wife do this? What's driving you here?

**[01:07:04] Matthew McConaughey**

I could feel that this united purpose we all have as Americans to beat this enemy and this virus. That purpose got hijacked a bit by partisan politics. All of a sudden the narrative became, well if you want to go to work, you must be on the far right, and if you want to stay at home, you must be on the far left. That created a false divide, that is not true. We're not going to beat this virus the way that we can if we're fighting each other. We don't have room for two wars right now. If we try to fight both those wars, we're going to lose both of them, but if we try to fight the one against the virus, which is the one we should be fighting, then we're going to beat it. Now even the mask wearing is getting politicized, where if you want to wear a mask, you wear a mask, you're a liberal, and if you don't, you're a conservative. We are waiting for science to catch up with us. The mask is about letting science catch up. If you are going to reengage right now, please wear a mask. A mask is a very good tool for that, and I have not heard any science that says it's not, so I don't even understand how there's a real argument. I haven't heard any science that says that is not a good idea. People still think, oh, you know, it's a bit of a retreat, or I want to express my freedoms or my independence, and I think they're just looking at it the wrong way. It should be a badge of honor right now, about us uniting. Everyone do it, I'm protecting you, you protect me. This is not about politics, it's about us.

**[01:08:25] Del Bigtree**

I couldn't agree more. This is not about politics, you know, But what Matthew McCartney is asking is, we should all be on a team, on the team of people who are neurotic and panicked. Not on the team of science. Don't listen to those people. Don't listen to Ioannidis and Katz and all the people speaking to our government. Don't listen to, you know, Peter Gøtzsche and all the scientists. Forget the fact that the Imperial model is crashed, that Tony Fauci has been wrong every time. Keep listening to him because we've got to wait for the science to catch up. No, no. That is not, alright, alright, alright. That is all wrong, all wrong, all wrong. Come on now, Matthew. The science doesn't have to catch up. Our leaders, our experts have got to wake up to the fact that they were dead wrong about all of the stats when it comes to COVID-19. That's just simply the fact. And I'm really shocked, Matthew, that you can't look at the science around the world. That you can't see the death rates and see that this looks like a bad flu. Oh, by the way, explain this to me, Matthew. Sweden. Sweden. Sweden. Taiwan. South Korea. Please, man. You want to lock us down? Your team is the team of terror and fear and panic. Of wearing masks. I mean, you have kids, Matthew, about the same age as mine, and I am telling you, I am not going to raise my kids to believe that they should be afraid to breathe the freaking air. That of the planet they live on.

**[01:09:58] Del Bigtree**

I happen to even once in a while go to a church that I know Matthew McConaughey is really a part of. You think God has something in the air that's going to kill us? Is that what you're teaching your children? Is that what you want in your schools? Are you starting to see these images around the world? Children with masks and shelters in their schools, being socially distanced, stuck in square boxes, more than six feet away from each other? My God, if this is the future, if being on a team means this is the world I live in, then you're right, I am not a team player. There is an I in team. It's called self-preservation. Or there's an I in intelligence. Use your mind, Matthew. There are only like 2 or 3 scientists, Tony Fauci, Deborah Birk, and a couple of people at the WHO, that have got you believing that we are all going to die. We are not going to die, trust me. In fact, you are going to do just fine. Your kids are going to do just fine. And if Andrew Cuomo and those people would stop sending sick people into the one place we should lock down, where there probably should be some masks used, then we would be through this by now, and we would have herd immunity by now.

**[01:11:14] Del Bigtree**

But the mask. The mask is our badge of honor? I haven't seen any science that says that the mask is a problem at all. Really? Well, then, obviously you didn't see this article by the world-renowned scientist, Dr. Russel Blaylock. Here's a couple of quotes from a brilliant article. "Blaylock" --this was on, can I go back to that title really quick so people can find it-- "Face masks pose serious risks to the healthy." Listen to this. "As for the scientific support for the use of face mask, a recent careful examination of the literature, in which 17 of the best studies were analyzed, concluded that, 'None of the studies established a conclusive relationship between mask/respirator use and protection against influenza infection...' Several studies have indeed found significant problems" --however-- "with wearing such a mask. This can vary from headaches, to increased airway resistance, carbon dioxide accumulation, to hypoxia, all the way to serious life-threatening complications... While most agree that the N95 mask can cause significant hypoxia and hypercapnia, another study of surgical masks found significant reductions in blood oxygen as well. In this study, researchers examined the blood oxygen levels in 53 surgeons using an oximeter. They measured blood oxygenation before surgery as well as at the end of surgeries. The researchers found that the mask reduced the blood oxygen levels...significantly. The longer the duration of wearing the mask, the greater the fall in blood oxygen levels." And lastly, "Studies have shown that hypoxia can inhibit the type of main immune cells used to fight viral infections called the CD4+ T-lymphocyte..." cells.

**[01:12:50] Del Bigtree**

"This sets the stage for contracting any infection, including COVID-19 and making the consequences of that infection much graver. In essence, your mask may very well put you at an increased risk of infections and if so, having a much worse outcome." There's actually one more. "When a person is infected with a respiratory virus, they will expel some of the virus with each breath. If they are wearing a mask, especially an N95 mask or other tightly fitting mask, they will be constantly rebreathing the viruses, raising the concentration of the virus in the lungs and the nasal passages... By wearing a mask, the exhaled viruses will not be able to escape and will concentrate in the nasal passages, enter the olfactory nerves and travel into the brain." See, that's the eye of intelligence. These are the eyes that can read. And Matthew, you should be using your eyes. Especially now that you're touting yourself, I guess you're Professor Matthew McConaughey. You now work at the University of Texas, I believe. Professor of Practice, Script to Screen, Moody College of Communications. It's quite a resume, but if you don't want to listen to, you know, Russel Blaylock, then maybe there are other scientists, maybe I have to collect scientists. Maybe I have to find a scientist who has a little bit longer CV than you do. How about Dolores Cahill, PhD? I'm not making this up. This is like a movie. It goes on. Look at this CV, on and on and on.

**[01:14:33] Del Bigtree**

Would you take her word for it, Matthew? I'm joined by Professor Dolores Cahill right now. That was pretty awesome. You have quite a background. Can you, maybe, in like 60 seconds, give me a sense of your background. I mean, you've been very close to, there was a human genome project, but you have really deciphered the proteins that are in the body. Tell me a little bit about your history, your past and your work.

**[01:15:00] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

Right. Thank you, lovely to see you again, Del. Yeah, my degree is in molecular genetics. My PhD is in immunology. I was targeting drugs and toxins like ricin to try and help brain tumor patients. And then I went on to the Max Planck and I ran a group there and I invented a technology and a suite of patents to make high-content protein arrays. And at that time it was quite disruptive. We had around 8,000 different human proteins and we were able to test the specificity of antibodies, and we also were able to profile the antibodies in serum for people who had autoimmune diseases and cancer and viral infections. And what was very interesting is up to that time, people would characterize around eight, against eight proteins, and we were able to characterize against 8,000. And there's about 20,000 proteins in the human genome expressed, and so I made these high content arrays. And at the time we were then able to take published antibodies from research publications and diagnostic labs and look at the specificity and cross-reactivity of antibodies. And I also worked on a meningitis vaccine and I worked in the Class 2 3 safety lab, and then I ran that lab for about three years. And the last thing is to say that because of high content protein arrays, we were able to look at the specificity and cross-reactivity of antibodies, but at one amino acid level, so that you can actually do epitope mapping. And we were also able to profile if a person naturally cleared a virus or a bacteria like meningitis, exactly what were the proteins, the antibodies against what proteins that made them say in meningitis not die, and then take those proteins and epitope map the antibody to the amino acid level. And I developed a company, Protogen, as you know, in 1997, co-founded it. And we were kind of quite world leaders at the time to make diagnostic assays. And also we looked at companion diagnostics for why did people respond to certain drugs and not, and also to profile people who had adverse events, so including unusual symptoms like chronic fatigue. So that's my....

**[01:17:16] Del Bigtree**

Alright, alright, alright, I'm sure you could go on and on and on, but I don't want to do, I want to admit to Matthew McConaughey, I only understood about half of that stuff, too, so we're together on that. But so, I think what we can glean from this is that you understand viruses at a very, you know, like profoundly microscopic level. You've been watching this COVID-19, I have a lot of questions for you, but since, I wanted to start the discussion with masks, you know. Russel Blaylock is a world-renowned doctor who has come out and said, there is a danger to wearing these things. Do you agree with him? What is your, what are you thinking when you look at disease profiles and viruses and bacteria, are masks effective at keeping us healthy?

**[01:18:03] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

So I would say I made it to the third slide there, there's a table that just compares coronaviruses with Ebola viruses. So if it was an Ebola virus outbreak, then a mask would be effective because Ebola virus is transmitted through the air. But in the case of coronavirus, it's not transmitted through the air, it's transmitted through droplets that then would drop on the surface like a door handle. So in coronavirus, there is absolutely no need to wear a mask. And also that means there's no necessity for coronaviruses. But also I entirely agree with Professor Blaylock, who has an outstanding track record and is very experienced in this area, that because the mask is covering you, you have less oxygen, and that puts your immune system under stress. And then the latent viruses that are in your body, because you're under immune stress, will reappear, and not only will you have more coronavirus, but if you had other latent viruses, it would allow them to reemerge. And the reason why they reemerge is that nutrition and vitamins and stress are very important, to have good nutrition, have very little stress on the body and ensure that you have vitamins to keep your immune system working. And in this case, in coronavirus, the immune system can clear the virus within, you know, 10 or 11 days. So I would definitively say, for coronavirus, there is no need for masks and also there is no need for social distancing. So I'm actually looking in Ireland to see whether we can take precedence cases against, you know, legally, because the government scientists, and our teacher is a doctor, and the Minister for Health, that they are making policy decisions that actually will make people sicker.

**[01:19:56] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

So there is no need to wear masks. And also, as your earlier commentary, that there will be more deaths, you know, that in the United Kingdom, for example, normally there are 5000 people diagnosed with cancer in a month and there's only 25,000. So there are issues around heart attacks being not treated properly, early diagnosis of cancer and also issues around depression. So I am saying that in Ireland, the deaths, any deaths that result will say from ten days time are entirely unnecessary, and we will be counting those deaths and holding our Prime Minister and Minister for Health personally to account, because I think it's verging on almost a crime against humanity. You know, there are deaths, hundreds of deaths will happen because of the policies that they're doing. Keeping people in their homes where they should be informed, good nutrition, vitamins, and people who have no underlying conditions and are under 70 should engage, in the next ten days, and interact with society to build up the herd immunity and go back to work. And I would be saying that any closure really in Ireland after the 25th of May is unnecessary. And I would even consider, you know, the same in America, and that perhaps people should consider actually going about their daily lives on the 25th of May because it is entirely unnecessary what's going on. And I do have one slide there with the three outbreaks from the CDC, it was the second slide if they wanted to put it up. And so the first, the second slide, this is actually from the director of the CDC, and it was presented at a US Presidential meeting.

**[01:21:33] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

And this clearly shows, it ranges from December 2019 to the 12th of April 2020, that when viruses circulate the globe, they actually circulate the globe within about three or 4 to 6 weeks. And that this flu season, as normal, Influenza B circulated, influenza A, and COVID-19. So what happens then as well is that everybody in the globe are exposed to these viruses, and people, you know, the majority of people will not have any symptoms and they will develop an immune response and clear it, and then a certain percentage of the population will have flu-like symptoms. And I am saying that only about 1 in 100 people will go on to develop a cough. And because we now are totally aware that the drug hydroxychloroquine with AZT and zinc can actually prevent those people from ever reaching hospital, that there is actually, you know, a well-known prevention and a treatment. And because we have that, it's then entirely unnecessary to have these lockdowns. And I am happy to join the other scientists in the world to call it out. But I do think there has to be legal consequences for the deaths after, let's say, the 25th of May, for politicians and scientists advising them. And they also have to really join in each of our countries with the scientists, there has to be debates on national broadcasting tv for the scientists who think like I do, to actually hold, you know, the ministers have to say what politicians, what scientists specifically are saying that the lockdown is necessary, masks are necessary. I have some slides there and sent you one of the publications associated with them. So essentially I'm saying in all countries. <video freezes>

**[01:23:29] Del Bigtree**

Uh oh. Why don't you try and get her back and let me go over, can we bring up that slide? I want to bring up the slide where she was showing because I think it's really important, we'll see if we can get her back on ine. We got her back? Alright, great. So, Dolores, obviously, you've covered so many things in what you just went through there that have all been questions and issues we've been dealing with, you know, here on the show. I, too, agree with you, that I would like to know, I mean, I would really like to have the people step forward and stand forward and say, who among you are behind the lockdown, the use of masks, those of you that are saying hydroxychloroquine doesn't work, and that this is a deadly epidemic that warrants a quarantine, I would like to see all those people stand next to each other so we know who will be responsible. And really, it seems to me that the body of science is now saying many of the things that you are. Let me just take it back, though, a minute, because you're, you know, you were in Ireland, which is, you know, pretty close to the UK, so you were much closer to the Imperial model than I was. But from all the way over here, it wasn't making a lot of sense from the beginning. And now we know, I mean, we have coders and people that are looking at this model saying it is one of the worst pieces of, you know, stinking disaster there ever was and the whole world. Followed it. Did you, could you tell right away, I mean, was it hard to understand? Should scientists have been as hoodwinked by the Imperial model as they were? When did you start recognizing something stinks here?

**[01:25:03] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

So I would say I was in touch with some doctors that were trying to impress the importance of hydroxychloroquine in February of 2020, who were already concerned at that stage. So what I would say is that there is absolutely no need to be looking at models in these cases because we have such information and actual data around the world for when the viruses actually circulate the globe, and where they are in different countries. And also since the first COVID 1 in 2003, there's thousands of publications for how that circulated the globe, and that people actually clear the antibody after that, and there were two more circulations. So what I'm saying, which is well-recognized in this virus, that once you have recovered from this virus, you are immune for life.

**[01:25:54] Del Bigtree**

And by the way, you've, you, Delores, you've recovered yourself. Am I correct in that you got COVID-19? How was it? Was it, was it like Cuomo, were you, like, hallucinating and talking to your, you know, your dead father as he described it? I don't know if you saw that, but our CNN anchor here was saying it was awful.

**[01:26:13] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

Yeah, so I would have had pneumonia was, like, you know, twice in my life, you know, 20 years ago. So it was nothing like that. So I had flew, my husband actually flew to America in December and January, and he came back with it, and then I got it. And I had flu-like symptoms for about two weeks. And then I started to get this very, well, maybe a week, and then a dry cough that went on for about two weeks. And towards the end I was breathless. So I was worried, a little bit for a few days, and then it went away. And I, of course, did not know what it was, but that was January and February. So that, I then found out because of the dry cough, that was the symptoms. But if we had known, which we could have, because it was in China, the way to boost the immune system for everybody is to have good nutrition, reduce stress, and take vitamins D and vitamin C and zinc. And then most people, the vast majority, 99 out of 100, will have no symptoms at all. And what the media should have been doing worldwide before the virus came is to publicize the symptoms, right. First of all, publicize the prevention with vitamin D, C and zinc, and then the symptoms so that people could have taken those in January and February. And then, you know, if they could have said the symptoms and then if they said if you have a cough, you can take hydroxychloroquine, AZT and zinc.

**[01:27:32] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

And because it was known in China very early in January and February that 50% of people in the world that were dying were over 80, hydroxychloroquine has a half-life of 21 days, and you could have the cystic fibrosis or underlying condition, a preventative tablet of hydroxychloroquine every two weeks. And then even then they would not have, and zinc, of course, and they would not have any symptoms. So we do not need anyone to die for this. So if you just put up the table again between Corona and Ebola, what I just wanted to do is to say, because I worked in one of these biosafety labs and I ran one, that Ebola is considered Class 4 safety, biosafety Class 4, and the reason for that is that there is no treatment. You know, we still don't have a vaccine. So Ebola was discovered first in 1976 and there is not a vaccine. And of course, it's not that they haven't worked on a vaccine, yhey just haven't a vaccine that's safe. So the reason why I think that this Corona, SARS Corona-2 should now be down to safety class 1, which means you don't require any social distancing, it's because we now know we have a preventative strategy and we have a treatment. So the difference between something.....

**[01:28:52] Del Bigtree**

We're getting a different story here, Dolores. I mean, here, I mean, I know you're singing the praises of hydroxychloroquine. We have seen the studies all over, you know, China, and they've been done in Italy, of course, the great work by Dr. Didier Raoult. But here in America, we've got Tony Fauci saying, you know, it really doesn't look very promising. We, you know, and we have governors that are saying, I am going to restrict the use of hydroxychloroquine and, for only emergency use, like right at the point where someone might be going on a respirator. What do you have to say about that policy that is, at least through most of America. And when we're hearing Matthew McConaughey saying, this shouldn't be political, I feel like hydroxychloroquine got really political here in America. As soon as Trump said, this looks really promising, CNN, MSNBC, NBC, all of these networks that seem to have a liberal bent just came out against it. You really believe this strongly that hydroxychloroquine could be considered a treatment to the point where we drop it from a level 4 virus, which means no treatment, very deadly, down to a level 1? Can you explain that? What are we doing here in America?



**[01:30:09] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

So what I think, you know there has been now, you know, first of all, that people should be aware that hydroxychloroquine has been used in malaria for over 60 years, and it's been used as treatment for arthritis and lupus for 20 years and also for people with HIV. So there was one very interesting study that hasn't really gotten much attention, that 68,000 people that were on, and generally elderly, were on hydroxychloroquine for arthritis, that out of 68,000, only four of these elderly people ended up in hospital. So they were taking, this is during this outbreak. So that's just an example of how hydroxychloroquine can be very safe when it's well-used. So what I would put a different slant on it, I would say to people like I have a mom who's 94 years old, and if people have are elderly themselves, that they actually, there is a treatment. So essentially the governments and the media are not informing people that there is a way for them to prevent getting flu-like symptoms, but also there is a legal and ethical and moral responsibility. You know, if I was 80 and I was listening to me and saying, well, there is an option that I just have to take a very safe treatment, that I will can go reengage in the world and I don't have to worry about getting these flu symptoms ,that I am saying that we have to hold individual people like our Taoiseach, I am holding Leo Varadkar to account, and our ministers for health, and they have to push forward on the main news stations.

**[01:31:36] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

Who is the scientist that's making those decisions? And when I ran the biosafety lab in Berlin, if anybody died because in my lab, I would be responsible, and even if I did not make a mistake. So I, and the fine was around a quarter of €1 million at the time, and that was, you know, 15 years ago. So that's an example of how scientists can be held to account. So I think what it is, is that people whose parents die, you know, in June, or if family members, that really those deaths are unnecessary. So the media is not, there's prevention, they're not saying that there's a treatment. So therefore, and I do fear as well that they are almost hoping that there will be a spike in the second wave and that spike in deaths could actually be patients who have undiagnosed cancers or an increase in cardiovascular disease.

**[01:32:29] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

So what we have to say is the policy is entirely wrong, and I am happy to debate in America or Ireland or anywhere with people. There is no need for social distancing, there is no need for masks. One people, once people know nutrition, vitamins and hydroxychloroquine can prevent it and treatment. But actually the whole world should be opening up on the 25th of May 2020. And also, we should never do this again, because once you clear the virus, you will be immune for life. So there is no need. We can actually, we'd be better to open up now as well, because the virus is circulating in the winter time, and there is no need to have a second wave. And I would say that we need to end the lockdown and then never again, right. This is not, it was an entirely mistake and it should never be done. And I think individual scientists should come out and publish the papers at a US presidential thing, the basis for all this. So there was no need for the models, right? We have enough data. There's no need for masks, distancing. We have to stop it right now.

**[01:33:31] Del Bigtree**

It seems to me, Dolores, and you're, there are so many scientists across the world that are saying the exact same thing. When I hear people like Matthew McConaughey, I'm beating on him a little bit. He doesn't know better, he's an actor, he's not a scientist. But when he says, you know, we have a common enemy, we have, we're in a war against a virus, it seems to me the war that's going on in this world right now is against herd immunity. It's really a war against nature and how we've survived since the dawn of man. We have this beautiful pattern which is so beautifully shown in the graphs you're showing. You see the flu in 2017, it lasted the same amount of time. We see, you know, we even know that MERS and SARS had the same cycle. This idea, you're hearing that the COVID-19 could be here forever, for 30 years. That defies all the science we know about every other coronavirus before it. It's as though they keep moving the goalposts. It's just like whatever anecdotal thought they can come up with to scare us some more, this is going to be the first coronavirus that lasts a lifetime, or this is the first coronavirus where maybe you don't get immunity after you've had it. Or you have the first virus ever that acts totally differently than any other virus we've seen through the history of mankind, and perhaps I think one of the biggest stories I want to know if you have any thoughts on this. You know, we've been hearing, in fact, do we have the video where we hear everybody talking about how children are safe? We've been hearing that children are safe, take a look at this, Dolores. .

**[01:35:00] Natasha Robinson, Health editor**

One of the merciful things about the coronavirus pandemic is that the disease does not seem to badly affect children.

**[01:35:06] Various speakers**

Kids seem to be relatively unaffected.

**[01:35:08] Various speakers**

Children are more mildly affected.

**[01:35:10] Various speakers**

The virus poses a low risk for kids.

**[01:35:13] Dr. Deborah Birx, Coronavirus Response Coordinator**

Millennials, Generation Z, Generation X that are out and about, these are the individuals that we know have the least symptoms.

**[01:35:21] Various speakers**

Kids have immune systems that can rapidly adapt and change, so if they get the coronavirus, it can fight it.



**[01:35:25] Various speakers**

Kids who have been found to be infected seem to be having mild illness, if any illness at all related to the infection.

**[01:35:35] Del Bigtree**

I mean, every scientist around the world has been saying, this doesn't affect children, it's really the elderly, we know this for a fact. But then all of a sudden this week, as though, you know, we're losing political ground. People are coming out into the sunshine. They're starting to just defy the orders of lockdown, saying this seems ridiculous. I'm seeing the science around the world. I'm seeing scientists saying we need herd immunity. Now, all of a sudden, this brand new story came out. This one was NBC saying, "Multiple children in in Mass. sickened by deadly coronavirus-related illness.... 'It's occurring about six weeks after a child may have been exposed to a COVID-19 infection,' he said." You know, and it is just randomly happening. "82 New York City kids diagnosed with 'mystery illness' related to COVID-19." That's a very strong statement. "The link between COVID-19 and the syndrome has not been confirmed." It hasn't been confirmed, yet look at that headline. Look at this. It says, not confirmed, but it says related to COVID-19. I mean, they're clearly going out of the way to scare people. If you read these articles deeper, it's saying that Kawasaki's disease, which can happen from a virus, there's multiple reasons why a child can get this. There were even articles that said that, well, though, Kawasaki's was seen in children after they'd had COVID-19, that several of the children didn't test positive. And we're talking about like a handful of children around the world right now. Is this a scare tactic, or right here?

**[01:37:01] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

Absolutely it is. So absolutely. There has been papers indeed for Kawasaki, maybe 1 or 2 cases. But I think what we have to do is, you know, judge risk, right. So say if the risk of the coronavirus is equivalent to the risk of people driving in America, right. So that if everyone doesn't drive, there will be the equivalent less deaths. But what we have to do in an ordinary people or in the world is they manage risk every day, so that, you know, people do drive to work every day, and they do recognize there is a very small risk. So I think why we have to hold personally the owners of the media stations personally responsible and the politicians and the health officials is that what they are doing is hyping up the fear so that to try and give a rationale for a policy that has no scientific immunological basis, and more people will be sick and more people will die because of their policy decisions. So I think we will actually globally, and I've been in touch with some scientists and lawyers worldwide, that we actually need to set up legal tribunals in countries for crimes against humanity, specifically for the heads of those countries. And also I would be calling between today and May 25th for the the presidents of those countries to name the individuals who are taking these decisions, and we will put them on notice, that there has to be a mechanism to hold them and they should actually, because if you are involved, especially as a medical profession and doctors, you have a duty to say that they have to do, they cannot do more harm than good. And I am saying, as are the other scientists, that their policy decisions, their personal decisions by the prime ministers and presidents of these countries, that they are negligent in their duties if they do not take in the opposite voices and have televised debates on the radio stations and tv stations in the country, and that otherwise we will count the deaths after the 25th of May, I would be saying, that is reopening the World Day.

**[01:39:04] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

And I think what's particularly tragic is that they are attacking people. You know, if you work in a government job like I do and have a pension, I'm still getting my salary. But if you own a small business or a restaurant or a hotel or a taxi driver, you really don't have enough money. So the health and economic consequences of the lockdown are multiples, and the destruction of people's health and immune systems are probably 10 to 20 times. So those individual people will have to be held to account and they should actually go to prison because they are resulting in unnecessary deaths within the various societies. So I would be saying that this is now being a crime against humanity, and I am holding Leo Varadkar to account, the Prime Minister of Ireland, and I would be very happy. If I am wrong, he can put all of his teams against me in a tv program in RTE for an hour, and if I am wrong, I will take them all on together. Then he can carry on with the lockdown. But if not, I would be saying that he should be personally sued and he should lose his salary and his pension. And as a doctor, he has an even greater responsibility to not harm people. So that's, I think we just need to.

**[01:40:17] Del Bigtree**

Alright, alright, alright. I'm going to start saying it now because it means something. Dolores, those are fantastic ideas. And it's true. Someone needs to be held accountable. We can't, I mean, if you watch Tony Fauci, the guy who said every possible scenario at some point. Don't wear a mask, it's totally pointless. Do wear a mask, you know it's going to protect you. This thing isn't really deadly. Oh, it's totally deadly. Oh, it's just like the flu. Oh, it's going to kill millions. I mean, it's like if you say enough things, he's got it covered. He can say, oh, I said that, amongst the other million things that totally went against that. But, Dolores, I want to thank you for taking the time. I know it's risky what you're saying right now.

**[01:40:52] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

Can I just say one more thing, Del?

**[01:40:54] Del Bigtree**

Go ahead.

**[01:40:55] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

If it's okay, can I <audio briefly cuts out> one little thing. I think that I have looked into these issues over about ten years, and I think there needs to be a global community where people who are assessing vaccine safety have no conflicts of interest, and, you know, say I could be involved in the vaccine, but it was entirely for Africa and I did not benefit from it and we didn't, and that you would sign that you and your family would not benefit from any vaccines. So I would say people like, you know, Dr. Sherri Tenpenny, Dr. Judy Mikovits, Professor Blaylock. So people who guarantee for their lifetimes they will not have any conflicts of interest in a vaccine, in any financial way, no benefit. That there should be a separate regional or global institute for vaccine safety, and I'd be very happy to be involved in that. And all of the results of the trials should be available and all of the adverse events and there needs to be a tracking system, post-marketing surveillance to actually track in countries what the adverse events are, because often they are six months or nine months after. And if they are in autoimmune diseases, they could be dependent, or chronic fatigue, on the genetic makeup of individuals. So if they're not tracked systematically after a particular vaccination, then it's very difficult to decide the symptoms. So I would just say.

**[01:42:15] Del Bigtree**

Let me just, right there, hold on, hold on. Because you brought up, you decided to ask more, so I have another question for you. When you start hearing this idea that they want to give this vaccine to everyone in the world. They're racing to, hopefully, they're now saying maybe by the end of the year. When you think of a vaccine that's going to have as little safety, we know there's no placebo trials going on, against a saline placebo, maybe some other, you know, adjuvanted vaccines or things, but we don't have a safety profile that will be established. Is it not terrifying to think, what good is a surveillance system to see that this vaccine actually causes severe autoimmune diseases if we've all already got it in us? What could this do to our species? .

**[01:43:00] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

So absolutely. So on an interview about a few days ago, I said that I would personally take a legal case and thank, I'm very grateful that a lot of barristers and solicitors have now contacted me and organizations in this space because in our country we have a constitutional and inalienable right to body integrity. But I think the issue with these coronaviruses, what people need to be aware, is that this coronavirus has been around since 2003 and there are no licensed vaccines, right? But it's not that they have previously done a huge amount of work to develop a vaccine, but the reason why there is no vaccine on the schedule in America or there's none available is that in the studies, when they vaccinated the animal models, that when those animal models, exactly. I sent you the paper, came across again a coronavirus subsequently, they had a cytokine storm. So this happened we'll say in RSV for children, and two of the children died, the initial ones. But also it is emerging that that could have been a major issue in why so many people died in Wuhan and in Lombardy, because no one is saying why weren't there more deaths across China or in other regions.

**[01:44:10] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

And there was actually vaccine <audio briefly cuts out> minister, and it shows that there, the US Army actually published a paper that in the influenza vaccine, that if coronaviruses were there and that they actually when the soldiers then came across a coronavirus, they had much more significant adverse events. So the danger for humanity is that there has been no corona vaccine in 17 years because, exactly as you say, if all of a population get it, it's only when the coronavirus comes along circulating the globe in 3 or 4 years, there could be hundreds of thousands of deaths. And so the reason why I started to speak out was that in Ireland, the Irish Medicines Organization did a press release on the 5th of May 2020 that they are going to engage in mandatory vaccinations for the whole country, and I will not take that vaccine and I will take a legal case. And I've also offered to volunteer for parents or anyone in their employment who are adversely affected because of this flu vaccination. So I think....

**[01:45:19] Del Bigtree**

So let me ask you, I read the article on the flu.

**[01:45:24] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

...with governments is, just, if you challenge them sometimes.

**[01:45:27] Del Bigtree**

Let me ask you a question. On the flu vaccine, my understanding was that there was viral interference. My understanding of that being that it was just, your body was taught to just look at the flu, but you kind of let coronavirus go by. But I've heard, one of the big, Plandemic has been a big discussion this week. Judy Mikovits said, there's actually coronavirus in the flu shot. Do you agree with that perspective, and does that then mean that what we're seeing may not, are you saying that it may not be viral interference, but what we're actually seeing is this antibody immune enhancement that was happening in the vaccines, that if there's a little coronavirus in the flu, then when we come in contact with it, it gives us a more serious reaction, which Tony Fauci keeps warning us is a possibility with the vaccine. Did I hear you right? Are you agreeing with Judy that coronavirus is in the vaccine.

**[01:46:17] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

Yes you did. I agree entirely with Judy and I just, you don't need to put it up now, but there was a second slide associated with the paper around the SARS, that what happens is that these vaccines are made sometimes on monkey kidneys, you know, or on different cell lines. And as we know, coronaviruses are actually, you know, they are actually coronaviruses associated with different animals. So if they use a tissue to make the influenza vaccine, and that tissue comes from a dog or from a monkey, and they are intrinsically have coronaviruses, when you're making a virus, you actually often homogenize the tissue, you know, the underlying fetal cell line or the underlying dog tissue or the underlying kidney from a monkey. And so all of the latent viruses that those animals have are then included in the flu that has then been injected into people. And so then they become exposed. So why there is no corona vaccine after 17 years is that when they injected those, the vaccines containing those type of material, all of the animals would die, or if it was in, you know, babies or in soldiers, that they would have this really adverse immune reaction, which then would have to be treated. So that's why in Ireland we cannot have a mandatory vaccination because essentially we are experimenting on the world. But I think what's also important to say is, the coronavirus has circulated the world, within six weeks, it's gone. And the way this virus does is you clear it, right? There is no, the PCR test would be negative, but your antibody test would be positive. So there is no latent disease. And what those people are are not cases like me, we are immune for life. And if we come across that exact virus again, we won't have symptoms. Of course, if it mutates, then some people will have depending on the mutation. So this is entirely unnecessary what they're doing, and we just have to call it out and I'm very happy to be given the opportunity, Del.

**[01:48:17] Del Bigtree**

Dolores, that was incredible information and a new look into, we've discussed the flu shot and I think about right now huge discussions in the Australian football leagues where they're trying to force many of those athletes to get a flu shot, saying, you don't want to get the flu and the coronavirus at the same time. But what you're saying is something I've been worried about, but on a deeper level. If there's coronavirus in those flu vaccines, you could be putting those athletes, and anybody. When I hear doctors here say, well you should at least get your flu shot, the idea that we might be putting people in grave danger by doing that is spectacular information.

**[01:48:56] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

And if you just want to do the lastslide, there's a lot of text in one of the slides on the SARS paper, and at the end, if you want to put it up, it's a lot of text, the second, the end of a paper, but the last sentence is, because of these results, we have to really consider whether we should be making corona-type viruses. So you don't have to put it up, but this was a 2012 paper that I sent you on, you can put it up on your website. So because of the results. Yeah, that it really, so I think that it's an experiment and that we should say no and scientists like me who study, you know, immunology, we have to speak up because otherwise there could be significant, unnecessary deaths.

**[01:49:36] Del Bigtree**

Absolutely. I have seen that. We've seen the science. It is so great to have you on. Continue your great work. You are obviously, you know, we always try to say to people, be brave. Dolores, amazing. Great to know you're out there. Luckily, you are surrounded by, I would say, the body of the most intelligent scientists in the world are agreeing with you. Thank you for bringing so much clarity to us today.

**[01:50:01] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

Thank you.

**[01:50:02] Del Bigtree**

Alright, you take care.

**[01:50:02] Prof. Dolores J. Cahill, PhD**

Thank you for having me, Del. Take care. Bye bye.

**[01:50:04] Del Bigtree**

You bet. Absolutely <ptfff>, right. Mind blowing, is that mind blowing? To see somebody with many, as many credentials as that, has worked on, you know, has tested the proteins that viruses are attaching to, knows more about this than almost anybody, certainly more than Matthew McConaughey. It's the last time, I swear ,I'm going to say his name. Look, I want to talk about something. You aren't seeing this on the news. The news report is saying, in Ireland, in America, I believe Anderson Cooper and Sanjay Gupta or Rachel Maddow, these people that are promoting these terrible ideas, that you should be locked down, that you should be wearing a mask, that hydroxychloroquine doesn't work, they are getting people killed. They are getting people killed. And we need to hold them accountable. As reporters, we're supposed to at least report on it, ask the hard questions, ask the hard questions of the health official in Ventura that says, we are going to take you from your home. Make them explain what they mean. And when we have Tony Fauci saying, I believe in a vaccine, say, is it possible the fact that the NIH holds patents, could that be blinding your vision? Or is it possible you're against hydroxychloroquine because you really want remdesivir? You don't want a product that's 99% successful, where 68,000 people who are taking it on a weekly basis couldn't even get coronavirus. Is it possible you want remdesivir because you need a failure out there, so that we keep failing our way forward towards your crazy vaccine, a year or two or 5 or 10 years out, where we're living in absolute Armageddon because we have no businesses anymore and maybe China owns everything because it's the only thing up and running.

**[01:51:51] Del Bigtree**

Folks, if you're joining us for the first time, obviously this is not like any other news station. I just did about a one hour interview with one of the top scientists in the world because we geek out here. We do. If you really want to know the science and you want to understand what's happening in the world you're living in and why your job isn't going to be there 2 or 3 months from now when California says maybe they'll let you out, or whether you're going to believe the next spike as it comes, we are bringing you the facts, and we are getting to the bottom of it. And we're showing you the studies. If you're brand new to us, right now, all you have to do is type in ICAN, I-C-A-N, right now in your comments, if you're watching on Facebook. If you're on YouTube or iTunes or on our website, thehighwire.com, all you have to do is text us at 33222, type in I-C-A-N, and we will try to get you as much of the details and the papers and the things that were referenced by people like Dolores, Professor Dolores, on our show. But more importantly, more than just what you see here on our set, more importantly than the research that we're doing around the world, we also have a legal team, and we are doing investigations.

**[01:52:59] Del Bigtree**

And when Dolores says, she wants to sue public officials, she wants to go after public officials, guess what we do here at the Informed Consent Action Network, that's our parent company, that's the nonprofit that makes The HighWire possible. We not only report on the news, we are making news. We have won lawsuits against the FDA, CDC, National Institute of Health, and Health and Human Services. And I want to bring your attention really quickly, if you want to know what we do, this is a brand new letter that we've drafted up and sent out. We are starting an investigation into who? Dr. Anthony Fauci. This letter is specifically about remdesivir. If you watched our show a couple of weeks ago, we have serious questions about the manipulation of the only study. Now, remember what Dolores was saying? Hydroxychloroquine is showing success all around the world. People who are taking a tablet for any other illness as a part of their treatment couldn't even get coronavirus. Only four out of like 68,000 elderly, the most vulnerable population, only four of them ended up in the hospital out of 68,000. I think most of those people, maybe all of them, were in Italy, which was the hotbed of coronavirus. It works. Yet Tony Fauci has come out against hydroxychloroquine.

**[01:54:14] Del Bigtree**

It's not being used appropriately upon diagnosis in hospitals in New York where elderly are dying. And I think that that's a real problem. Instead, he's come out, he's excited about remdesivir, which is the exact flip of the coin, the opposite side of the coin. Remdesivir is failing in studies all around. Studies have been dropped out that we talked about this two weeks ago, you can go watch that show. But they're dropping out of trials because people are dying at higher rates that are taking remdesivir. Well, we're beginning an investigation, this letter is going out to Tony Fauci. Let me read some of the excerpts right now, can we bring that up? This is, Dear Dr. Fauci, The Informed Consent Action Network is reporting to you.... "On April 29th, 2020, you stated that 'The data shows that remdesivir has a clear-cut, significant positive effect in diminishing the time to recovery...' This study appears to have many serious irregularities as detailed below. Prior to sending these concerns to the appropriate federal ethics and oversight committees, we wanted to provide you an opportunity to respond." We start discussing, "The study at issue, a multi-center, randomized clinical trial commenced on February 21, 2020. Like all such studies, before it commenced a detailed study protocol was established. It is critical that the protocol be set in stone before a study begins. This assures the validity of the study... Despite the importance of adhering the study protocol, there were numerous substantive deviations in the NIAID's study of remdesivir." The one you yourself are doing. All the failed studies, you're about to override it with one study that you were doing.

**[01:55:48] Del Bigtree**

We go through all of the issues. They changed the amount of people in the study. They went on and, you know, despite the study protocol, they started changing categories. They even removed death as one of the categories so that we know how many people died. All of this while they're in the middle of the study. You're changing it while you're seeing results come in. This, by almost every definition in science, is scientific fraud. Therefore, we end this letter this way. And you can read it, this is up on our website. "I will not speculate as to your motives in seeking to have remdesivir licensed and pushed out to the public so quickly. What I will say is that you and NIAID can do better. The American people deserve better. They deserve science that is on solid footing. Not a sales pitch based on a single study in which every material element of its protocol was changed after patient outcomes were observed. Please provide a response on or before May 20th, 2020 to the serious irregularities regarding the NIAID remdesivir study detailed above. If we do not receive a response by then, we intend to pursue ethics and related claims with the appropriate federal agencies. Very truly yours, Del Bigtree, CEO of the Informed Consent Action Network." You can mark your words, we are not just stopping at a letter.

**[01:57:11] Del Bigtree**

I hope that Dr. Fauci decides to respond to us and explain what's going on with this goofy study. I also want to let you know that we have 30 FOIA requests, Freedom of Information Act requests, for materials from Dr. Fauci, people at HHS, CDC, the NIH. We are under a full tilt shock and awe investigation of our government and this ridiculous thing that's been going on with COVID-19. If you want to support these efforts along with this amazing show where we're bringing in the best scientists around the world, I really need your help. These lawsuits are going to cost a lot. Having this legal team put forward these letters and do these FOIA requests, it is nonstop, 24/7. Please donate \$20 for 2020 right now. You can make a difference. You can stop this. Not only me putting up a tweet, stop Ventura County from taking your kids away, imagine what we can do if we can stop Tony Fauci from manipulating studies to push through bad drugs, to erase good drugs, or make us wait on vaccines while they destroy our economy. The HighWire is directly active. Maybe I'm not a news reporter. Maybe I'm an activist. I'm called all sorts of different things in newspapers all over the world. All I can say is I work for you. We are here for you. We are fighting for the issues that matter, and we are discussing the issues that matter. And we are reporting on everything we find.

**[01:58:38] Del Bigtree**

And if we find a problem, we don't just report on it, we investigate it. We send letters and ultimately we bring lawsuits. You are making that possible. If you want to try and imagine who else is doing exactly that, I'd like to know, and I would also celebrate them too. But we are here for you. This is sponsored by the Informed Consent Action Network. You are a part of that network. You are making it happen. And all of this is to make sure that this entire planet does not turn into a circus, that our country and government is not some circus game, but is run by intelligent people that actually care about us, that actually work for us. You know, when we look at this circus around the world, there are other countries that are ahead of us. The UK is ahead of us. They got into this a little bit earlier. The disease took off a little bit earlier. And I guess, you know, as they say in comedy, maybe it's too soon. It's apparently not too soon in the UK. Look at this great piece that was put out by a guy who's acting like he's feeding information to their bumbling health minister. I thought this was hysterical. And to me, it really shows, once you start being the focus of comedy, once you become a Saturday Night Live skit, your days are numbered. Take a listen to this out of the UK.

**[01:59:57] Questioner**

Are we caught in something of a Catch-22 with contact tracing, because most of us are trying to isolate ourselves as much as possible.

**[02:00:04] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

So. Um. Um.

**[02:00:09] Michael Spicer**

Just say no.

**[02:00:10] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

No, is the short answer.

**[02:00:13] Michael Spicer**

And the long answer is...

**[02:00:17] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

And the slightly longer answer is that...

**[02:00:21] Michael Spicer**

We're not caught in a Catch-22.

**[02:00:22] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

So we're not caught in a, in a, in a Catch-22.

**[02:00:26] Michael Spicer**

And social distancing measures are still very important, even in the Isle of Wight, where we are trialing the app.

**[02:00:32] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

Social distancing measures are the, are the thing that are doing there.

**[02:00:35] Michael Spicer**

Are the thing that it doing there? No, no, no, hold it together, Matt. Try to say the words rather than let them dribble out of your wobbly mouth.

**[02:00:41] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

And so the, hence the.

**[02:00:43] Michael Spicer**

Stay at home, protect the NHS, save lives. That's still really important.

**[02:00:45] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

Stay at home to protect the NHS and save lives. Unless you're in the Isle of Wight.

**[02:00:51] Michael Spicer**

What? No. Take that back right now, you gibbering omelet.

**[02:00:55] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

But in your, even in the Isle of Wight, you should...

**[02:00:58] Michael Spicer**

Still stay at home.

**[02:00:59] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

Still.

**[02:01:00] Michael Spicer**

Stay at home.



**[02:01:02] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

Stay at home to protect the NHS and save lives.

**[02:01:04] Michael Spicer**

But install the app if you're on the Isle of Wight.

**[02:01:07] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

You should also install the app because that will help this to be yet more effective.

**[02:01:12] Michael Spicer**

Okay, I think our message of stay at home save lives but go out and use our app is starting to confuse people.

**[02:01:18] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

And it's quite a, um...

**[02:01:22] Michael Spicer**

Okay, what's important right now is stressing that there is no link between contact tracing and relaxing lockdown measures.

**[02:01:28] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

We haven't said that you...

**[02:01:31] Michael Spicer**

We can't make changes.

**[02:01:32] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

We can't make changes before it's up and running. It's just that the the...

**[02:01:37] Michael Spicer**

The lower the number of new cases, the more effective it will be.

**[02:01:40] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

The lower the number of new cases, the more effective it will be.

**[02:01:43] Michael Spicer**

Fine, move on.

**[02:01:44] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

But we haven't made a concrete link.

**[02:01:46] Michael Spicer**

Move on.

**[02:01:47] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

That your question drew.

**[02:01:49] Michael Spicer**

Move on before you get into another one of your muddles.

**[02:01:51] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

Between the number, between the um.

**[02:01:53] Michael Spicer**

Too late.

**[02:01:56] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

They they they they...

**[02:01:56] Michael Spicer**

You do realize that the more you try to explain things on which you have no expertise, the more it becomes apparent that your level of success should not have gone any further than that of a branch manager of a PC World.

**[02:02:08] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

And making changes to the social distancing measures.

**[02:02:12] Michael Spicer**

Are you done?

**[02:02:14] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

There isn't a necessary link between the two. They're just, they they they they.

**[02:02:18] Michael Spicer**

Please stop. You're somehow saying nothing, and you're saying it really slowly. So just, just wind up and say goodbye, please.

**[02:02:26] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

Thank you very much indeed. Thanks too, for all the questions.

**[02:02:29] Michael Spicer**

Very grateful for the opportunity to blah, blah, blah.

**[02:02:32] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

Very grateful for this opportunity to have set out these details of our test, t-, track.

**[02:02:37] Michael Spicer**

Yeah, that's crystal clear.

**[02:02:38] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

Test track and trace program and look forward to seeing you again here.

**[02:02:44] Michael Spicer**

Just get off, you're not auditioning for the One Show.

**[02:02:46] Matt Hancock, UK Secretary of State for Health and Social Care**

From here in Downing Street very soon. Thanks very much.

**[02:02:50] Del Bigtree**

That was from Michael Spicer.co.uk. Absolutely hysterical. Look, folks, we do have to maintain a sense of humor. I mean, we've got to maintain a sense of humor or this could all get very, very depressing really fast. Luckily on our team, as we do this work, we do have these moments and we do have to start laughing. But by the way, that was edited, it was manipulated, it's very funny, but actually things are getting comical. It's almost like Monty Python. This was just the other day on one of the top morning talk shows in the UK. This is not edited. Listen to how confused their news media now is based on what Boris Johnson said last night. You can't make this stuff up. Imagine, this is like Fawlty Towers or some Monty Python sketch. Take a listen to this.

**[02:03:40] Various news reporters**

Well, we've got to start this morning in a state of utter confusion after last night's address to the nation by Boris Johnson. His speech created more questions than answers.

**[02:03:49] Various news reporters**

And the answers seem to change every half hour. I can't. The problem is, I think we're all just about holding on. We've all done so well. We've all done exactly as we've been told, haven't we? We're doing so well to keep our spirits up, to keep going, to keep going, to keep going. But when there is this level of confusion, it knocks you back.

**[02:04:08] Various news reporters**

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

**[02:04:08] Various news reporters**

So it's like when you feel like you're just getting to grips with it, you're just keeping afloat, it just knocks you back again.

**[02:04:13] Various news reporters**

Well, that's the trouble with there this morning, is that we now lack clarity. I now, I understood until last night at 7:00, I understood where we were going, I understood what was happening. Now I don't understand. Now I don't know what's happening. The most recent piece of confusion is whether you can see your parents, because it now seems that you are being asked to choose between your mother and your father. Initially, the government said that you could only see one of them, which makes no sense whatsoever. And then the First Minister, Dominic Raab, said on the Today Show earlier that you could see two parents. Now they've gone back and said that you can only see one.

**[02:04:50] Various news reporters**

Well, we'd like to have heard from the government themselves, but they have decided not to speak to ITV today, both ourselves and GMB. Dominic Raab, he went on to say, if, for example, you're going to the park and you want to, you can stay two meters apart, you could meet up with another member of your own household, but surely you've been.

**[02:05:08] Various news reporters**

Well, the government sources then said that Mr. Raab had misspoke and he meant to say that only members of the same household can all go to the park together. I mean, you literally couldn't write this. You couldn't write it. If this was in a farce on the telly, I'd go, that's a bit far-fetched. No government would arse it up that much. I mean, it is, it is utterly astonishing. And you know that we've been we've been really level on here, we've been really sensible, I think, on here. But now this is this is this has just tipped us over the edge today until somebody maybe would come on the show and explain what it is that you actually want us to do. What are we allowed to do? Are you genuinely saying that we can only meet one parent? Can you meet one parent in the morning and another parent in the afternoon? If you go round to their house, do we go round to the house or does it have to be outside? Does the mother come out of the house and stand in the garden, and does the father go back into the house? Maybe the father is in the back garden whilst you meet your mother in the front garden. What do you mean?

**[02:06:05] Various news reporters**

We don't understand.

**[02:06:08] Del Bigtree**

I mean, I love what he said. Since he's apparently allowed to say it in the UK, I'm going to repeat it. It's almost like a farce. No government would arise up that much, right? Couldn't possibly be. It does seem that way. Folks, there's a lot of important information you're getting here on The HighWire. But I also want to point out to you that scientists all around the world are actually joining in a loud, cacophonous consensus. The lockdown is unnecessary. It was only the first step if we ever use it amongst four steps that have to do with getting to herd immunity. We've got to get to herd immunity, and no matter what the idiots at the WHO say, yes, you are immune for life to the COVID-19 once you get it. For 99% of you, 99 out of 100, that means you are going to have light symptoms or no symptoms at all. All of these things are true. There is nothing behind the fact that children are getting any sicker, even though they're trying to make you afraid. And know that once you start seeing news anchors saying, this is absolutely nuts, I am totally confused. I don't trust anybody that's running this government, which is now what we're all saying about every government we're watching, the days are numbered.

**[02:07:23] Del Bigtree**

This is going to come to an end. Bill Gates is not going to get away with this great coup. I do not believe we're going to all end up microchipped and getting forcibly injected with by 300 million vaccines delivered on us by the military on a product that was never tested for safety, even though they produced it before it ever went through a safety study. There is no way we are that stupid. There is no way, there are enough of us to let them get away with this. There is no way that there are enough doctors and nurses that will go along with this insanity when they start pushing out vaccines that have never been tested for safety. And by the way, guess who's supposed to get them first? That's right. The doctors and nurses, the frontline themselves. Do you think they aren't able to read a study? Do you think they're not asking themselves, geez, if I'm the first one that has to get it, and it never went through a safety trial. And I did hear a little bit about the fact that the animals all died in the only animal trials I could hear about. Trust me, folks, we win this, we win big. But please do not be silent. Please do not sit back.

**[02:08:29] Del Bigtree**

Clearly, when we step up with our voice, when we tweet, when we say, no and hell no. Not yeah, yeah, yeah, we're in, but no, no, no, no, no, we are not. When we step up with our voices in countries that said, not only are you allowed to step up against your, you know, with an argument against your government, you are demanded to do it, by the Constitution of the United States. When your rights start getting taken away, when you see laws that are unjust, when the science does not back up what they are telling you is happening with the virus, you are not only allowed to our government, the government that was built by our founding fathers, is supposed to be correct and when they're not, you as citizens are supposed to, it's incumbent upon you, to step up and say, no. Not now, not today, certainly not in the United States of America. I don't know what your laws are in Australia, but I'd be saying not in Australia, not on my rugby team, not on my soccer team. You are not going to force products that have terrible safety records, that look like they're making everybody else more sick that get them. We will not stand for this. These are governments for and by the people. The citizens.

**[02:09:54] Del Bigtree**

That are allowed to follow the truth. Yeah, YouTube and Facebook and private companies can censor us, but the government cannot. The government cannot stop us. And I would take Andrew Cuomo's word for it when he said, yeah, we might have written a law, but you didn't have to listen to it. Especially since people were going to get killed. And if you're a doctor or a nurse that is pushing forward with protocols, that's putting people on ventilators and avoiding giving them hydroxychloroquine, just know no matter what happens, in your final days as you lay staring at the ceiling, hydroxychloroquine was available. Those people did not need to die. And I will not celebrate you on the front lines if you do not step forward and start saving people instead of killing them. We have treatments. This is not Ebola. This is not a level 4. This is a level 1. And it's time to treat it as a level 1. Save people. Save our nations. Save this world. It's in our hands. See you next week on The HighWire.

**[02:11:26] Del Bigtree**

Thanks for watching, and thank you for being a HighWire Insider. Be sure to share this show with your friends on Facebook, YouTube, Periscope, and Instagram. Because knowledge is power, power is freedom, and we need all we can get.

END OF TRANSCRIPT